



Burundi Farmers' Organizations in Tea Industry: What Issues, what solutions?

Eric Ndayisaba

► To cite this version:

Eric Ndayisaba. Burundi Farmers' Organizations in Tea Industry: What Issues, what solutions?. International Marmara Social Sciences Congress (Imascon Autumn 2021), International Marmara Social Sciences, Dec 2021, Kocaeli, Turkey. pp.466-474. hal-03560898

HAL Id: hal-03560898

<https://hal.science/hal-03560898>

Submitted on 7 Feb 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Burundi Farmers' Organizations in Tea Industry: What Issues, what solutions?

By

*Eric Ndayisaba, PhD, Head of Humanities and Social Sciences Departement at Burundi High
Institute of Education*

Contact mail: ndayisaba.eric@yahoo.fr

Abstract

Tea is a very important economy in Burundi. Famers send their production to companies which transforms and exports it. This study concerns the issues of tea famer's organizations in the context of state monopoly and domination. First, it analyzes the failure of famer's appropriation during the development of the tea industry. This happened because the development tea policies about peasant's organizations did not correspond to the local realities. Secondary, this article proposes some solutions for more farmer's participation for a better future of this sector. It suggests the emergence of autonomous peasant associations.

Keywords

Farming, Tea, Organization, Burundi

Introduction

The tea industry is the second national economy in Burundi. This plant was introduced in Burundi in the early 1960s in the context of the Third World Development. Currently, this sector has 12,000 hectares and more than 6,000 producers spread over 5 tea regions namely Famers sell their tea green leaves to companies and the latter transform them into dry tea ready for export (more than 90 %). In return, companies set the price and pay tea farmers after every two months.

As far as the tea industry management is concerned, farmers are not involved in the process. However, in the 1960s and 1970s, there was an idea to promote farmers' associations, a policy which did not succeed. The State continued to increase its monopoly in the tea industry.

Despite the movement of associations born from the liberalization policy, tea industry remains the business of the big actors namely the Government and private companies. Farmers are marginalized by the paternalist and authoritarian system.

This work is done with funding from African Studies Center of Edinburgh University during April to June 2021. I thank it very much. By means of a historical approach, this study seeks to understand the different issues of the farmers' participation to the management of the tea industry from the 1960s to the present days. It is based on the fieldwork in Burundi tea regions and the documentation through analysis of public and economic policies, rural studies, etc. This same study is interested in the different interactions between the different actors, (the State, Private Companies, associations' leaders and farmers) and the capacities of farmers to negotiate their participation in the tea industry. Finally, it proposes a participatory approach for a better future of the industry.

1. Origins of the policy of Farmers' Organizations

The policy of cooperatives stems from the idea of promoting workers and working conditions, which emerged in the Western countries during the Industrial Revolution (Delas, 1999:29). This vision has widespread further thanks to the initiatives of the International Labour Organization (ILO).

In Burundi as in the rest of the Belgian colonies, the policy of farmers' organizations was thought of since the 1920s through peasants and cooperatives (Mukuri, 1990:150-211). This approach was considered as effective in removing the African mass from traditional production practices.

Similar initiatives have grown in number since the end of the Second World War, with the importance of international development cooperation (Develtere, 1998:13). Therefore, this associative or cooperative policy for economic production was transferred and generalized in developing areas as a test of an egalitarian and democratic economy (Ndayisaba, 2019:472). The Government and its partners focused on the role of the farmers' organizations in the intensification of rural development; it was considered that cooperatives were useful and deserved to be supported thanks to their potential to modernize the conditions of economic and social life, by organizing the market without forgetting the ordinary people (Raison, 1989:412).

Similarly, the village cooperative was considered as a key element in the realm of building a nation state. The peasantry or development village was supposed to promote both the angle of education and civilization insofar as its vision aimed at the populations left behind in order to learn values and standards of an ideal socio-economic modernity (Ndayisaba, 2020b:86).

For this reason, the official support and the ideal image of cooperative development were very common. In fact, this was at the origin of the technocratic influence, even of the monopoly of the administration and the elites in all its developmental structures. This was often realized at the expense of the local populations.

Despite the failure or just the little motivation on the part of the peasants, this collectivist vision of the socio-economic life has lasted long. As it was considered as the best way for an integrated socio-economic development, the same vision has continued to attract the post-colonial regimes. It was reinforced by the Communist awakening and the nationalist and socialist commitment of the first independence elites who envisaged rural development through groupings of farms and populations into villages (Ergas, 1979:174).

However, the transposition of certain colonial practices namely the omnipresence of the technocratic and paternalistic state, the grid of cooperatives by parastatal companies, disciplinary and authoritarian logic and the privilege of the notables were maneuvers to strengthen the control of these apparatuses on the peasantry. In the same perspective of the organization of a “useful peasantry” for an “economy of effort” (Capecchi, 1976:224), the administration sensitized the population for the promotion of national plants, without taking into account related socio-economic constraints. This logic of supervised development has been realized through the tea project.

2. The contradictions of the cooperative policy in the tea sector: from the 1960s to the 1980s

In the early 1960s, the Government of Burundi, widely supported by the then European Economic Community, embarked on the development of tea plantation all over the hills of the highlands region. The choice of cooperatives and associations was the most privileged both in large estates and small peasant estates, although contradictions were eloquent.

2.1. The inconsistencies of the cooperative policy in large tea estates

In large tea estates of Bugarama, Rwegura and Tora, it was planned to develop collective farms. To maximize the profitability of the project, plantations had to be exploited collectively by farmers grouped into cooperatives (Kingdom of Burundi, 1962:29). Being aware of the complexity of the situation, from 1962 to 1966, the managers of the project had the mission to survey the local administration and the labors to know their views on the form to reserve to the farms. The responses were mostly favorable to individual farms, contrary to the wishes of the program planners. It was realized that labors always considered themselves as mere employees in the project without any will to become partners of the project. They had never espoused the idea of a cooperative and always preferred to keep small individual farms, insofar as, in principle, people provide more care, rather to individual property than to collective farms (Ndayisaba, 2020b:88). They also mentioned the risks of administrative constraints for the case of a collective farm.

The managers of the projects were also interested in the legal, social and economic forms to reserve to the groupings of the tea farmers. Despite the worries about the project, they have tried to set up farmers' organizations. The process consisted of forming "rural organizations enjoying civil status", under the supervision of the Ministry of Agriculture. It was a matter of promoting *agriculture under contracts*. The contracts concerned, on the one hand, the State and the cooperative and, on the other hand, the cooperative and the producers. According to the terms of the contract, after the departure of expatriate technical assistance, the cooperatives of the tea farmers were to reimburse progressively the funding and ensure the management of the enterprise (See archives of the Burundi Tea Board).

However, in that period of time, one could notice the superficial aspect of that peasant modernization and certain ambiguities. In fact, there were gaps at the level of the very definition of the particular statutes of the members of the cooperative, constituted by a diversity of categories namely tea farmers and labors. In addition, in order to be admitted as a member of the cooperative, one had to live in the vicinity of the site and regularly work in the company (See archives of the Teza Tea Company). This logic of production through a model of a collectivist enterprise was inconsistent vis-à-vis the reality of the Burundian peasantry, characterised by very

small individual and dispersed farm units. With the requirements of the cooperative approach, the project structures became very bureaucratic and complex for the peasants. The administrative and legal formalities were authoritarian, dubious and boring towards the peasantry. In addition, the population was always reluctant vis-à-vis the collective or cooperative commitment, for she had been deceived by the coffee cooperatives settled during the colonial period and these were mostly influenced by the State and the elites. Moreover, the compulsory and binding nature that characterised all the development policies did not help to convince people of their utility.

In reality, this type of business imposed by the cooperative exploitation neglected the realities of the peasants. People wished to freely work as mere employees in the company and, if necessary, maintain their small and individual tea plots as it was for the coffee plantation. In fact, claiming to develop a population of a given region, through a uniform model, without taking into account local realities, generally leads to considerable resistance and failure (Chonchol, 1996: 161). In addition to tea plantation, other socio-economic concerns inherent in rural life held back the population. The idea of a collective exploitation was not the concern of the population insofar as she could not neglect the subsistence farming. This was more meaningful since the tea yard had a fixed duration. The workers had no guarantees to be selected as members of the cooperatives. The working conditions were also harsh due to long distance to walk to get to the workplace, fatal accidents, low pay and poor weather conditions (Ndayisaba, 2019:328). In such a situation, the tea project was perceived as an overload toward peasant communities and, therefore, these were frequently absent from the tea yard.

In general, public policy actors, regardless of their extent of influence, keep relative capacities to resist against an imposed model (Darbon *et al.*, 2019: 20). For this case study, the populations have resisted against any form of collective or cooperative exploitation. They have either refused to sign the contracts (the case of Teza) or neglected to care community plantations / farms (the case of Tora). Though the idea of cooperative development seemed to be innovative, it originated directly from the funders, was assimilated to the colonizer and from the state; henceforth, due to its authoritarian nature, it could not arouse the popular and voluntary adhesion of the targeted population. At first, people seemed to adhere, but with reservation as they waited for the situation to deteriorate in order to assert their logic; they did not want to get much trouble with the authorities (Ndayisaba, 2019: 482).

Throughout all the means put in place to sensitize the population, there were ambiguities between work on the site and the chore or between the partner and the dominated. Despite their benefits in terms of employment, the tea yard undermined the individual, social and community freedom. It was against their will to choose what activity to do or not to do according to the need. Due to mistrust vis-à-vis the cooperative farming, the managers of the tea projects had to question what they had planned before. Thus, the tea programme was oriented, on the one hand, in the form of large estates under the effective management of the state and, on the other hand, in small peasant estates.

2.2. The failure of the peasant organizations in small tea farms

Toward the end of the 1960s, the tea program began to show interest in *village tea projects*. It was an extension of the tea plantation in small individual peasant estates. For these estates, the idea of village or grouped farms was also envisaged in order to create large spaces only reserved for the tea farming. Tea producers were sometimes called upon to set up individual tea-growing plots comprising between 20 and 25 ares, grouped together along the roads and tracks under the form of peasants. However, this measure was not implemented due to land challenges, as well as the close attachment of peasants to subsistence farming (Ndayisaba, 2020b:224).

In an attempt to implement this policy, associations of tea growers were hastily set up by the Administration. The purpose was to encourage tea growers to collectively organize themselves in order to increase the value of their production through a collective sale to the tea company. The association had to be funded through collective contributions from the tea farmers. The Tea Board was in charge of, among other things, the program management, the technical supervision of the tea growers, as well as the supply of fertilizers, equipment, and phytosanitary products. On their part, tea farmers had to maintain their tea plots in accordance with the guidelines of the company, collectively deliver their production to the factory, pay the services rendered by the association and execute certain community works such as the maintenance of roads and tracks. According to the plans, they are the peasant associations which had, later on, to evolve into cooperatives; the aim was to ensure the succession for the management of the tea companies after the departure of expatriate technical assistance (See Archives of Tea Company of Ijenda).

It is observed, however, that the developmental and technocrat vision of this type was inconsistent vis-à-vis the socio-economic logic of the Burundian peasant. We can, for instance, ask ourselves how the peasants of the then period, alleged associates, could make their own the legal and economic modalities of this model (Capecchi, 1976:297). Moreover, the authoritarian sensitization around the land and the workforce was considered as a means of captivity and control of the peasantry. This enthusiasm for development models through village and collective exploitation had less attention to the will of the concerned peasants. In this perspective of a rational economic organization, the administration encouraged the population to promote profitable national plants namely the tea without taking into account the socio-economic cost undergone by the peasant communities. As in the colonial period in the context of human and equipment resources valorization, the populations were encouraged to live and to produce according to a type of model which did not correspond to their standard of thought and life. For the population, the concern was neither to make up large tea estates of such a kind of production (the labor was always a major challenge) nor to adhere to a cooperative model. Instead, their wish was to maintain the small individual tea lots, similarly to the realities of the local peasants whose land issues remain crucial. But the sharp attitude of the administrative elite to dialogue with the peasants would marginalize the civil initiatives and the community participation into such a rural sector of development. Thus, the structures of associations were progressively abandoned, leaving the State monopoly in the effective management of that large agro-industrial sector.

In brief, this elitist and technocrat vision of the development, through groupings of the estates and farmers, had not taken into account the peasant logic of life and production. It had delayed to understand the situation in the context of all interactions of the socio-economic rural life. Due to a set of economic, social, cultural and legal ambiguities, the cooperative policy has failed both in large estates and in small individual farms. This has compromised the idea of community ownership of the tea sector through the organizations at the expense of the State which has benefited from it and increased its monopoly.

3. The emergence of the State monopoly in a centralized agro-industrial enterprise

Since the 1970s, the State had already increased its influences in all sectors. Due to the ambiguities of the cooperative or associative policy, decision-makers have opted for the

capitalization of the conjugated efforts to save that sector whose challenges had become more and more significant since the mid of the 1970s. The challenges were about, among others, the peasants' reluctance to the idea of working in cooperative and to the large estates, to poor maintenance of the plantations, to low productivity vis-à-vis the forecasts, to dubious management, to misunderstandings and role conflicts and interests. Moreover, while the cost of the expatriate technical assistance was revealed to be important, there was also doubt in the succession (Ndayisaba 2019:486). The matter was how to guarantee more acceptable competence and efficiency according to the development logic of the time.

In such a situation, it is the State monopoly that presented the best solution for the future of the tea enterprise. Thus, in October 1971, the Burundi Tea Board was created to centralize the technical and financial management of all the tea projects.

As for the other great projects of the then period, the tea plantation was considered as a key for the development (See Archives of Burundi Tea Board). Thus, decision-makers have opted to reorganize that agro-industrial and commercial sector in the perspective of the centralization and the state monopoly. Indeed, in October 1981, a study contract of *the reorganization of the tea sector in Burundi* was concluded between the Government of Burundi and the 'Organization, Management and Marketing Company' (SORGEM, French acronym) to specifically reflect on the organizational and legal plans, economic and financial aspects of the enterprise whose propositions had to result in a real institutional reform. Therefore, all the units, tea companies, rural associations, work sites, ... have become integrated entities of specialized and centralized state bodies in order to provide to the State all the necessary means to act effectively. In this context, the tea sector began to radically escape the control of the farmers and became a *major State affair* (Ndayisaba, 2020a: 227).

In brief, it was the notion of state sector for a specialized development, a kind of linear, structured and framed vision which was privileged. The evolution of the tea sector, from the community vision towards a great centralized state sector, became the symbol of state ownership at the expense of the increase of the peasant initiatives. The approaches related to the collective, associative or cooperative exploitation had failed, leaving the place to the monopoly of the decentralizing state. This role of the State, though it was sometimes necessary, hindered initiatives

of civil or community autonomy. The farmers were left with the income distributed in the context of profitability of a centralized sector, of economic poverty, but also of the vagaries of the market and of the great actors, increasingly diversified, with the liberalization policy.

4. What is the place of peasant organizations in the process of liberalizing the tea enterprise?

The idea of liberalization originates from the neoliberal policies, recommended by the World Bank since the end of the 1980s. It mainly aimed at a gradual withdrawal of the State from the management of principal economic sectors for the benefit of the private actors and farmers' organizations. In the tea sector, it was compulsory to wait almost two decades in order to be interested in that approach.

It remains to be seen whether this option succeeds in bringing about the emergence of the peasant association movement, if not, think of innovative alternatives.

4.1. The weaknesses of the new peasant organizations

Since the early 1990s, the idea of farmers' organizations was recurrent in official discourses related to the liberalization approach. However, it was not until 2004 that the State embarked on the creation of tea farmers' associations, with the support of the Non-Governmental Organizations namely the 'Institut Africain pour le Développement Economique et Social' i.e. the African Institute for Economic and Social Development (INADES- Formation)¹.

However, the situation was not very easy. In 2007, it was estimated that only 29% of tea farmers were members of the associations. Similarly, in 2010, in the tea-growing region of Ijenda, only 25 hills out of more than 70 had associations, whereas from 2014 to 2015, on the national forecast / plan, there has been a 6.8% decrease in number of members of the tea farmers' associations. Since they did not understand the aims and the future of those organizations, certain members gradually gave up. They should only stay on condition of the granting of collective loans by the microfinances under the endorsement of those organizations.

¹ Interview with P. Manirakiza (Chief of Tea producers Organisation) at Bujumbura, 18 may 2021.

Originally, the objective was for the peasant organizations to take part in the purchase and management of the business. However, this has remained under the control of the State. The latter remains reluctant and does not want to embark on reforms without any guarantee of the survival of the business since the failure in the privatization of the coffee sector has left bad memories (Ndagijimana, 2015: 42).

In addition, these “top down” organizations, without community base, largely remain without ambitions and sometimes inaccessible to the peasants that they were supposed to represent. The leaders of those organizations are more interested in the participation of seminars, often organized by external funders. Since they consider themselves as *little chiefs of the village*, they hold speeches whose tone and message are similar to those of the administration (Ndayisaba, 2019: 495). This hinders communication, delays and even blocks the development of the peasant associative movement in this sector.

From an organizational point of view, there is a bureaucratic tendency like any other state institution and office. This makes these organizations be hierarchical and inefficient structures. Having no definite aim, these associations gradually turn away from the principal official mission and embrace, namely, the logic of local solidarity such as loans and aid to members facing difficulties. But, due to the lack of clear statutes and leadership, such initiatives do not last long.

A general observation is that it is not easy for those kinds of organizations created under the initiatives of the public authorities (not by the concerned people) to resist the temporal challenges and the lack of legitimate leaders (Cochet, 1995: 110). Such associations generally remain administration ‘puppets’ of the State and cannot oppose or compete with the latter so that it can leave a space for those organizations (Ndayisaba, 2020b: 95).

In this context, tea farmers’ organizations have little opportunity to take off or question the system which also controls them. The paternalist and authoritarian logic of supervising the agricultural production and economy in general, privilege the profitability logic and, thus, hinder the emergence of the community or private initiatives to be more autonomous. For the farmers’ organizations, to become influential actors, more efforts should be conjugated to anticipate innovative perspectives.

3.2. The participatory approach for the future of farmers' organizations

With reference to the paradigms of sustainable development (See Millennium Development Objectives) and to the role of the social enterprise, it is necessary that the farmer be more interested (paid) , rather integrated through the participation in the management of 'his' company. The dominant and effective economic model is, therefore, the one that evolves towards the enterprise liberalization with an important participation of the producers.

Considering that more than 80 % of Burundian tea comes from small peasant farms, the farmer must have a crucial place. One of the alternatives of the tea business concerns the emergence and participation of the autonomous and integrated peasant organizations. To achieve the community ownership in this sector, political will and efforts of the actors are indispensable to make the general socio-economic framework more flexible, accessible, efficient and reassuring.

On the other hand, in this transitional process towards liberalization, the State cannot withdraw suddenly. In the short term, the first phase of liberalization, lasting around 10 years, with the participation of the State, the private actors and the farmers' associations, could allow the latter to gradually familiarize with the management of that enterprise. After, an independent commission would assess and decide, through a widespread and discussed study, on the form to give to the second phase of liberalization, always taking into account the importance of both the economic profitability and farmers' participation. Concerning the financial autonomy of associative structures, the role of banking and microfinance institutions is important to sustain the different farmers' initiatives.

In this regard, the Kenyan model of liberalization and community ownership of the tea business can inspire Burundi. In that great tea country (ranked 3rd worldwide and 1st in Africa), since the 2000s, the farmers' organizations take on a community basis and actively participate in the management of their enterprise (Ndayisaba, 2019: 570).

This participatory approach requires more efforts to sensitize all the concerned stakeholders. The State should allow a reassuring emergence of a "business climate" in order to encourage more potential actors. It would equally be good to trust the farmers who have suffered a lot from a number of authority abuses. This would necessitate the change of mentalities in order to enhance

the state-peasant rapport in the perspective, rather, of cooperation than of monopoly or domination.

Therefore, it is through the process of community, associative and participatory ownership that actors in the tea enterprise could get more benefits of the different opportunities offered by this agro-industrial sector.

Conclusion

The policy of the farmers' organizations has always interested the authorities of the tea sector. However, the paternalist and technocratic vision of the development, through the groupings of the farms and tea growers, has not taken into account the logic of the farmers' life and of the production in the context of all the interactions of the rural socio-economic life. This model of cooperative exploitation or rural association, initiated by the "High" did not conform to the farmer's logic of work and production. Since the beginning of the program, official speeches on the farmers' organizations were not relevant to the reality on the field. The authoritarian practices used to persuade the population about this policy were not likely to bring about the emergence of community care. The "puppet-type" organizations, officially and technically structured as any "modern" enterprise appeared elusive in the eyes of the tea growers.

In principle, this antagonist participation (Develtere, 1998:85), realized with constraints, does not last long. As the farmers were neither interested in nor integrated, they have boycotted the policy of collective farming and farmers' organizations of the 1960-70s. Despite its modernizing nature, the cooperative approach has undergone a remarkable failure, both in large estates and in small individual peasant farms. This has therefore left room to centralization and the state's monopoly in this large agro-industrial sector.

The coming back of the farmers' organizations inspired by the neoliberal vision of the enterprise, is also limited. These types of associations "fabricated" by the State authorities and their partners hardly take off to succeed in their primary mission: the protection of the tea growers' interests. They are challenged either by the influence of the public authorities or by the incompetence of the leadership.

However, it is clear that the participatory approach has to be privileged for the future of the tea business. The success of this approach is closely linked to the emergence of the farmers' organizations, and the latter should be proactive, autonomous, responsible and integrated.

Bibliography

1. Capecchi Bernard, (1976), *La culture du caféier et du théier au Burundi*, Thèse, Université de Bordeaux III, Bordeaux.
2. Chonchol Jacques, (1996), « Revaloriser les sociétés rurales du Tiers-Monde : Conditions inéluctable du développement », in Guichaoua André, *Questions du développement. Nouvelles approches et enjeux*, Paris, L'Harmattan, 147-166.
3. Cochet Hubert, (1995), *Etude sur la stratégie des producteurs de café du Burundi*, Paris, Institut National Agronomique.
4. Darbon Dominique et Provini Olivier (2018), « Penser l'action publique en contextes africains. Les enjeux d'une décentralisation », *Gouvernement et action publique*, Paris, Presses de Science Po, n° 2, pp. 9-29.
5. Darbon Dominique *et al.* (2019), « Un état de la littérature sur l'analyse des politiques publiques en Afrique », *Papiers de recherches AFD*.
6. Decoudras Pierre-Marie (1997), *A la recherche des logiques paysannes*, Paris, Karthala.
7. Delas Jean-Pierre, (1991), *Le mouvement ouvrier. Naissance et reconnaissance XIX^e-XX^e siècles*, Paris, Nathan.
8. Develtere Patrick, (1998), *Economie sociale et développement. Les coopératives, mutuelles et associations dans les pays en développement*, Bruxelles, De Boeck.
9. Ergas Zecki, (1979). « La politique des villages Ujamaa en Tanzanie : la fin d'un mythe », *Tiers-Monde*, 77, 169-186.
10. Mukuri Melchior, (1990), *Les transformations de l'Agriculture au Burundi sous la colonisation belge (1924-1959)*, Québec, Thèse, Université de Laval.
11. Ndagijimana Marcien, (2015), *Enjeux de la privatisation de la filière café au Burundi*, Saarbrücken, Editions Européennes.
12. Ndayisaba Eric (2019), *Le thé au Burundi des années 1960 à 2018 : politique publique de développement, rente et appropriations*, Pau, Thèse de doctorat, Université de Pau et des Pays de l'Adour.
13. Ndayisaba Eric, (2020a), « Les défis de l'appropriation communautaire dans le secteur théicole au Rwanda et au Burundi des années 1960 à nos jours », in S. Geenen, A. Nyenyezi Bisoka, S. Alidou, *Conjonctures de l'Afrique Centrale 2020*, Paris, L'Harmattan, pp. 217-237.
14. Ndayisaba Eric, (2020b) « Les défis des organisations paysannes au Burundi : cas du secteur théicole », *Della/ Afrique*, T2, V2, 6, septembre 2020, pp. 83-100.

15. Raison Pierre, (1989), « *Les erreurs géographiques de l'Ujama tanzanienne* », Tropiques : lieux et liens : florilège offert à Paul Pelissier et Gilles Sautter, Paris, Pinton Florence, ORSTOM, 402-420.
16. Royaume du Burundi. (1962), *Théiculture au Burundi. Muramvya- Busangana*, Rapport, Bujumbura.

Fieldwork and interviews

Names	Profession	Region and date
Bakurakubusa S.	Tea producer	Ijenda, 21 april 2021
Barandereka S.	administrator	Ijenda, 21 april 2021
Barakamfitiye T.	Tea producer	Ijenda, 21 april 2021
Barandagiye M.	Tea producer	Ijenda, 21 april 2021
Baranyomana P.	Tea producer	Ijenda, 21 april 2021
Batwenga R.	Tea producer	Ijenda, 21 april 2021
Bazompora R.	Tea producer	Ijenda, 21 april 2011
Siryuyumusi E.	Association Leader	Ijenda 21 april 2021
Semivyiro H	Tea producer	Ijenda, 21 april 2021
Ndabemeye M.	Association Leader	Ijenda, 21 april 2021
Gahungu E.	Association Leader	Ijenda, 21 april 2021
Hicuburundi D.	Théiculteur	Ijenda, 22 april 2021
Irakoze I.	Association Leader	Ijenda, 22 april 2021
Ndayishimiye D.	Association Leader	Ijenda, 22 april 2021
Niyongabo Ch.	Association Leader	Ijenda, 22 april 2021
Nizigama C.	Association Leader	Ijenda, 22 april 2021
Niyongabo N.	Association Leader	Ijenda, 22 april 2021
Nizigiyimana E.	Association Leader	Ijenda, 22 april 2021
Ntagumuka Th.	Association Leader	Ijenda, 22 april 2021
Nzeyimana E.	Association Leader	Ijenda, 22 april 2021
Nzinahora V.	Tea producer	Ijenda, 22 april 2021
Nzobonimpa F.	Tea producer	Ijenda, 22 april 2021
Mubiri J.	Tea producer	Ijenda, 22 april 2021
Bayadonda D.	Tea producer	Ijenda, 22 april 2021
Bigirimana R.	Tea producer	Ijenda, 22 april 2021
Bihumugani J.	Tea producer	Ijenda, 22 april 2021
Biraronderwa S.	Tea producer	Ijenda, 22 april 2011
Bitaruka V.	Tea producer	Ijenda, 22 april 2011
Bizimana Sophie	Tea producer	Ijenda, 22 april 2021
Denyeri V.	Tea producer	Buhoro, 25 april 2021

Gahungu L.	Tea producer	Buhoro, 25 april 2021
Gahungu S.	Tea producer	Buhoro, 25 april 2021
Bakundukize Ph.	Cadre de l'OTB	Buhoro, 25 april 2021
Manirambona J.	Tea producer	Buhoro, 25 april 2021
Ndayiragije F.	Association Leader	Buhoro, 26 april 2021
Masabarakiza R.	Tea producer	Buhoro, 26 april 2021
Ndayizamba B.	Tea producer	Buhoro, 26 april 2021
Nikwigize A.	Association Leader	Buhoro, 26 april 2021
Niragira A.	Tea producer	Buhoro, 26 april 2021
Nubusa A.	Association Leader	Buhoro, 26 april 2021
Sinibagira L.	Tea producer	Buhoro, 26 april 2021
Sinzinkayo G.	Tea producer	Buhoro, 26 april 2021
Nizigiyimana B.	Tea producer	Buhoro, 26 april 2021
Nyabuyoya S.	Tea producer	Buhoro, 26 april 2021
Nizigiyimana J.	Tea producer	Buhoro, 26 april 2021
Iradukunda R.	Association Leader	Tora, 5 may 2021
Gahungu S.	Tea producer	Teza, 5 may 2021
Nahimana S.	Tea producer	Tora, 5 may 2021
Gahungu V.	Tea producer	Tora, 5 may 2021
Mukubano S.	Tea producer	Tora, 5 may 2021
Ndayirindire R.	Association Leader	Tora, 6 may 2021
Nahayo C.	Tea producer	Tora, 6 may 2021
Ndikumasabo E.	Tea producer	Tora, 6 may 2021
Nitunga G.	Tea producer	Tora, 6 may 2021
Niyoyunguruza G.	Théicultrice	Tora, 6 may 2021
Nibogora C.	Tea producer	Tora, 6 may 2021
Nkurunziza C.	Association Leader	Tora, 6 may 2021
Ntamutumba G.	Tea producer	Tora, 6 may 2021
Karira G.	Tea producer	Rwegura, 10 may 2021
Karonkano A.	Tea producer	Rwegura, 10 may 2021
Bazubwabo A.	Association Leader	Rwegura, 10 may 2021
Kagabo F.	Association Leader	Rwegura, 10 may 2021
Munezero B.	Tea producer	Rwegura, 10 may 2021
Ndayisaba M.	Tea producer	Rwegura, 10 may 2021
Ndikumagenge P.	Association Leader	Rwegura, 10 may 2021
Ndikumana C.	Tea producer	Rwegura, 11 may 2021
Nizigiyimana I.	Tea producer	Rwegura, 11 may 2021
Nikigize L.	Association Leader	Rwegura, 11 may 2021

Nkurunziza E.	Tea producer	Rwegura, 11 may 2021
Nyandwi G.	Association Leader	Rwegura, 11 may 2021
Simbarakiye C.	Tea producer	Rwegura, 11 may 2021
Sengiyumva L.	Tea producer	Rwegura, 11 may 2021
Sindaruhuka M.	Tea producer	Rwegura, 11 may 2021
Bizimana S.	Tea producer	Rwegura, 11 may 2021
Gahungu E.	Tea producer	Teza, 15 may 2021
Mayoya B.	Tea producer	Teza, 15 may 2021
Mushimirimana H.	Tea producer	Teza, 15 may 2021
Gatoto G.	Tea producer	Teza, 15 may 2021
Hakizimana Th.	Tea producer	Teza, 15 may 2021
Ndabirinde A.	Association Leader	Teza, 15 may 2021
Ndayishimiye A.	Tea producer	Teza, 15 may 2021
Ndikumana M.	Tea producer	Teza, 15 may 2021
Ndikumana G.	Tea producer	Teza, 16 may 2021
Nijebariko R.	Tea producer	Teza, 16 may 2021
Nimbona J.	Association Leader	Teza, 16 may 2021
Nimbonera A.	Tea producer	Teza, 16 may 2021
Nimpaye I.	Tea producer	Teza, 16 may 2021
Nzosaba S.	Tea producer	Teza, 16 may 2021
Nzotungwanayo G.	Tea producer	Teza, 16 may 2021
Shaka H.	Association Leader	Teza, 16 may 2021
Simbare E.	Tea producer	Teza, 16 may 2021
Kana G.	Tea producer	Teza, 16 may 2021
Barutwanayo A.	Association Leader	Bujumbura, 18 may 2021
Manirakiza P.	Association Leader	Bujumbura, 18 may 2021