[Artificial Intelligence in Agriculture 5 (2021) 292–300](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aiia.2021.12.001)

Contents lists available at [ScienceDirect](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/)

Artificial Intelligence in Agriculture

journal homepage: [http://www.keaipublishing.com/en/journa ls/artificial- intelligence- in-agriculture/](http://www.keaipublishing.com/en/journals/artificial-intelligence-in-agriculture/)

[](http://crossmark.crossref.org/dialog/?doi=10.1016/j.aiia.2021.12.001&domain=pdf)Will digital solution transform Sub-Sahara African agriculture?

Gezahagn Kudama [a](#_bookmark0),[⁎](#_bookmark2), Mabiratu Dangia [b](#_bookmark1), Hika Wana [a](#_bookmark0), Bona Tadese [a](#_bookmark0)

a *Wollega University, Shambu Campus, Department of Agricultural Economics, Shambu, Ethiopia*

b *Gambella University, Department of Agricultural Economics, Gambella, Ethiopia*

# a r t i c l e i n f o

*Article history:*

Received 24 October 2021

Received in revised form 28 November 2021 Accepted 4 December 2021

Available online 9 December 2021

*Keywords:*

Agriculture

Digital solution and service Digitalization Transformation

Contents

# a b s t r a c t

Given its superior importance of digital agricultural solutions to overcome challenges in agricultural activities, many of the solutions are in face of challenges to scale in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). On the other hand, the impact of digitalization on economic development in developing countries is documented in several literatures but dig- ital technologies have lately touched the agricultural sector in SSA. The objective of this study was to briefly re- view the impact of digital solution on smallholder farmers agriculture transformation, and the key and challenges influencing of agricultural digitalization in SSA. We used all-inclusive approach comprising original research ar- ticles, peer-reviewed articles, working papers, conference papers, book chapters, database, guide book, and in- dexes from 60 recent empirical academic studies conducted on impacts on digital solution in the region to produce a broad review. Results show that digital solution, when effectively used in SSA, has enabled smallholder farmers to gain a wide range of benefits involving access to real timely price, market, and farming information and safe financial transactions, alternative value chain linkages, multifaceted knowledge, better earning and yield, reduce costs, social well-being and risk minimization, women empowerment benefits. In contrast, fail to use adaptable tools, unaffordability, digital illiterateness, low participation of women and old smallholder farmers due to their low income and education status, are main barriers to digitalization in agriculture. Accord- ingly, it essential to the SSA countries to invest on technologies that is adaptable their target population, ensure balancing regulatory and delivery approaches that permit equal involvement of women, old age category, and re- mote areas, realize affordable access to digital services through reducing data costs and tax cuts on digital agri- cultural tools, and offering digital skill training for farmers by segmenting them into their gender, age, and education to fully harness the opportunities of digitalization in agriculture.

© 2021 The Authors. Publishing services by Elsevier B.V. on behalf of KeAi Communications Co., Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

1. Introduction 293
2. Methodology 293
   1. Literature search 293
3. Findings 294
   1. Facilitating market information and value chain linkages 294
   2. Farm productivity and income 294
   3. Financial services 295
   4. Social well-being and risk sharing 296
   5. Women empowering and inclusive 296
   6. Risks and challenges influencing of agricultural digitalization in SSA 296
4. Conclusions and policy implications 298

Declaration of Competing Interest 299

Acknowledgements 299

References 299

\* Corresponding author.

*E-mail address:* [gkudhama@gmail.com](mailto:gkudhama@gmail.com) (G. Kudama).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aiia.2021.12.001>

2589-7217/© 2021 The Authors. Publishing services by Elsevier B.V. on behalf of KeAi Communications Co., Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license ([http://](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) [creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)).

1. Introduction

Agriculture is the mainstay for several Low and Middle-Income Countries (LMICs), where 54% of labor force in Sub-Saharan Africa are actively engaged in it and rely on the sector for their livelihoods ([GSMA, 2020a](#_bookmark24)). On the other hand, Africa need to increase more than double the current status of agricultural production over the next 30 years so as to meet the growing demand of food and nutrition secu- rity ([Tsan et al., 2019](#_bookmark24)). Specially, Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) has been fac- ing the highest food security problem than any other region. The greatest growth in food demand will call for considerably outperform rate of agricultural productivity and yield increases than the usual in the region ([Tsan et al., 2019](#_bookmark24)). Furthermore, high input costs, poor access to information and credit, and deteriorating productivity are worsening African farmers' potentials to boom agricultural yield and sustainability of farming business ([Abell et al., 2019](#_bookmark8)). Consequently, it calls for agricul- tural transformation a state in which agriculture become vibrant, and modern that generates value for farmers, entrepreneurs, youth and women, and produces affordable, nutritious and healthy food for all on continuous basis ([Tsan et al., 2019](#_bookmark24)).

Despite the improvement and decision making in agriculture is not an easy task ([Tamene et al., 2021](#_bookmark24)), digital breakthroughs have the power to transform the sectors ([Goedde et al., 2021](#_bookmark24)). Utilization of dig- ital technologies is helpful in providing the right solutions to few of the most burning issues of our time, comprising climate variability, food in- security and malnutrition, and environmental degradation ([Abell et al.,](#_bookmark8) [2019](#_bookmark8)). Digital technologies enhance user benefits via facilitating instan- taneous information exchange, and access to new information among people ([Deichmann et al., 2016](#_bookmark16)).

Historically, agriculture has experienced a number of dramatical change that involves digital agricultural breakthroughs. The digital agri- cultural revolution becomes the latest change which could help realizes agriculture meets the food demand of the world in the future ([Trendov](#_bookmark24) [et al., 2019](#_bookmark24)). The introduction of digital solutions like machine learning, drone technology, robotics and related technologies in agriculture are paving the way towards agricultural sector advancement ([Tamene](#_bookmark24) [et al., 2021](#_bookmark24)). Digitalization will highly optimize agricultural resources management and allocation to the best of their own optimal recom- mendations through facilitating access of information in real time in a super-connected means ([Trendov et al., 2019](#_bookmark24)). Moreover, digital agriculture will generate means that are extremely productive, and adaptable to changes such as those associated to climate change. Conse- quently, it can ensure higher food security, profitability and sustainabil- ity ([Trendov et al., 2019](#_bookmark24)).

Digitalization for agriculture (D4Ag), the application of digital break- throughs in the whole ranges agricultural value chains, overcomes chal- lenges in agricultural activities and helps better earning for smallholder farmers, food and nutrition security, climate change adaptation and ex- tends the involvement of youth and women ([Tsan et al., 2019](#_bookmark24)). D4Ag contributes to a structural transformation of the agri-food sector via ac- celerating the information to smallholder farmers or to other agricul- tural value chains actors, involving extension agents, agri-inputs dealers, agribusinesses, financial service providers and policymakers by using digital tools, and channels ([Tsan et al., 2019](#_bookmark24); [Muyiramye and](#_bookmark24) [Addom, 2020](#_bookmark24)). These solutions comprise mobile-accessible apps and tools that rise access to timely market price data, financial services, weather predictions, pest outbreaks, and more ([Thompson and](#_bookmark24) [Gyatso, 2020](#_bookmark24)). The variety of digital tools in agriculture is wide- ranging from low-tech solutions disseminating voice and text-based ad- visory on feature phones, to advanced holistic tools including satellites, sensors and big data analytics ([GSMA, 2020a](#_bookmark24)).

Digital solutions have risen steeply in figure. About 60% (227 out of 390 active solutions) have begun to provide services over last three years in Africa ([Tsan et al., 2019](#_bookmark24)). Digital agriculture solutions in use provide five primary services involving, advisory and information ser- vices, market linkage, financial services, supply chain management,

and business intelligence in the continent ([Tsan et al., 2019](#_bookmark24); [Goedde](#_bookmark24) [et al., 2021](#_bookmark24)).

In the last decade, among many of different digital solutions trials, some have got satisfactory measure to attract viable investment. A few of such successful digital services have changed the lives of several smallholder farmers and have led them to larger productivity and in- comes ([Tsan et al., 2019](#_bookmark24)). Digital agriculture is growing rapidly and 13% of Africa's smallholder farmers have accessed the digital solutions and yield up to ~€144 million revenue per year, with growing evidence of the sector's positive effect on smallholder farmers. The recent revolu- tion of digital agriculture, therefore, will be the good news to SSA that help address their key challenges currently facing the region ([GSMA,](#_bookmark24) [2020a](#_bookmark24)).

Despite their clear benefits, numerous digital solutions struggle to expand and some of them fail to advance the lives of farmers and other end users. In SSA, for instance, most applications possess beneath 30% active users ([Goedde et al., 2021](#_bookmark24)). On the other hand, the under de- veloped status of enabling environment, including policies, institutions, infrastructure, and other conditions required to use the digital solutions are also key barriers to the expansion of digital agriculture in the conti- nent. Furthermore, poor technological infrastructure, high costs of tech- nology, low levels of e-literacy and digital skills, poor governing framework and limit the access to facilities are challenges hindering the use agricultural digital solution in developing counties ([Trendov](#_bookmark24) [et al., 2019](#_bookmark24)). Rural areas also have less established digital ecosystems (resources, skills, networks) when compared with urban areas. When such limitations combined with global movements of urbanization and middle and rich classes subsiding in cities, digitalization is capable to aggravate existing rural-urban disparities ([UN DESA, 2018](#_bookmark24); [Trendov](#_bookmark24) [et al., 2019](#_bookmark24)) which can lead to fall behind in the progression of a digital revolution in agriculture ([Trendov et al., 2019](#_bookmark24)).

The impact of digitalization on economic development in developing countries is documented in several literatures but digital technologies have lately touched the agricultural sector in SSA ([Thompson and](#_bookmark24) [Gyatso, 2020](#_bookmark24)). Consequently, literatures are scare on the role that digital solution can play on agriculture transformation in the region.

Drawing on the lessons from the forementioned discussions and high research gap currently observed on the role of digitalization on ag- riculture in Sub Sahara African, this article provides a brief review of the impact of digital solutions on smallholder farmers agriculture transfor- mation in Sub Sahara African. Moreover, this review paper aims to in- vestigate the following research questions: Will digital solution transform smallholder farmers agriculture? Does digital technology in agriculture inclusive? what are the main challenges faced by firms within the agri-food value chains in the adoption of digital break- throughs?

1. Methodology
   1. *Literature search*

we used all-inclusive approach comprising original research articles, peer-reviewed articles, working papers, conference papers, book chap- ters, database, guide book, and indexes from different sources to pro- duce a broad review. The literature was collected via, Web of science, and Google scholar and so forth, largely focusing on recent studies. The key words used were: impact of digitalization on smallholder farmers agricultural transformation, influence of digitalization on facili- tating market information and agricultural value chain linkages, impact of digitalization on farm yield and income improvement, the effect of digitalization on social well-being and risk minimization, digital inclu- sive and divide in agriculture, effects of digitalization on access to finan- cial services, and challenges influencing of agricultural digitalization in SSA.

We reviewed 29 peer reviewed journals, 2 books, 2 book chapters, 1, manual guide, 2 workshop papers, 17 reports, 4 working papers, 1

Table 1

Effect of digital solution interventions on agriculture outcomes.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Main Finding | Location | Product or services | Technology | Study |
| Facilitating market information and VCA  Increase multifaceted, options to navigate the variety of chain alternatives, | Mt Kenya | Horticulture | Smartphone | ([Hartmann](#_bookmark24) [et](#_bookmark24) [al., 2020](#_bookmark24)) |
| and emerging digital markets among smallholder farmers |  |  | adoption |  |
| Reduce farmers' search cost | Niger | Agricultural product | Mobile phone | ([Aker and Mbiti, 2010](#_bookmark9)) |

Productivity and profit

Increase farm productivity Kaduna State,

Nigeria

Agricultural product SMS text reminders ([Sennuga](#_bookmark24) [et](#_bookmark24) [al., 2020](#_bookmark24))

Has positive association with maize productivity and increase profit Iringa, Tanzania Maize Mobile phone [Quandt](#_bookmark24) [et](#_bookmark24) [al. (2020)](#_bookmark24)

Facilitates the adoption of legume based sustainable agricultural intensification practices and increases knowledge on new practices

Tanzania Legume Radio and SMS [Silvestri](#_bookmark24) [et](#_bookmark24) [al. (2020)](#_bookmark24)

Facilitates the groundnut farmers services and reduced the workload of extension workers

South-East Tanzania Groundnut Interactive voice

Message

[Ortiz-Crespo](#_bookmark24) [et](#_bookmark24) [al.](#_bookmark24) [(2020)](#_bookmark24)

Increases farmers' use of seeds and fertilizers as well as land and labor productivity

Kenya Seeds and fertilizers ICT [Ochieng](#_bookmark24) [et](#_bookmark24) [al. (2013)](#_bookmark24)

Increased yield and profit Nigeria Rice Mobile application [Arouna](#_bookmark11) [et](#_bookmark11) [al. (2020)](#_bookmark11) Financial services

Increase access to loan Malawi Loan Mobile phone [Montfaucon (2020)](#_bookmark27)

Increase money transmissions, the nonfarm employment, and the portion of households food security

Women empowering and inclusive

Enhance women empowerment, household income, food security, and dietary quality

Northern Uganda Money transactions Mobile money [Wieser](#_bookmark26) [et](#_bookmark26) [al. (2019)](#_bookmark26)

Central Uganda Mobile service Mobile phone ([Sekabira and Qaim,](#_bookmark24)

[2017](#_bookmark24))

conference papers, and 2 facts and figures. Among the 29 peer reviewed journals, 23 are empirical studies, and 6 are literature reviews papers. There has been plenty of evidence on the ways in which digital solutions help improve the lives of smallholder farmers. A summary of the review results given in [Table 1](#_bookmark3) below. The subsequent sections briefly review this evidence as well as challenges influencing agricultural digitalization.

1. Findings

Based on the relations of the topics the review results were catego- rized into digitalization on (1) facilitating market information and agri- cultural value chain linkages, (2) farm productivity and income,

(3) access to financial services, (4) social well-being and risk minimiza- tion, (5) women empowering and inclusive, and (6) risks and chal- lenges of agricultural digitalization in SSA.

* 1. *Facilitating market information and value chain linkages*

The proportions of the agribusiness sector development is low when compared to that of farming size in most of SSA ([World Bank, 2013](#_bookmark28)). Many of these countries (such as Ethiopia, Malawi, Burundi) remain to depend on the export of agricultural commodities. The agricultural commodities export of them accounts for about 75% of their exports with very slight or no processing included ([UNIDO, 2011](#_bookmark24)). Furthermore, the majority of African farmers still face challenges to access real-time marketing and price information that help them to make sound deci- sions on time and market and at what price to sell their produces.

Digital solutions are potential to enhance farmers' negotiating power and reduce the risk of selling produce at low prices via facilitating price and marketing information access to farmers ([Malabo Montpellier](#_bookmark24) [Panel, 2019](#_bookmark24)). For example, in the rural areas of Niger, the use mobile phones reduced farmers' search cost on agricultural price information by 50% when related with personal travel ([Aker and Mbiti, 2010](#_bookmark9)).

In responds to quick changes in the agri-food sector over the previ- ous two decades, smallholders' involvement in global value chains (GVCs) arose as a new approach towards poverty mitigation ([Ruben,](#_bookmark24) [2017](#_bookmark24)). However, the involvement of small farmers agricultural value chains is low in SSA ([Deutsche Bank Research, 2014](#_bookmark17)). Some of the vital value chain challenges in the sub-region involves, output markets (like price risk, lack of regional integration, quality issues, policies distorting markets, food safety, social and environmental issues), access

to inputs and technology, infrastructure, finance, inadequate skills and issues with engaging smallholders ([World Bank, 2013](#_bookmark28)).

On the other hand, it is commonly accepted that digital connectivity is becoming a crucial aspect in facilitating more discrete, standardized agri-food value chains in SSA value chain in recent years. Digitization of value chains supports these trends, since legible information lets im- proved management and monitoring of GVCs. The use of digitally- enabled solutions is potential to reduce the problems of smallholder farmers in agri-food value chain through linking them to high-quality farm inputs (such as seeds, fertilizers, herbicides/pesticides), produc- tion and post-harvest machinery and mechanization services, off-take markets, or even to the end -consumer ([Tsan et al., 2019](#_bookmark24)). For instance, Twiga Foods, a company began in 2014 to link small fruit and vegetable farmers in rural Kenya with small and medium-sized sellers in cities ([Malabo Montpellier Panel, 2019](#_bookmark24); [Thompson and Gyatso, 2020](#_bookmark24)) has been able to provide higher prices and a guaranteed market to more than 17,000 farmers in the country in 2019. The high price obtained by farmers is due to avoiding the inclusion of intermediaries in whole- sale markets ([Thompson and Gyatso, 2020](#_bookmark24)).

With regard to opportunities of digital connectivity, the Information Communication Technology (ICT) innovations rise efficiency gains due to the minimized need for physical journeys between value chain ac- tors. Furthermore, ICT enabled information permit firms the capability to improve monitor and manage vital resources and employees ([Esselaar et al., 2007](#_bookmark24); [Donner and Escobari, 2010](#_bookmark18)). Higher information flows help build stronger networks between firms. As a result, ICTs en- able new creative and innovative activities between groups of firms ([Foster and Heeks, 2013](#_bookmark24)). Moreover, digital technologies and market- places might potentially alter the interaction of small firms with mar- kets, and enable new types of business model and innovation at scale online ([World Bank, 2016](#_bookmark29)). The research finding by [Hartmann et al.](#_bookmark24) [(2020)](#_bookmark24) in Kenya indicates that the adoption of smartphone increased multifaceted knowledge (vertical knowledge flows, and horizontal knowledge networks), options to navigate the variety of chain alterna- tives (domestic production, informal export production), and emerging digital markets among horticultural smallholder farmers.

* 1. *Farm productivity and income*

SSA remains the most important sector for economic growth, pov- erty reduction and food security ([Asfaw et al., 2012](#_bookmark10); [Deutsche Bank](#_bookmark17)

[Research, 2014](#_bookmark17)). The region has huge amounts of uncultivated land (nearly the half of world availability), unused water resources and greater possibility for improvements in inputs to rise agricultural pro- ductivity. Consequently, advancing African agriculture is considered as a way to achieve the growing global food demand. However, agricul- tural productivity in SSA remains low compared with other areas ([Bjornlund et al., 2020](#_bookmark14)), due to numerous reasons involving under- investment, poor infrastructure, insecure land tenure, unfavorable price policies and weak institutions ([Deutsche Bank Research, 2014](#_bookmark17)). Many other factors, including climate, soil quality, slavery and disease ([Bjornlund et al., 2020](#_bookmark14)).

In addition, food production in the region has not kept pace with population growth ([Tittonell and Giller, 2013](#_bookmark24); [Deutsche Bank](#_bookmark17) [Research, 2014](#_bookmark17)), due to lowest land and labor productivity rates of the region in the world ([Tittonell and Giller, 2013](#_bookmark24)). However, there is no single solution for agricultural productivity improvement in SSA. Conse- quently, it necessitates improved access to numerous inputs, enabling policies, and a good-operational supply and value chains ([Thompson](#_bookmark24) [and Gyatso, 2020](#_bookmark24)). Furthermore, attaining agricultural production growth will be unthinkable unless developing and disseminating yield-enhancing technologies since it is no longer possible to meet the growing food demand along with the increasing population through the enlargement of cultivable area ([Asfaw et al., 2012](#_bookmark10)).

Previous studies witnessed that information asymmetry has con- ventionally inhibited smallholder farmers' access to markets, which in turns limited the adoption of modern technologies that could have boosted their farm productivities ([Ochieng et al., 2013](#_bookmark24)). Often extension agents have traditionally been the primary means of reducing the infor- mation asymmetries related to technology adoption and provider advi- sory services to farmers in SSA ([Davis, 2008](#_bookmark19)). Despite the role of extension workers is mainly crucial when it comes to promoting mod- ern agricultural technologies, their capacity to provide updated and ac- tionable information might be limited by the low ratio extension agent to farmer, under developed infrastructure, together with low incentive and responsibility ([Aker, 2011](#_bookmark8)). The comprehensive advice on recom- mendable fertilizer application rates has failed to realize attainable yield improvements for crop production in several SSA ([Arouna et al.,](#_bookmark11) [2020](#_bookmark11)).

Farmers need lifelong learning and continuous access to diverse sus- tainable yield improvement technology-related information, to care on- going, flexible adaptation to varying burdens and opportunities ([Pretty](#_bookmark24) [and Bharucha, 2014](#_bookmark24); [Brown et al., 2017](#_bookmark20)). As a result, farmers tend to be more interested to information that is easier to access than conventional extension services, and more personalized to their specific situation. Which suggests the need to access efficiently information delivery means in the context of the adoption technology to the target farmers' specific situations ([Davis and Sulaiman, 2014](#_bookmark21)). The use of ICT platforms have a potential to shift the traditional extension scenario ([Ochieng](#_bookmark24) [et al., 2013](#_bookmark24)) by accelerating and offering more information for farmers ([Thompson and Gyatso, 2020](#_bookmark24)).

Unlike traditional extension approaches, e-extension advisory allow to reach more farmers, often with updated information and cost- effective way ([Davis, 2008](#_bookmark19)). Moreover, the digital technology nowa- days, makes it easy access to offer individualized extension services to farmers at a much lesser expense ([Arouna et al., 2020](#_bookmark11)). The study con- ducted in rural Tanzania, by [Silvestri et al. (2020)](#_bookmark24) shows that informa- tion provided through radio and SMS to farmers boosted their adoption in legume based sustainable agricultural intensification prac- tices and knowledge on something new practices such as planting, seeds, fertilizers and soil fertility, pests and diseases control, weeding, harvesting, and storage. The same finding displays that both awareness and adoption are boosted if SMS supports radio campaigns. The study further demonstrated that radio alone was the most cost-effective ap- proach; each dollar spent on the radio campaign results in 2.1 farmers that have adopted at least one new practice, compared with 0.5 farmers for SMS and 0.4 farmers for radio and SMS jointed ([Silvestri et al., 2020](#_bookmark24)).

In case it might be challenging to fit the broadcasts with farmers on regular procedures due to the high labor load of farming and related ac- tivities, user-centered interactive voice response can also be alternative means of digital agricultural advice. For example, the research findings of [Ortiz-Crespo et al. (2020)](#_bookmark24) display that groundnut farmers dynami- cally engaged with user-centered interactive voice message response to agricultural advice in Tanzania. Furthermore, the study illustrates that user-centered interactive voice message minimized the workload of extension workers compared to traditional communication channels via sharing automated push-calls responses to a group of farmers at once for questions seeking similar answering raised from different farmers.

In the same analogous, the study results by [Ochieng et al. (2013)](#_bookmark24) in Kenya shows that participation in ICT relied market information ser- vices (MIS) project increased farmers' use of seeds and fertilizers signif- icantly and enhanced land and labor productivity. Similarly, the study results by [Arouna et al. (2020)](#_bookmark11) in Nigeria show that use of mobile appli- cation personalized advice on rice nutrient management enhanced farmers' rice yield and profit by 7% and 10% respectively with the same average amount of fertilizer application. Likewise, [Sennuga et al.](#_bookmark24) [(2020)](#_bookmark24) show that in Kaduna State, Nigeria, information provided via mobile phones (SMS text reminders) to farmers increased their farm productivity. Similarly, [Quandt et al. (2020)](#_bookmark24) in Iringa rural district, Tanzania indicates that the use of mobile phone for agricultural opera- tions by smallholder farmer has positive association with maize produc- tivity and increased the profit of the smallholder farmers obtained from maize production.

* 1. *Financial services*

The 2017 After Access survey shows that only 29% have access to for- mal financial services among 10 surveyed countries in SSA ([Gillwald](#_bookmark24) [and Mothobi, 2019](#_bookmark24)). Moreover, among surveyed countries, mobile money services are merely fruitful in Kenya (85%), Ghana (55%) and Tanzania (45%), whereas very low in Nigeria (4%) and South Africa (8%). The low performance of mobile money in countries such as Nigeria is largely due to lack a good partnership among mobile phone service providers and banks. Despite their uneven adoption and use, mobile money services have had a positive effect on financial inclusion in Africa ([Gillwald and Mothobi, 2019](#_bookmark24); [Research ICT Africa, 2019](#_bookmark24)).

The financial service has a crucial role in permitting agriculture to contribute to economic advancement and poverty alleviation ([Mcintosh and Mansini, 2018](#_bookmark25)). In particular, agriculture plays the signif- icant role in economic growth, poverty reduction and food security in SSA since the sector generates about 25% of GDP on average in the sub-region ([Deutsche Bank Research, 2014](#_bookmark17)). Despite agriculture offer employments for more than of half the population in SSA, the large mass of farmers still not have access to formal financial institutions and relinquish access to basic banking services, loans and pensions ([Malabo Montpellier Panel, 2019](#_bookmark24); [The World Bank Group, 2020](#_bookmark24)).

This in turns, affects farmers' working decisions, such as devoting in seeds and other inputs, choice of crop, timing of harvest and sales as well as it limits their longer-period decisions on the management and implementation of production approaches ([Deutsche Bank Research,](#_bookmark17) [2014](#_bookmark17); [Malabo Montpellier Panel, 2019](#_bookmark24)).

On the other hand, digital financial service (DFS) offers a hopeful op- portunity to address some of these persistent desires ([Martin and](#_bookmark24) [Harihareswara, 2016](#_bookmark24)), and facilitates easier access to banking, saving and transaction roles ([Malabo Montpellier Panel, 2019](#_bookmark24)). Digital financial service is a wide-ranging sort that incorporates Mobile Financial Ser- vices (MFS) and all branchless banking facilities that are empowered through automated channels ([Martin and Harihareswara, 2016](#_bookmark24)).

In addition to its a role to increasing agricultural productivity, digiti- zation can guarantee timely and safe payments, and enhance savings ([The World Bank Group, 2020](#_bookmark24)). [Wieser et al. (2019)](#_bookmark26) in rural Northern Uganda shows that mobile money transactions enhanced money

transmissions. Another study investigated the access to financial ser- vices through mobile technology on agricultural income in Malawi ([Montfaucon, 2020](#_bookmark27)). According to the author, a higher number of mo- bile phones in a household significantly and positively affects the prob- ability of the household's access to financial capitals. Another similar study, [Suri and Jack (2016)](#_bookmark24) reveals that M-PESA (mobile money in Swa- hili), helped households to develop the habit of financial management and increased their savings particularly for female-headed households ([Suri and Jack, 2016](#_bookmark24)).

* 1. *Social well-being and risk sharing*

Digital payments are also potential to improve customer well-being both directly or indirectly ([Karlan et al., 2016](#_bookmark24)). For instance, M-PESA (mobile money in Swahili) improved per capita consumption levels and lifted 194,000 households out of poverty in Kenya ([Suri and Jack,](#_bookmark24) [2016](#_bookmark24)). In addition, it provided alternative jobs, mostly for women, who engaged into business from agriculture ([Suri and Jack, 2016](#_bookmark24)).

In addition to its benefit to lowering transaction costs, increasing availability of credit and savings DFS is capable to reduce risk for farmers ([Martin and Harihareswara, 2016](#_bookmark24)). Likewise, the study finding in Kenya shows that M-PESA improved households' respond to shocks by bor- rowing or receiving gifts from friends and relatives through strengthen- ing their informal risk-sharing networks ([Jack and Suri, 2014](#_bookmark24)). Consequently, the M-PESA users are more likely to take a larger number and higher value of remittances from long distances and greater net- works, upon they face unforeseen negative shocks. The study result fur- ther indicates that while M-PESA user households' consumption was indifferent to negative income shocks, such as illness or drought, non- user households' consumption was reduced by 7% ([Jack and Suri, 2014](#_bookmark24)). Furthermore, [Wieser et al. (2019)](#_bookmark26) in rural Northern Uganda shows that mobile money transactions enhanced money transmissions, the nonfarm self-employment rate by two-fold (from 3.4 to 6.4%), and re- duced the portion of households with very low food security from

62.9 to 47.2%, in distant areas from a bank service.

* 1. *Women empowering and inclusive*

In numerous developing countries, agricultural extension services are largely delivered in favor of men, with information focused mostly to male members of a farming household and in arrangements that are hardly adapted for women ([Lecoutere et al., 2019](#_bookmark24)). Moreover, in de- veloping countries, women have been inconclusive to the access and use of digital information and communication technologies so far ([Hilbert, 2011](#_bookmark24)).

On the other hand, it is well documented in literature that the use of digital solutions has improved smallholder farmers' market access and income. Beyond these, digital technologies can possibly influence other extents of social welfare, such as gender equality and women em- powerment. A study in 12 Latin American and 13 African countries by controlling women's unfavorable conditions (such as employment, ed- ucation and income) revealed that women become more active users of digital tools as compared to men ([Hilbert, 2011](#_bookmark24)). Similarly, the exper- imental study conducted by viewing videos on improved maize man- agement practices to both men and women maize-farming households in eastern Uganda showed that the video-enabled exten- sion increases women involvement in productive decision-making pro- cesses ([Lecoutere et al., 2019](#_bookmark24)). The same source, further assured that video-mediated agricultural extension enhances women's knowledge about improved maize management practices, role in agricultural decision-making, up taking of the recommended practices and inputs use, increases the quantity of maize supply to the market and production-related outcomes on women-managed maize plots ([Lecoutere et al., 2019](#_bookmark24)).

The study conducted in Masaka and Luwero districts, central Uganda show that the use of mobile phone has positive association with

household income, women empowerment, food security, and dietary quality ([Sekabira and Qaim, 2017](#_bookmark24)). The same study revealed that that female possessing mobile phones, increased household incomes and so- cial welfare in excess of male mobile phone users ([Sekabira and Qaim,](#_bookmark24) [2017](#_bookmark24)). Thus, provided that women were capacitated to use mobile phones, they would be more benefited than men ([Aker and Ksoll,](#_bookmark12) [2016](#_bookmark12); [Sekabira and Qaim, 2017](#_bookmark24)).

In addition to its advantage of technology uptake, the new digital fa- cilities can also deliver specific advice to women engaged in agribusi- nesses and advance their links to markets ([Malabo Montpellier Panel,](#_bookmark24) [2019](#_bookmark24)). For example, enhancing women's access to international mar- kets and links to buyers via mobile breakthroughs in the shea nut butter sector decreased the interferences of middlemen and tend to increase their profits by 82% in Ghana (Braun von, 2019) as cited in ([Malabo](#_bookmark24) [Montpellier Panel, 2019](#_bookmark24)).

* 1. *Risks and challenges influencing of agricultural digitalization in SSA*

Despite digital breakthrough can play a crucial role in supporting ag- ricultural transformation in Africa, the introduction of new technologies also involves challenges, limitations and risks, especially for smallholder farming and women ([Malabo Montpellier Panel, 2019](#_bookmark24)).

The critics to digital connectivity in the region, suggest that connec- tivity may not benefit all, rather it leads to power and control among dif- ferent types of firms. Moreover, connectivity might empower stronger firms at the expense of weaker ones ([Foster and Graham, 2017](#_bookmark24); [Murphy et al., 2014](#_bookmark30)). For instance, [Foster et al. (2018)](#_bookmark24) show that in Kenya and Rwanda, digital connectivity shifted modes of value chain governance, led to control of lead firms and data standards are leading to new challenges for firms looking to digitally integrate in tea and tour- ism GVC sub sectors. Their finding further indicates that Digital connec- tivity has mostly led to shrill integration, through which small firms be able to make little communication and productivity enhancements without more considerable advancement with exception to some small firms who are able to supply to emerging niche customers, and local or regional markets. However, their findings show nothing about the effect of digital connectivity on tea producers ([Hartmann et al.,](#_bookmark24) [2020](#_bookmark24)).

Despite affordable internet is a requirement for smallholder farmers to fully harness the opportunities of digitalization in agriculture, the prices for internet use in the region is still the world leading prices with wide-ranging prices across the region ([Malabo Montpellier Panel,](#_bookmark24) [2019](#_bookmark24)). In addition, in numerous African countries, mobile-data baskets (voice, mobile data and fixed broadband) are still beyond reach for a big portion of the population, costing higher than 10% of GNI (Gross Na- tional Income) per capita, in conditions where incomes are already in- adequate ([ITU, 2021](#_bookmark24)). Besides, given the superior importance of smartphone for accessing the internet and use of digital technologies and services, affordability and prices of handsets are a major limitation for smartphone ownership, especially in rural SSA ([Malabo Montpellier](#_bookmark24) [Panel, 2019](#_bookmark24)). In several African countries, regressive taxes on digital de- vices and services are one the factors that escalate the cost of communi- cation and undermine the use digital technologies. Moreover, excessive increases can lead to counterproductive and generate disincentives for investment, but the reduction of direct and indirect taxes from fees will separate one of the foremost cost amplifiers. Reducing the cost of communication become successful in countries like Namibia tend to in- crease use of digital technologies, economies of scale, and increase taxes derived from profits. Accordingly, it needs the region to review taxation system on the sector ([Research ICT Africa, 2019](#_bookmark24)). Moreover, the propor- tion of people using the Internet remains low as compared to the other region in the world. Whilst the percentage of individuals using the In- ternet in 2019 totaled 28.6% in Africa, it accounts for 51.4% globally ([ITU, 2021](#_bookmark24)).

Despite its paramount prerequisite for enabling digital technologies, lack of infrastructure is not the vital cause for the relatively small

numbers of people using the Internet in SSA ([GSMA, 2020b](#_bookmark24); [ITU, 2021](#_bookmark24)). For instance, at the end of 2019, about 49% of people across Sub-Saharan Africa were connected to the mobile Internet, but not using the Internet. Unaffordability (high cost of smartphones, relative to average income levels), and low digital skills are the key barriers to mobile internet adoption in the region ([GSMA, 2020b](#_bookmark24); [ITU, 2021](#_bookmark24)). Moreover, After Ac- cess Survey, carried out in 10 SSA countries – Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Mozambique, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Tanzania and Uganda indicates that the key barriers to Internet use for those who do not use the Internet are the lack of Internet-enabled devices (23%) and lack of digital literacy (16%) ([Gillwald and Mothobi, 2019](#_bookmark24)). The same study result further indicates that the main barriers to Internet use for those who use the Internet is the cost of data (36%) ([Gillwald](#_bookmark24) [and Mothobi, 2019](#_bookmark24)).

Likewise, many of digital agriculture solutions are in face of chal- lenges to scale. In sub-Saharan Africa alone, in excess of 400 digital ag- riculture solutions are in use, but numerous of them struggle to scale and fail to advance the lives of farmers and other end users. Most plat-

0.70

0.60

0.50


0.40

0.30

0.20

0.10

0.00



0.64

0.42

0.43

0.45 0.45

0.35

0.27

Ethiopia Senegal Nigeria Rwanda Kenya Ghana South

Africa

Fig. 1. Digital Adoption Index in 2016. Source: [World Bank (2016)](#_bookmark29).

forms have below 30% active users and merely 5% of them have more than 80% of user farmers and achieved scale of more than one million farmers. ([Goedde et al., 2021](#_bookmark24)).

Digital literateness also remains low in SSA ([Kim et al., 2020](#_bookmark24)). A re- view research conducted by [Annosi et al. (2020)](#_bookmark13) on digitalization and agri-food sector found that the use of information and communication technologies is reliant on the literateness of the people. Thus, skills for handling, browsing, and evaluating data as well as digital know how are supreme ([Baumüller and Addom, 2020](#_bookmark15)). Having alone digital devise and traditional literacy (able to read or write), is not enough to use dig- ital breakthroughs. Information and data literateness are crucial for dig- ital technology users like smallholder farmers, researchers, traders, extension agents, and policymakers ([Baumüller and Addom, 2020](#_bookmark15)). In contrast, the size of uneducated people who possess digital devises comprise considerable share in several African countries ([Gillwald and](#_bookmark24) [Mothobi, 2019](#_bookmark24)). For example, [Gillwald and Mothobi (2019)](#_bookmark24) in their sur- vey found that merely around 30% of smartphone handlers replying to the survey in Ghana and Nigeria had ever deployed an application on their phone. This figure largely cut with an increasing reliance on agri- culture as a means of livelihood ([Baumüller and Addom, 2020](#_bookmark15)).

Despite digital literacy and skills are desirable for the scaling up and the use digital solutions in agriculture, digital literacy still a major block- ade in the continent ([Trendov et al., 2019](#_bookmark24); [Baumüller and Addom,](#_bookmark15) [2020](#_bookmark15)). For example, the study by [Foster et al. (2018)](#_bookmark24) show that digital skill incapacities, and lack of finance is the main exclusionary digital bar- riers for small firms in tea and tourism GVC sub sectors. Moreover, farmers throughout Africa are mainly low-income earner and older that often less technologically skillful than the younger and urban pop- ulation ([Malabo Montpellier Panel, 2019](#_bookmark24)). Consequently, the low digital skill and knowledge status of rural community, continue to hinder the adoption of digital solutions for agriculture ([Gillwald and Mothobi,](#_bookmark24) [2019](#_bookmark24); [Kim et al., 2020](#_bookmark24)).

limits access to information on farm-related activities, nutrition and health, financial support, market access, bargaining power, decision- making power as well as thickening their dependency of women in the sub-region ([Malabo Montpellier Panel, 2019](#_bookmark24)).

In contrast to the developed economies, the digital gender gap trend in Africa has been increasing over time. While the Internet user gender gap has increased from 20.7 to 33% in between 2013 and 2019 in Africa, it has declined from 9.4 to 5.3% for the same period in Europe ([ITU,](#_bookmark24) [2019](#_bookmark24)). On the other hand, the gender inequality is also high in mobile phone use with wide range among the countries ([Gillwald and](#_bookmark24) [Mothobi, 2019](#_bookmark24)). Whilst disparity in mobile phone use between men and women is as low as −5% in South Africa, it is as high as 42% in Rwanda ([Fig. 3](#_bookmark6)). Moreover, on average 14% women less probable to possess a mobile phone than men, and 25% less likely to have internet access than men in SSA ([Gillwald and Mothobi, 2019](#_bookmark24)).

Like other digital technologies, women smallholder farmers are underrepresented among digital agricultural solution users in SSA. While share of women smallholder farmers in SSA is estimated to 40–50%, only 25% of registered users of digital agricultural solutions are women ([Tsan et al., 2019](#_bookmark24); [Thompson and Gyatso, 2020](#_bookmark24)). The D4Ag solution gender divide is also large between 5 SSA for which reliable data are available ([Fig. 4](#_bookmark7)). Whilst gender disparity in using D4Ag solu- tion is highest with 90% in Senegal, relatively the lowest gap has been recorded, 70% in Ghana ([Tsan et al., 2019](#_bookmark24)).

Numerous empirical evidences suggest that digital gender dispar- ities associate with years of education and income ([Gillwald and](#_bookmark24) [Mothobi, 2019](#_bookmark24)). Similarly, [Deen-Swarray et al. (2013)](#_bookmark22) found that a pos- itive and significant correlation between use of the Internet and level of education and income (more significantly, use of the Internet and years of education and income in Africa. By the same token, [Deen-Swarray](#_bookmark23)

The digital divide, unevenly distribution of digital technologies be-

tween rural and urban areas, gender, and youth population still a com- mon problem in transforming agriculture in SSA ([World Bank, 2016](#_bookmark29); [Trendov et al., 2019](#_bookmark24); [Tsan et al., 2019](#_bookmark24)). It is mainly affected by restricted or no access to electricity, weak networks, meagre basic connectivity and low digital knowledge, which cause considerable differences in telephone and internet penetration ([Malabo Montpellier Panel, 2019](#_bookmark24)). The percentage of individuals using the Internet and digital adoption rate greatly varies across the SSA region. For example, the adoption index and share of individuals using internet is large between SSA for which consistent data are existing ([Figs. 1 and 2](#_bookmark4)). In 2016, the Digital adoption index is as high as 0.64 in South Africa, and as low as 0.27 in Ethiopia. The percentage of individuals using internet is 56.17% and 15.37%, respectively, in the same two countries. The disparities are much greater than those between women and men, between the old and the youth or among rural and urban areas. This severely in turns,

60.00

50.00

**Percentage of internet users**

40.00


30.00

20.00

10.00

0.00

56.17



34.67

25.66 25.67

15.37

16.60

20.00

Ethiopia Kenya Rwanda Senegal Nigeria Ghana South

Africa

**Countries**

Fig. 2. Percentage of individuals using internet in 2016. Source: [World Bank (2016)](#_bookmark29).

50.0%

40.0%

30.0%

**Percentage geder disparity**


20.0%

10.0%

0.0%

-10.0%

-5.0%



16%

18%

9%

10%

South Africa

Senegal

Kenya Ghana Nigeria Rwanda

**Countries**

42%

10,000,000

9,000,000

8,000,000

7,000,000

**Number of users**

6,000,000

5,000,000


4,000,000

3,000,000

2,000,000

1,000,000

0



**9000000**

**7500000**

**5000000**

**3500000**

**400,000 1600000**

Senegal Ghana Rwanda Ethiopia Nigeria Kenya

**Countries**

Fig. 5. D4Ag solutions by number users in 2018. Source: [Tsan et al. (2019)](#_bookmark24).

Fig. 3. Gender disparity in mobile phone use. Source: RIA After Access Survey data, 2017.


[et al. (2012)](#_bookmark23) found that education and income were the foremost deter- minants of gender inequalities in ICT access and use, rather than gender per se. Likewise, the low level of women's mobile phone ownership in the region might be determined by low level of women in terms of in- come and education when compared to men ([Gillwald, 2017](#_bookmark24); [Gillwald](#_bookmark24) [and Mothobi, 2019](#_bookmark24)).

Similarly, the urban–rural gap in mobile use in Africa increased from 34% in 2007 to 61% in 2017 ([Gillwald and Mothobi, 2019](#_bookmark24)). The substan- tial urban–rural divide is mainly due to lack of coverage in the rural areas, since mobile operators consider rural areas unprofitable ([Gillwald and Mothobi, 2019](#_bookmark24)). There is also evidence that the digital di- vide continuously tracks historical social inequalities, in such a way that it further broadening the difference among the poor and the rich. Digital exclusion is mainly a matter of poverty, with those at the bottom of the pyramid (women and the poor) being the most disregarded ([Research](#_bookmark24) [ICT Africa, 2019](#_bookmark24)). Consequently, the effect digital divide is triple that of its gender inequality for poor women farm households residing in rural areas and severely affects their digital uptake in agriculture.

On the other hand, the D4Ag solutions largely succeed in attracting youth but the average age of farmers in Africa exceeds 50 ([Tsan et al.,](#_bookmark24) [2019](#_bookmark24)). For example, in 2018, the share of youth (under 35 age) users was 65% ([Tsan et al., 2019](#_bookmark24)). The big portion of youth show that difficult of the solutions for old-aged group and a vital age divide that must be overwhelmed so as to involve the important share of farmers from older groups.

In addition, the expansion of D4Ag solutions with digital adoption index and services don't coincide in most countries of SSA. While Kenya

100



**80**

**83**

**90**

**70**

**72**

**Percentage of Gender disparity**

90

80

70

60

50

40

30

20

10

0

Ghana Kenya Nigeria Ethiopia Senegal

**Countries**

Fig. 4. Gender gap in D4Ag solutions use data, 2018. Source: Based on [Tsan et al. (2019)](#_bookmark24).

has lower percentage of individuals internet user when compared coun- tries like South Africa, the country has succeeded in D4Ag among the rest Sub-Sahara African countries for which real data existing ([Figs. 2](#_bookmark5) [and 3](#_bookmark5)). Moreover, the country has extra D4Ag enterprises and users than any other SSA ([Tsan et al., 2019](#_bookmark24)). The success behind in Kenya might be linked with better collaboration between D4Ag stakeholders and encouraging policy support currently observed in the country.

Even Ethiopia, which has the lowest value for digital adoption index (0.27) and percentage of individuals using internet (15.37%) has excess number of D4Ag solution users when compared to country like, Senegal, which has higher share of internet users (26.6%) with digital adoption index value of 0.35 ([Figs. 1, 2 and 5](#_bookmark4)). The number of the solution users in Ethiopia exceeds that of Senegal by more than 12 folds ([Fig. 5](#_bookmark6)). There- fore, such big disparity among the two countries is not due to the difference in digital facilities, rather due to the policy strategy and gov- ernment policy stand on D4Ag expansion.

In Ethiopia, a state-led development model for D4Ag has shown rapid scaling, despite digital literacy among farmers is nominal and fa- cilities for digital services (such as access to the internet) is lower in the country ([Tsan et al., 2019](#_bookmark24)). To address these challenges the country has developed effective ways to work around the limitations via heavily investing on 8028 Farmer Hotline deployment and agents who can ad- dress smallholder farmers' queries. The platform provides free advisory services via interactive voice response (IVR)/short message service (SMS) for about 5 million farmers ([Fig. 5](#_bookmark6)). The service offers a much wider reach than internet-based solutions and odd from countries like Senegal, where the government policy fails to fully support D4Ag ([Tsan et al., 2019](#_bookmark24)).

Finally, there exists numerous encounters to accelerating digitiza- tion of agribusiness payments to farmers. These involves, restricted con- nectivity, poor digital literacy, and a weak regulatory ecosystem for digital payments, limited availability of cash-in, and cash-out points and opportunities to use e-money ([The World Bank Group, 2020](#_bookmark24)).

1. Conclusions and policy implications

In Africa, the growing demand of food and nutrition security strive to increase more than double the current status of agricultural production over the next 30 years. The problem will be more worsen SSA, that has al- ready been facing the highest food insecurity than any other regions. The recent revolution of digital agriculture, therefore, will be the good news to SSA that help address their key challenges currently facing the region. Nu- merous studies have revealed that a few of successful digital services have changed the lives of several smallholder farmers in SSA.

By harnessing disruptive agricultural technology innovations via digital solutions, smallholder farmers in SSA have recognized the advan- tages to be gained, with the top expected benefits including reduce their

search cost; guaranteed real timely access to safe financial transactions, increased options to navigate the variety of domestic and international chain alternatives; increased multifaceted knowledge and adoption of new sustainable practices; accessed to individualized extension services at a much lesser expense, increased productivity and incomes, en- hanced self-employment rate, improved per capita consumption levels and, women empowerment, food security and dietary quality; faster ac- cess to price, market, and farming information; reduced the risk of in- come shocks and poverty incidence and increased adaptability to situational changes.

Despite its clear benefits of digital breakthrough in supporting agri- cultural transformation there is also evidence that these innovations often fail to adopt and attain broader acceptance. Primarily, the digital technology scale-up remains low, and most of digital agricultural solu- tions have succeeded below 30% and struggle to scale in the region. In spite of the fact that low status of digital infrastructure in SSA, is not the vital cause for the relatively small numbers of people using digital solutions. For instance, at the end of 2019, about 49% of people across Sub-Saharan Africa were connected to the mobile Internet, but not using the Internet. The failure of policy strategy to create simple workarounds and universal-access mechanisms -that can circumvent digital barriers to D4Ag scale-up are only two of many constraints farmers face. For example, Ethiopia, which has lowest access to the in- ternet and nominal digital literacy among farmers relatively with other SSA, has addressed these challenges via heavily investing on 8028 Farmer Hotline deployment and agents who can address small- holder farmers' queries. The service offers a much wider reach than internet-based solutions, has shown rapid scaling in D4Ag, and odd from countries like Senegal, where the government policy fails to fully support D4Ag.

Others include unaffordability for digital enabling tools and data prices. For most SSA, price for mobile-data baskets and cost of smartphones are still beyond reach for a big portion of the population, in conditions where incomes are already inadequate. In several African countries, regressive taxes on digital devices and services are one the factors that escalate the cost of communication and undermine the use digital technologies. When the challenges of unaffordability sum up with higher digital illiterateness conditions of the region, the prob- lems become more sever for poor smallholder farmers. Consequently, they jointly together lead to low digital scale up among smallholder farmers in agriculture. Accordingly, it needs the region to review taxa- tion system on the sector.

The Digital divide also seems to intensifying existing inequalities in SSA. Unlike, developed economies, the digital gender gap in region has been persistently increasing over time. The disparities are much greater than those between women and men, between the old and the youth or among rural and urban areas, between poor and rich.

Like other digital technologies, women and old smallholder farmers are underrepresented among digital agricultural solution users in SSA. Merely a fourth of registered users of digital agricultural solutions were women among 40–50% women smallholder farmers in 2018. This is mainly due to the low level of their education and income status. Digital exclusion is mainly a matter of poverty, with those at the bottom of the pyramid (women and the poor) being the most disregarded. Moreover, Africa's urban–rural disparity is triple that of its gender in- equality. On the other hand, the D4Ag solutions largely succeed in attracting youth regardless of old-aged farmers in the region. For exam- ple, in 2018, the share of youth (under 35 age) users was 65%. The big portion of youth show that difficult of the solutions for old-aged group. Finally, there exists numerous encounters to accelerating digitiza- tion of agribusiness payments to farmers. These involves, restricted con- nectivity, poor digital literacy, and a weak regulatory ecosystem for digital payments, limited availability of cash-in, and cash-out points and opportunities to use e-money. Therefore, a rapid growth of digitiza- tion of agricultural payments would call for establishment of founda-

tional drivers and the ecosystem for rural DFS.

Accordingly, one strategy to realize their potential the SSA countries need to work to digitize their own systems or replicate and adopt suc- cessful interventions that match with their target populations' digital skill and infrastructure to fully harness the opportunities of digitaliza- tion in agriculture. Moreover, to address the problem of digital divide, balancing regulatory and delivery approaches will be essential to permit different categories of services to be offered by different kinds of opera- tors. Likewise, to ease and enhance the use of digital agricultural solu- tion and service, it is essential to ensure affordable access to digital tools for agriculture along with fair price for mobile-data baskets partic- ularly for the poor and women smallholder farmers. These may be real- ized via reducing data costs, and tax cuts or totally removing customs duty and exoneration of VAT on digital agriculture enabling tools. Sim- ilarly, countrywide allocated range not in use in remote areas must be made accessible via low-cost or license-exempt spectrum for communi- ties, non-profit providers or micro-networks.

To tackle the problem of digital skills, capacity building training on the use digital solutions should be offered persistently to the target pop- ulation by segmenting them via their gender, age, and education.

Declaration of Competing Interest

None.

Acknowledgements

None.

References

Abell, T., Ambrosius, M., van den Berg, J., van den Broek, T., van Hooff, H., Tolsma, A.M., 2019. [Accelerating CGIAR’S Digital Transformation](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0005).

Aker, J., 2011. Dial “A” for agriculture: using ICTs for agricultural extension in developing countries. Agric. Econ. 42 (6), 631–647. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-0862.2011.](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-0862.2011.00545)

[00545](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-0862.2011.00545).

Aker, J.C., Ksoll, C., 2016. [Can mobile phones improve agricultural outcomes? Evidence](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0015) [from a randomized experiment in Niger. Food Policy 60, 44–51](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0015).

Aker, Jenny C., Mbiti, I.M., 2010. Mobile phones and economic development in Africa.

J. Econ. Perspect. 24 (3), 207–232. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.24.3.207>.

Annosi, M.C., Brunetta, F., Capo, F., Heideveld, L., 2020. Digitalization in the Agri-food industry: the relationship between technology and sustainable development. Manag. Decis. 58 (8), 1737–1757. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-09-2019-1328>.

Arouna, A., Michler, J.D., Yergo, W.G., Saito, K., 2020. One size fits all? Experimental evi- dence on the digital delivery of personalized extension advice in Nigeria. Am.

J. Agric. Econ. 103 (2), 596–619. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajae.12151>.

Asfaw, S., Shiferaw, B., Simtowe, F., Lipper, L., 2012. [Impact of modern agricultural tech-](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0035) [nologies on smallholder welfare: evidence from Tanzania and Ethiopia. Food Policy](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0035) [37, 283–295](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0035).

Baumüller, H., Addom, B.K., 2020. The enabling environments for the digitalization of African agriculture. In: Resnick, D., Diao, X., Tadesse, G. (Eds.), Sustaining Africa’s Agrifood System Transformation: The Role of Public Policies. International Food Pol- icy Research Institute (IFPRI), pp. 159–173. <https://doi.org/10.2499/9780896293946>.

Bjornlund, Vibeke, Bjornlund, Henning, Van Rooyen, Andre F, 2020. Why agricultural pro- duction in sub-Saharan Africa remains low compared to the rest of the world –a his- torical perspective. International Journal of Water Resources Development 36 (sup1), S20–S53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07900627.2020.1739512> S1, In this issue.

Brown, B., Nuberg, I., Llewellyn, R., 2017. [Stepwise frameworks for understanding the](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0045) [utilisation of conservation agriculture in Africa. Agric. Syst. 153, 11–22](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0045).

Davis, K., 2008. Extension in sub-Saharan Africa: overview and assessment of past and current models and future prospects. J. Int. Agric. Ext. Educ. 15 (3), 15–28. [https://](https://doi.org/10.5191/jiaee.2008.15302) [doi.org/10.5191/jiaee.2008.15302](https://doi.org/10.5191/jiaee.2008.15302).

Davis, K., Sulaiman, R., 2014. [The new extensionist: roles and capacities to strengthen](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0055) [extension and advisory services. J. Int. Agric. Ext. Educ. 21 (3), 341–35](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0055)5.

Deen-Swarray, M., Gillwald, A., Morrell, A., Khan, S., 2012. Lifting the Veil on ICT Gender Indicators in Africa (No. 13). [www.researchictafrica.net/publications/E](http://www.researchictafrica.net/publications/Evidence_for_ICT_Policy_Action/Policy_Paper_13_-_Lifting_the_veil_on_gender_ICT_indicators_in_Africa.pdf) [vidence\_for\_ICT\_Policy\_Action/Policy\_Paper\_13\_-\_Lifting\_the\_veil\_on\_gender\_IC](http://www.researchictafrica.net/publications/Evidence_for_ICT_Policy_Action/Policy_Paper_13_-_Lifting_the_veil_on_gender_ICT_indicators_in_Africa.pdf) [T\_indicators\_in\_Africa.pdf](http://www.researchictafrica.net/publications/Evidence_for_ICT_Policy_Action/Policy_Paper_13_-_Lifting_the_veil_on_gender_ICT_indicators_in_Africa.pdf).

Deen-Swarray, M., Moyo, M., Stork, C., 2013. [ICT access and usage among informal busi-](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0065) [nesses in Africa. Info J. 15 (5), 52–68](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0065).

Deichmann, U., Goyal, A., Mishra, D., 2016. [Will digital technologies transform agriculture](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0070) [in developing countries ? Agric. Econ. 47, 21–33 (doi:D40, I31, O13, O33)](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0070).

Deutsche Bank Research, 2014. [Agricultural Value Chains in Sub-Saharan Africa](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0075).

Donner, J., Escobari, M., 2010. A review of evidence on mobile use by micro and small en- terprises in developing countries. J. Int. Dev. 22 (5), 641–658. https://doi.org/10. 1002/jid.v22:5.

Esselaar, S., Stork, C., Ndiwalana, A., Deen-Swarray, M., 2007. ICT usage and its impact on profitability of SMEs in 13 African countries. Inf. Technol. Int. Dev. 4 (1), 87–100. <https://doi.org/10.1162/itid.2007.4.issue-1>.

Foster, C., Graham, M., 2017. Reconsidering the role of the digital in global production net- works. GlobalNetworks 17 (1), 66–88. <https://doi.org/10.1111/glob.12142>.

Foster, C.G., Heeks, R.B., 2013. Conceptualising inclusive innovation: modifying systems of innovation frameworks to understand diffusion of new technology to low-income consumers. Eur. J. Dev. Res. 25 (3), 333–355. <https://doi.org/10.1057/ejdr.2013.7>.

Foster, Christopher, Graham, M., Mann, L., Waema, T., Mann, L., 2018. Digital control in value chains: challenges of connectivity for east African firms. Econ. Geogr. 94 (1), 68–86. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00130095.2017.1350104>.

Gillwald, A., 2017. [*Beyond Access: Addressing Digital Inequality in Africa* (48)](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0105).

Gillwald, A., Mothobi, O., 2019. After Access 2018: A Demand-Side View of Mobile Inter- net from 10 African Countries. [https://researchictafrica.net/2019\_after-access\_africa-](https://researchictafrica.net/2019_after-access_africa-comparative-report/) [comparative-report/](https://researchictafrica.net/2019_after-access_africa-comparative-report/).

Goedde, L., McCullough, R., Ooko-Ombaka, A., Pais, G., 2021. [*How Digital Tools Can Help*](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0115)[*Transform African Agri-Food Systems* (Issue January, pp. 1–9). McKinsey & Compan](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0115)y. GSMA, 2020a. [Digital Agriculture Maps 2020 State of the Sector in Low and Middle-](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0120)

[Income Countrie](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0120)s.

GSMA, 2020b. The Mobile Economy Sub-Saharan Africa *2020 Nearly*. [www.gsma.com](http://www.gsma.com/).

Hartmann, G., Nduru, G., Dannenberg, P., 2020. Digital connectivity at the upstream end of value chains: a dynamic perspective on smartphone adoption amongst horti- cultural smallholders in Kenya. Compet. Chang., 1–23. [https://doi.org/10.1177/](https://doi.org/10.1177/1024529420914483) [1024529420914483](https://doi.org/10.1177/1024529420914483).

Hilbert, M., 2011. Digital gender divide or technologically empowered women in develop- ing countries ? A typical case of lies, damned lies, and statistics. Women’s Stud. Int. Forum 34 (6), 479–489. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2011.07.001>.

ITU, 2019. Measuring Digital Development Facts and Figures. https://SAP id 43255.

ITU, 2021. Digital Trends in Africa 2021. ITU (International Telecommunication Union). <https://creativecommons.org/%0Alicenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/igo/>.

Jack, William, Suri, Tavneet, 2014. [Risk Sharing and Transactions Costs: Evidence from](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/optVWb22B2ebv) [Kenya’s Mobile Money Revolution. American Economic Review 104, 183–223 1](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/optVWb22B2ebv).

Karlan, D., Kendall, J., Mann, R., Pande, R., Suri, T., Zinman, J., 2016. [Research and Impacts](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0150) [of Digital Financial Services (No. 22633)](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0150).

Kim, J., Shah, P., Gaskell, J.C., Prasann, A., Luthra, A., 2020. Scaling Up Disruptive Agricul- tural Technologies in Africa. 1818. International Bank for Reconstruction and Devel- opment / The World Bank. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-1522-5>.

Lecoutere, E., Spielman, D.J., Van Campenhout, B., 2019. [Empowering women with digital](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0160) [extension in Uganda: Effects of information and role models. 6th African Conference](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0160) [of Agricultural Economists, pp. 1–21](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0160).

Malabo Montpellier Panel, 2019. Byte by Byte: Policy Innovation for Transforming Africa’s Food System with Digital Technologies. <https://doi.org/10.2499/9780896296848>.

Martin, C., Harihareswara, N., 2016. [Guide to the Use of Digital Financial Services in Agri-](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0170) [culture. United States Agency for International Development (USAID)](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0170).

Mcintosh, C., Mansini, C.S., 2018. The Use of Financial Technology in the Agriculture Sector (No.

872). <https://www.adb.org/publications/use-financial-technology-agriculture-sector>.

Montfaucon, A.F., 2020. Increasing agricultural income and access to financial services through mobile technology in Africa: Evidence from Malawi. In: Osabuohien, E.S. (Ed.), The Palgrave Handbook of Agricultural and Rural Development in Africa. Pal- grave Macmillan, pp. 247–262. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-41513-6_12>.

Murphy, J., Carmody, P., Surborg, B., 2014. Industrial transformation or business as usual? Information and communication technologies and Africa’s place in the global infor- mation economy. Rev. Afr. Polit. Econ. 41 (140), 264–283. [https://doi.org/10.1080/](https://doi.org/10.1080/03056244.2013.873024) [03056244.2013.873024](https://doi.org/10.1080/03056244.2013.873024).

Muyiramye, D., Addom, B.K., 2020. [COVID-19 and Agriculture in Africa: Implications for](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0190) [Digitalisation (Issue August](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0190)).

Ochieng, S.O., Okello, J.J., Otieno, D.J., 2013. [Impact of information and communication](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0195) [technology-based market information services on smallholder farm input use and](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0195) [productivity. *The Case of Kenya* (4th International Conference of the African Associa-](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0195) [tion of Agricultural Economists (ICAAAE))](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0195).

Ortiz-crespo, B., Steinke, J., Quirós, C.F., Van De Gevel, J., Daudi, H., Mgimiloko, M.G., Van Etten, J., 2020. User-centred design of a digital advisory service: enhancing public ag- ricultural extension for sustainable intensification in Tanzania. Int. J. Agric. Sustain. 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14735903.2020.1720474>.

Pretty, J., Bharucha, Z.P., 2014. [Sustainable intensification in agricultural systems. Ann.](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0205)

[Bot. 114 (8), 1571–1596](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0205).

Quandt, A., Salerno, J.D., Neff, J.C., Baird, T.D., Herrick, J.E., McCabe, J.T., Xu, E., Hartter, J., 2020. Mobile phone use is associated with higher smallholder agricultural productiv- ity in Tanzania, East Africa. PLoS One 15 (8), 1–16. [https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0237337) [pone.0237337](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0237337).

Research ICT Africa, 2019. [Understanding Digital Access and Use in the Global South](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0215).

Ruben, R., 2017. [Impact assessment of commodity standards: towards inclusive value](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0220) [chains. Enterp. Dev. Microfinance 28, 82–97](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0220).

Sekabira, H., Qaim, M., 2017. Can mobile phones improve gender equality and nutrition? Panel data evidence from farm households in Uganda. Food Policy 73, 95–103. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpoI.2017.10.004>.

Sennuga, S.O., Conway, J.S., Sennuga, M.A., 2020. [Technology adoption for improving ag-](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0230) [ricultural productivity in sub-Saharan Africa. Int. J. Agric. Ext. Rural Dev. Stud. 7 (1),](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0230) [27–43](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0230).

Silvestri, S., Richard, M., Edward, B., Dharmesh, G., 2020. Going digital in agriculture: how radio and SMS can scale-up smallholder participation in legume based sustainable agricultural intensification practices and technologies in Tanzania. Int. J. Agric. Sustain. 0 (0), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14735903.2020.1750796>.

Suri, T., Jack, W., 2016. The long-run poverty and gender impacts of mobile money.

Science *354* (6317). <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aah5309> 1288 LP – 1292.

Tamene, L., Abera, W., Erkossa, T., 2021. [Digital Solutions to Transform Agriculture:](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0245) [Lessons and Experiences in Ethiopia](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0245).

The World Bank Group, 2020. [Digitization of Agribusiness Payments in Africa](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0250). Thompson, T., Gyatso, T., 2020. Technology Adoption for Improving Agricultural Produc-

tivity in Sub-Saharan Afric. [www.globalagriculturalproductivity.org](http://www.globalagriculturalproductivity.org/).

Tittonell, P., Giller, K.E., 2013. [When yield gaps are poverty traps: the paradigm of ecolog-](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0260) [ical intensifcation in African smallholder agriculture. Field Crop Res. 143, 76–90](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0260).

Trendov, N.M., Varas, S., Zeng, M., 2019. [Digital Technologies in Agriculture and Rural](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0265) [Areas - Briefing Pape](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0265)r.

Tsan, M., Totapally, S., Hailu, M., Addom, B.K., 2019. [The Digitalisation of African Agricul-](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0270) [ture Report](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0270).

UN DESA, 2018. [United Nation e-Government Survey 2018](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0275). UNIDO, 2011. [Agribusiness for Africa’s Prosperity. United Nations Industrial Development](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0280)

[Organization (UNIDO)](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0280).

Wieser, C., Bruhn, M., Kinzinger, J., Ruckteschler, C., Heitmann, S., 2019. [The Impact of Mo-](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0285) [bile Money on Poor Rural Households Experimental Evidence from Uganda (No.](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0285) [8913; Issue June)](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0285).

World Bank, 2013. [Growing Africa: Unlocking the Potential of Agribusines](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0290)s. World Bank, 2016. [World Development Report 2016. Digital Dividend](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2589-7217(21)00036-2/rf0295)s.