



Strengthening Africa in World Trade



Aligning Trade and Agricultural Policy Frameworks with Agroecological and Food Sovereignty Goals in Africa

Analytical Paper, October, 2025



Acknowledgements

This analytical paper titled; "Aligning Trade and Agricultural Policy Frameworks with Agroecological and Food Sovereignty Goals in Africa", was published by the Southern and Eastern Africa Trade Information and Negotiations Institute (SEATINI) Uganda with generous support from Both ENDS.

The development of the paper benefited significantly from the technical expertise and insights of SEATINI staff, notably Ms. Jane Nalunga, Mr. Herbert Kafeero, and Mr. Jonathan Lubega. Their guidance and contributions were instrumental in shaping the analytical depth and policy relevance of this work.

SEATINI acknowledges all the stakeholders, practitioners, and experts who have contributed, directly or indirectly, to advancing the discourse on agroecology, trade, and food sovereignty in Africa.

1. Introduction

The urgency of transitioning towards resilient, sustainable, and inclusive food and agricultural systems in Africa has been intensified by a series of intersecting global crises. Climate-related disasters, the COVID-19 pandemic, geopolitical tensions, and ongoing conflicts have severely disrupted global supply chains, highlighting structural vulnerabilities within Africa's agri-food systems.

In this context, agroecology is gaining recognition as a viable and transformative alternative to conventional, industrial agriculture. Agroecology encompasses both a scientific and socio-political approach to food and farming systems. It emphasizes ecological principles such as biodiversity, nutrient cycling, and natural resource regeneration, while also advocating for social justice, farmer autonomy, gender equality, and cultural integrity.

Agroecological systems have demonstrated the potential to enhance climate resilience, restore ecosystems, reduce dependence on external inputs, conserve biodiversity, and lower greenhouse gas emissions. These outcomes directly support the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly those related to climate action, food security, poverty alleviation, and sustainable livelihoods. Furthermore, agroecology aligns with commitments made under Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) in the context of the Paris Agreement.

Despite this growing body of evidence and recognition, agroecology remains marginalized within prevailing agricultural, trade, and investment policy frameworks across Africa particularly in Eastern Africa. Current policy models continue to favor export-oriented, industrial agricultural systems that prioritize monocultures, high external input use, and integration into global value chains. These models are often promoted under the logic of economic growth but have led to the displacement of smallholder farmers, erosion of traditional knowledge systems, and degradation of ecosystems.

Trade liberalization policies shaped by commitments under the World Trade Organization (WTO) as well as regional and bilateral trade agreements have further reinforced these dynamics. African countries have significantly reduced tariffs and opened their markets, exposing domestic producers to competition from heavily subsidized imports from the Global North. These trade regimes have undermined local food systems, increased dependence on volatile global markets, and weakened national and regional food sovereignty.

This analytical paper critically examines the extent to which existing trade and agricultural policy frameworks at national, regional, and continental levels support or inhibit the development of agroecological food systems and food sovereignty in Africa. It identifies key policy misalignments, structural barriers, and legal inconsistencies, and proposes strategic policy recommendations for harmonizing trade and agricultural frameworks with the principles of agroecology and food sovereignty.

Objectives of the Analytical Paper

- Assess the extent to which agroecology and food sovereignty principles are integrated into key national and regional frameworks (e.g., CAADP, UPOV 91, and Plant Varieties Acts).
- Analyze selected national, regional, and global trade policies in terms of their alignment with agroecological and food sovereignty goals.
- Generate actionable recommendations aimed at reforming trade and agricultural frameworks to better support agroecological practices, uphold the rights of smallholder and marginalized communities, and advance environmental sustainability.

2. Assessing Agroecology and food sovereignty principles in national and regional agricultural frameworks

Many African countries, individually at respective national levels and collectively at regional and continental levels, have put in place a number of policy frameworks and initiative to promote agroecology and food sovereignty on the continent. This section will analyze the efficacy of a few selected national and regional agricultural policy in mainstreaming agroecological principles and practices. These are Uganda's national agricultural policy, UPOV 91, Kenya's Plant Varieties Act and CAADP.

2.1 Uganda's Agricultural policy

Uganda's 2013 National Agriculture Policy promotes sustainable agricultural productivity, value addition, and trade, with provisions under Objective 5 for sustainable resource use.

The overall objective of the agricultural policy is achieving food and nutrition security and improving household incomes through coordinated interventions that focus on enhancing sustainable agricultural productivity and value addition, providing employment opportunities, and promoting domestic and international trade.

While the policy does not explicitly reference agroecology, it provides an opening for integrating agroecological principles.

The 2019 National Organic Agriculture Policy further strengthens this potential by recognizing Uganda's predominantly organic agricultural landscape. The policy highlights the importance of enhancing the organic value chain, offering fertile ground for scaling agroecological practices.

In 2019, Uganda developed and passed the National Organic Agriculture Policy whose vision is to create a sustainable and profitable organic agriculture sub-sector for national competitiveness. The policy was developed on the justification that Uganda's agriculture system is by default largely organic due to the very minimal use of external inputs. The policy was also developed to support the effective implementation of the National Agriculture Policy through harnessing the country's organic agriculture resources and strengthening the capacity of the various value chain actors to achieve their potential.

2.2 The East African Organic Products Standard (EAOS)

The East African Organic Products Standard (EAOS), adopted in 2007, is the second regional organic standard globally after the EU's. Developed to harmonize organic production and trade within the East African Community (EAC), it provides a unified framework grounded in ecological principles, traditional knowledge, and scientific innovation. The standard emphasizes ecosystem management, soil fertility, biodiversity conservation, and prohibits synthetic fertilizers and pesticides.

Uganda, Kenya, and Tanzania have officially adopted and integrated the EAOS into their national organic policies, with Rwanda and Burundi also recognizing the standard to varying degrees. Uganda has emerged as a regional leader, leveraging the EAOS to boost organic exports, which contribute to rural incomes and national foreign exchange.

The East African Organic Mark (EAOM) complements the standard by certifying compliance, enhancing consumer trust, and facilitating access to regional and international organic markets. The East African organic mark is available to all producers who conform to the EAOPS.

By promoting ecological sustainability, improved livelihoods, and premium market access, the EAOS serves as a critical instrument for advancing agroecology and food sovereignty within regional trade frameworks.

2.3 UPOV 91

Africa's farmer-managed seed systems are foundational to food sovereignty, biodiversity preservation, and ecological resilience. These systems depend on informal practices of seed saving, exchange, and community ownership. However, UPOV 91-aligned laws such as Kenya's Seed and Plant Varieties Act undermine these systems by criminalizing traditional practices and privileging breeders' rights.

A World Bank-commissioned study across five countries (including Kenya and Uganda) confirms that formal seed laws threaten farmer seed systems by restricting the reuse and exchange of seeds. This facilitates a shift toward corporate-controlled hybrid and Genetically Modified Organisms (GMO) seed systems, increasing farmer dependency on external inputs and diminishing resilience to climate shocks¹.

Despite their proven role in preserving agrobiodiversity, empowering farmers and enhancing food sovereignty, CSBs are under threat. They serve as vital repositories for traditional seed varieties and offer community-based alternatives to the corporate-dominated seed industry. Yet, under UPOV-aligned laws, such as Kenya's Seed and Plant Varieties Act (2012), farmers' ability to use, exchange, or sell their own seed varieties is severely limited.

The increased adoption of UPOV-aligned policies has further commercialized the seed sector

¹ Carlos M. Correa et al., *Plant Variety Protection in Developing Countries: A tool for Designing a Sui Generis Plant Variety Protection System: An Alternative to UPOV 1991*, APBREBES, 2015.

which has deepened farmer dependency on expensive external inputs thus reducing autonomy and increasing vulnerability. Therefore, this over-reliance has aggravated Africa's fragile food systems, particularly in the face of climate change, land degradation and inefficient supply chains. For instance, in countries such as Kenya, Zambia and Malawi, farmers are increasingly dependent on hybrid and genetically modified seeds that require specific Agro-chemicals and fertilizers sold by the same companies that own the seed patents.² When farmers cannot afford these costly inputs or face supply chain disruptions, the yields may drop drastically which directly threatens household food security and also national production targets.

The corporate seed control undermines agroecology and food sovereignty, limits biodiversity and compromises intergenerational knowledge transfer. Unless these policies are reformed to protect and promote Farmer Managed Seed Systems, Africa risks entrenching a cycle of dependency, hunger, and environmental degradation.

2.4 Kenya's Plant Varieties Act

The Seed and Plant Varieties Act Cap 326 was assented to in May 1972.³ It has undergone several amendments in 1998, 2002, 2012, 2016. The amendments to the Plant Varieties Act introduced provisions closely aligned with UPOV 1991 (Act of the International Convention for the Protection of New breeders' Varieties of Plants). The 2011 amendment introduced Section 19(1) by granting breeders' rights for 20 years from the date of the grant, or 25 years in the case of trees and vines.

Under Section 20(1) and 20(1A) – (1C), a breeder holds exclusive and enforceable rights over a protected variety, including its production, sale, export/import, and even harvested material derived without permission. These rights extend to new varieties essentially derived from or indistinguishable from the original, granting breeders overarching control over a broad range of genetic materials.

Then came the punitive inclusions through Section 10, subsections 4(d), (e), and (f) of the amended Act. These clauses impose fines of up to KSh **1 million or a two-year prison sentence on any person who, while not registered as a seed merchant, imports, processes, or packages seed for sale**; sells or displays for sale any seed that does not match the description in a required certificate; offers for sale seed that fails to meet certification standards or has been rejected at any stage of certification.

These provisions criminalize smallholder practices fundamental to agroecology such as community seed banking and seed exchange deepening the grip of corporate agribusiness and threatening local biodiversity and food sovereignty.

2.5 CAADP (Kampala CAADP Declaration)

The Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP), a flagship initiative under the African Union's Agenda 2063, specifically Aspiration 1, Goal 5 seeks to modernize agriculture to increase productivity and production across the continent. The CAADP Strategy

² <https://www.aatf-africa.org/lessons-from-africas-largest-producer-of-gmo-maize/>

³ Seeds of Discontent: Kenya's Seed Law Undermines Farmers' Resilience. Accessed on <https://progressiveinternational.wire/2025-10-01-seeds-of-discontent-kenyas-seed-law-undermines-farmers-resilience/en>

and Action Plan (2026–2035) and the Kampala Declaration ⁴on Building Resilient and Sustainable Agri-food Systems prioritize agricultural productivity, commercialization, and trade integration. While there are general commitments to building “resilient agri-food systems,” agroecology is not explicitly prioritized.

This bias toward export-oriented and industrial agriculture risks sidelining agroecological approaches, farmer-managed seed systems, and local food chains. Such marginalization undermines efforts to build food sovereignty, enhance biodiversity, and strengthen smallholder resilience.

However, the ongoing process of developing implementation indicators for the new CAADP Strategy offers a critical opportunity. By embedding agroecological metrics, stakeholders can reorient the implementation of CAADP toward sustainability, ecological integrity, and inclusiveness. For instance, Strategic Objective 1 which focuses on intensifying sustainable food production, agro-industrialization, and trade includes provisions to promote tools and practices that integrate natural ecosystems with agriculture to support biodiversity and resilience. This opens policy space to advance agroecology through well-defined indicators and measurable outcomes.

This evolving policy framework offers a strategic entry point for advocates and policymakers to ensure that agroecology is effectively integrated into continental agricultural strategies through well-defined indicators and measurable outcomes.

3. Assessment of national and regional trade policies and frameworks support agroecology and food sovereignty (National Trade Policy, EAC, AFCFTA)

Putting in place enabling trade policy frameworks and addressing issues of classification and standards can address systemic barriers and incentivize the scale up agroecological products in the markets. Trade and trade related policies and frameworks that support the transition to agroecological production and trade can be divided into two areas i.e., those policies that incentivize and promote the production and trade of agroecological products; and those which eliminate or discourage agroecological trade.

This section analyses the extent to which some of the existing national and regional trade policies have integrated agroecological and food sovereignty principles and practices in order to promote the production and trade in agroecological products. The selected policies are the Uganda national policy, the EAC Customs union Protocol, the Simplified Trade Regime (STR) in EAC, COMESA and SADC; and the AfCFTA.

3.1 Uganda National Trade Policy

Uganda’s National Trade Policy (2008–2018) emphasizes export diversification and integration into regional and global markets.

⁴ <https://au.int/en/newsevents/20250505/official-launch-kampala-caadp-strategy-and-action-plan-2026-2035>

The policy further emphasizes the facilitation of agricultural trade, promotion of industrialization and expansion into regional and global markets. Uganda through the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Cooperatives has been key in the search for new market in the region and global level. Uganda is a key actor in the EAC, SADC, COMESA and in the AfCFTA. The National Trade Policy is anchored in developing a competitive private sector that drives export growth. Although the trade policy promotes agricultural trade, there is no differentiation among the agricultural products to consider agroecological products.

While the National Trade Policy recognizes the importance of agricultural trade, it fails to distinguish or support agroecological products.

The current policy review presents a timely opportunity to integrate agroecology, promote eco-labeling, and support smallholder access to domestic and regional markets.

3.2 Regional Trade Policies.

The EAC has established several frameworks to promote intra-regional trade and facilitate the participation of all East Africans in regional trade. The regional frameworks, include, inter alia, the EAC Customs Union Protocol and the Simplified Trade Regime (STR). The STR has also been adopted and being implemented by COMESA and SADC.

3.2.1 The Simplified Trade Regime (STR)

Under the EAC Customs Union, the Simplified Trade Regime (STR) is a special provision designed to facilitate low-value, cross-border trade by small-scale traders, particularly women. The regime allows goods originating within the EAC and valued at under US\$2,000 to enter partner states duty-free using a Simplified Certificate of Origin (SCOO). COMESA and SADC have adopted similar mechanisms, recognizing the central role of informal cross-border trade (ICBT) in regional economies.

While the STR significantly reduces administrative and financial burdens for small traders, it lacks provisions to differentiate agroecological products from conventional goods. Despite the prevalence of traditionally farmed grains, local seeds, and organic foodstuffs in informal trade, these items are treated generically under current STR classifications. This oversight represents a missed opportunity to promote sustainable trade practices and enhance the visibility of agroecological goods.

Critically, the STR does not incorporate eco-labelling mechanisms a key tool for certifying that products meet specific environmental or agroecological standards such as low external input use, biodiversity conservation, and sustainable land management. The absence of such labelling creates barriers to traceability, competitiveness, and consumer recognition of agroecological products in regional markets.

Without recognized eco-labels or simplified verification systems, agroecological producers many of whom are women and smallholders cannot substantiate claims of ecological integrity, limiting their access to premium markets and weakening incentives for sustainable pro-

duction. Furthermore, by focusing solely on tariff and documentation simplification, existing STR frameworks in EAC, COMESA, and SADC perpetuate the institutional invisibility of agroecological products within regional value chains.

3.2.2 EAC Customs union Protocol

The EAC recognizes the centrality of agriculture as a mainstay of the region in terms of economic development and food security. In fact, the EAC's Agricultural policies focus on sustainable agricultural development and food security. The EAC, through the Customs Union Protocol, provides for a Common External Tariff (CET) to facilitate the movement of agricultural products within the region. The CET is applied to all products imported into the Community without reference to agroecological products.

Although the EAC Customs Union supports agricultural trade through CET harmonization and Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) measures, agroecology remains absent from its classification systems and trade protocols. However, recent actions such as the EALA's July 2025 motion to promote agroecology signal a shift toward recognition. Yet, trade policies within the region remain disconnected from this momentum.

The EAC has taken steps to develop a regional framework for agroecology and strengthen institutional capacity to implement agroecological practices across member states. The developing framework aims to build capacity among policymakers, promote seed equity, and strengthen institutional mechanisms to support agroecological practices at a regional level in order to enhance food sovereignty and security, promote ecological integrity, improve livelihoods, and eradicate hunger by 2030.

However, it should be noted that this framework doesn't address the issue of how agroecological products can be traded across the region.

Therefore, despite the aspiration for a transition to agroecology, trade policies and frameworks at national and regional level are largely silent about agroecology.

3.2.3 AfCFTA Trade in goods Protocol

The African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA) prioritizes trade liberalization and high-value exports but overlooks agroecological products, seed sovereignty, and biosafety. The current structure reinforces industrial agriculture and risks facilitating the spread of GMOs and corporate-controlled seed systems. There are also fears that given the fact that some AfCFTA member states have already authorized GMO commercial production, liberalization of seed trade would lead to the proliferation of GMOs thus eroding biodiversity and disadvantaging small holder farmers.

Without safeguards, AfCFTA's Trade and IPR protocols may marginalize smallholder farmers and degrade biodiversity. However, opportunities exist to reorient AfCFTA such as embedding agroecology in trade protocols, developing regional eco-labels, and eliminating non-tariff barriers to local food trade.

It is important that in the ongoing review of the AfCFTA, provisions that support agroecology, food sovereignty, biosafety and farmers rights are included.

It should also be noted that the AfCFTA protocol on Trade in goods does not provide for trade in agroecological products. There is also a marked absence of biosafety provisions and explicit disclosure requirements within the AfCFTA's IPR Protocol which would undermine seed sovereignty on the continent.

4. Recommendations for aligning trade and agricultural policies with the promotion of agroecology, food sovereignty, and the rights of smallholder farmers and marginalized communities:

- 4.1 **Mainstream Agroecology and Food Sovereignty in Trade and Agricultural Policy Frameworks:**
Agroecology and food sovereignty should be explicitly integrated into national, regional, and continental trade and agricultural policies. This includes recognition of agroecological products as a distinct category of goods and the development of supportive instruments to ensure their competitive participation in domestic, regional, and international markets.
- 4.2 **Integrate Agroecology into CAADP and AfCFTA Frameworks:**
Agroecological approaches must be embedded in the implementation of the CAADP Strategy and Action Plan (2026–2035) and the AfCFTA protocols particularly the Protocol on Trade in Goods and the Protocol on Intellectual Property Rights (IPR). Agroecological products should be accorded specific Harmonized System (HS) Codes to facilitate their identification, classification, and trade.
- 4.3 **Expand and Strengthen Simplified Trade Regimes (STRs):**
Regional STR mechanisms under EAC, COMESA, and SADC should be revised to explicitly include agroecological goods such as farmer-saved seeds, traditional grains, and ecologically produced food items. Harmonization of documentation and standards across RECs is essential to reduce trade costs and enhance smallholder market participation.
- 4.4 **Eliminate Non-Tariff Barriers (NTBs) Restricting Agroecological Trade:**
NTBs that hinder the cross-border movement of agroecological goods including restrictions on indigenous seeds, organic fertilizers, and traditional food products should be identified and removed through targeted policy reforms and harmonized regulatory frameworks.
- 4.5 **Support Smallholder- and Community-Led Agroecological Enterprises:**
Strengthen youth- and women-led agroecological enterprises by improving access to finance, technical assistance, market linkages, and enterprise development services. Public procurement programs can also serve as tools to promote demand for agroecological products.
- 4.6 **Develop and Harmonize Agroecological Standards Based on FAO Principles:**

Establish national and regional standards for agroecological products using [FAO's 13 principles of agroecology](#)⁵ as a foundational framework. Clearly defined criteria for agroecology will improve regulatory recognition, enhance product differentiation, and build consumer trust in agroecological markets.

- 4.7 Establish a Continental Agroecological Traceability System: Develop an African Union-led traceability system to verify agroecological practices across the value chain. This system should capture data on production methods, biodiversity outcomes, social equity, land tenure, and the use of local knowledge. Harmonization across RECs and member states is necessary to facilitate seamless trade under AfCFTA.

- 4.8 Prioritize Traceability to Enhance Market Access and Consumer Confidence:
Robust traceability mechanisms are essential to verify compliance with agroecological standards and to meet the transparency requirements of premium domestic and international markets. Traceability systems should document the journey of products from farm to consumer, including inputs used, certification status, and ecological outcomes.

- 4.9 Adopt a Stand-Alone AU Policy on Agroecology: The African Union should develop a dedicated continental policy on agroecology to consolidate fragmented policy initiatives and ensure coherence with CAADP, AfCFTA, biodiversity, and climate strategies. This policy should promote agroecology as a strategic pathway for achieving food sovereignty, climate resilience, and sustainable development goals.

- 4.10 Leverage CAADP and AfCFTA Review Processes for Agroecological Integration: The ongoing development of indicators for CAADP 2026–2035 and the review of AfCFTA protocols present immediate opportunities to integrate agroecology. Key areas for intervention include:

- Integrate Agroecological Indicators into CAADP Monitoring Frameworks including metrics on agro-biodiversity, soil health, low-external input use, farmer-managed seed systems, and indigenous knowledge systems.
- Include Agroecological Products in the AfCFTA Protocol on Trade in Goods by classifying agroecological products under distinct HS codes to support regulatory recognition and market facilitation.
- Incorporate Farmers' Rights and Biosafety in the IPR Protocol to protect traditional knowledge, farmers' seed rights, and biodiversity by embedding farmers' rights and biosafety safeguards in the AfCFTA Intellectual Property Rights Protocol.

- 4.11 Create an Enabling Environment for Agroecological Trade: Beyond policy alignment, African governments must invest in the institutional infrastructure required to support agroecological trade such as certification bodies, extension services, decentralized seed systems, and local markets. This will ensure that agroecology is not only recognized in policy but actively facili-

tated in practice.

5. Conclusion

Aligning Africa's trade and agricultural policies with agroecological and food sovereignty goals is critical to advancing resilient, inclusive, and climate-compatible food systems. However, prevailing policy frameworks such as UPOV 91-aligned seed laws, AfCFTA protocols, and regional trade instruments continue to reinforce industrial, export-driven models that marginalize smallholders, reduce agrobiodiversity, and weaken farmer-managed seed systems.

While policies like Uganda's Organic Agriculture Policy and the East African Organic Products Standard (EAOS) demonstrate progress, they remain insufficiently integrated into broader trade regimes. Key structural gaps include the absence of agroecological product classifications, inadequate biosafety and farmers' rights protections, and lack of institutional support for sustainable, smallholder-led production systems.

The exclusion of eco-labelling and sustainability criteria from trade facilitation mechanisms such as the Simplified Trade Regime (STR) under EAC, COMESA, and SADC limits the visibility, traceability, and competitiveness of agroecological products, particularly those traded informally across borders.

The ongoing reviews of CAADP and AfCFTA offer a critical opportunity to address these gaps. Embedding agroecology into these frameworks through dedicated HS codes, traceability and eco-labelling systems, formal recognition of farmer-managed seed systems, and harmonized biosafety standards will support the transition toward equitable, regenerative, and sovereign food systems across the continent.

References

- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). (2018). The 10 elements of agroecology: Guiding the transition to sustainable food and agricultural systems.
<https://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/I9037EN>
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). (2019). The 13 principles of agroecology.
<https://www.fao.org/agroecology/knowledge/13-principles/en/>
- African Union. (2023). Framework and guidelines for scaling up agroecology in Africa.
<https://au.int/en/documents/20230301/framework-guidelines-agroecology-africa>
- De Schutter, O. (2010). Report submitted by the Special Rapporteur on the right to food: Agroecology and the right to food (A/HRC/16/49). United Nations Human Rights Council. <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/698464>
- World Trade Organization (WTO). (1995). Agreement on Agriculture.
https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/14-ag_01_e.htm
- Tripp, R. (2006). Seed provision and agricultural development: The institutions of rural change. James Currey / Oxford University Press.
<https://global.oup.com/academic/product/seed-provision-and-agricultural-development-9780852554323>
- United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). (2020). The role of trade in promoting sustainable development. <https://unctad.org/web-flyer/role-trade-promoting-sustainable-development>
- African Union. (2023). Draft continental guidelines for the harmonization of seed regulations in Africa. <https://au.int/en/documents/20230315/draft-seed-harmonization-guidelines>
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). (2022). Climate Change 2022: Impacts, adaptation and vulnerability (Sixth Assessment Report).
<https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg2/>
- Both ENDS. (2022). Trade and agroecology: Towards a sustainable future.
<https://www.bothends.org/en/Whats-new/Publications/Trade-and-agro-ecology-Towards-a-sustainable-future/>



For more information please contact

Southern and Eastern Africa Trade Information and Negotiations Institute –
(SEATINI) Uganda | P. O Box, 3138, Kampala, Plot 806, Block 213, Bukoto-Kisasi
Road – Kampala | Email: info@seatiniuganda.org | Tel: +256 414 540856 | Website:
www.seatiniuganda.org

