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#### Abstract

Egypt attempts to enhance its food production through the horizontal expansion of arable land to the sandy desert. The reclaimed land in the desert is referred to as new lands to differentiate it from the old farming land. The total cultivated area in the newly reclaimed land was about 3.1 million feddans as an annual average for the period 2017-2021. The largest effort of land reclamation took place in the Nubaria region with an estimated area of about one million feddan. The total value of farm production in year 2020 amounted to EGP 595.7 billion where the contribution of old lands was about 77.6 percent and the contribution of new lands was about 22.4 percent. Egypt is keen to increase its production of the wheat crop through the expansion of wheat acreage in the newly reclaimed lands. The contribution of the new lands to the national wheat acreage increased from about 11.3 percent in 1990-1999 to about 22.43 in 2010-2021. The average crop yield of the wheat crop per feddan was about 16 ardab for the old lands and 10 ardab for the new lands during the period 1990-1999. This average increased to 19 ardab for the old lands and 16 ardab for the new lands during the recent period of 2010-2021.The wheat yield gap between the old land and the new lands has been narrowing over the time period of 1990-2021. Furthermore, the incremental yield improvement for the white maize crop is higher for the new lands than its counterpart for the old lands. Another important export crop is potatoes. The acreage of potatoes has increased between the periods of 1990-1999 and 2000-2009 by 14 percent in the old lands and by 41 percent in the new lands. . Finally, the potato crop yield has increased annually during the study period by statistically significant rates of about 0.11 tons in the old lands and 0.21 tons in the new lands. That is the incremental yield improvement for the potato crop in the new lands is almost twice its counterpart for the old lands. [Howayda Y. Botros and Maha M. Bastawy. A Comparative Study of Egypt Crop Yields in New Lands and Old Lands. J Am Sci 2023;19(12):87-98]. ISSN 1545-1003 (print); ISSN 2375-7264 (online). http://www.jofamericansci ence.org_04.doi:10.7537/marsjas 191223.04.
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## Introduction:

In its pursuit for achieving food security Egypt attempts to enhance its food production through two main dimensions. The first one is known as horizontal expansion which means expanding the arable area in the Egyptian desert. The resultant reclaimed land is referred to as new lands to differentiate it from the old farming land. The second dimension to enhance food security is known as vertical expansion which means the increase of crop productivity per unit of land through the applications of modern farming practices and adoption of modern technologies. The total value of farm production in year 2020 amounted to EGP 595.7 billion where the contribution of old lands was estimated at 77.6 percent and the contribution of new lands was about 22.4 percent.

The total value of field crops production reached EGP 159.1 billion in 2020 with a small contribution of new lands amounting to 18.4 percent. However, the contribution of new lands to the total value of vegetable production was as high as 44.1
percent in year 2020. In fact the horticultural crops assume higher relative importance in the new lands compared to traditional field crops.

## Research Problem:

It is always assumed that new lands are less productive than the fertile old lands in Egypt. This claim might be true at the early stages of development of the reclaimed lands. But it is not known how the productivity gap between new lands and old lands is evolving over time. Previous studies tend to overlook the potential for improvements in crop productivity in the new lands. This study is an attempt to provide information on the development of yields of the main crops in both types of lands and how the yield gap is closing with the passage of time.

## Research Objectives:

The main objective of this research is to shed light on the evolution of crop yields in new lands and old lands over a long time period. The focus of the study is on five crops mainly; wheat, white maize, yellow maize, tomatoes and potatoes. The study
attempts to explain how the crop gap is widening or closing for different crops. Then the study concludes with a set of recommendations in order to enhance the land productivity in the new lands and hence to improve the food security potentialities in Egypt.

## Research Methodology:

The study relied heavily on secondary data from the Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation for the period 1990-2021. Descriptive statistics and time trend equations are utilized to explore the evolution of different crop yields. The similarities and disparities for different crops are highlighted in order to draw conclusions and policy recommendations for future development efforts.

## Results and Discussion:

## New Agricultural Lands:

Table 1 indicates the evolution of the national agricultural production in Egypt during the study period of 1990-2020. The annual average of the value of agricultural production during this period was EGP 203billion. The average contribution of the new lands to national agricultural production is estimated at 15 percent. However, this contribution has increased from about 5.5 percent in 1992 to about 22.4 percent in year 2020. According to the time trend equations in table 2 , the value of agricultural production in the new lands has increased annually by about 0.435 percent during the study period. This average annual rate of increase is highly significant from the statistical view point. However, the contribution of old lands has shown declining trend during the same period.

Table (1): The Total value of Farm production in New and Old Lands.

| Year | The Total value of Farm production (EGP billion) | The value of Farm production in Old Land (EGP billion) | The value of Farm production in New Land (EGP billion) | \%Old <br> Lands | \% New Lands |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1990 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1991 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1992 | 30.96 | 29.27 | 1.70 | 94.52 | 5.48 |
| 1993 | 36.51 | 33.53 | 2.98 | 91.85 | 8.15 |
| 1994 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 49.99 | 44.00 | 5.98 | 88.03 | 11.97 |
| 1996 | 56.08 | 48.76 | 7.32 | 86.94 | 13.06 |
| 1997 | 61.27 | 52.96 | 8.31 | 86.44 | 13.56 |
| 1998 | 63.64 | 54.21 | 9.43 | 85.19 | 14.81 |
| 1999 | 68.89 | 58.76 | 10.12 | 85.30 | 14.70 |
| 2000 | 71.66 | 61.40 | 10.27 | 85.68 | 14.32 |
| 2001 | 74.74 | 64.52 | 10.22 | 86.32 | 13.68 |
| 2002 | 84.26 | 72.90 | 11.36 | 86.52 | 13.48 |
| 2003 | 96.85 | 84.03 | 12.82 | 86.76 | 13.24 |
| 2004 | 111.84 | 96.87 | 14.96 | 86.62 | 13.38 |
| 2005 | 126.97 | 110.86 | 16.11 | 87.31 | 12.69 |
| 2006 | 137.40 | 119.00 | 18.40 | 86.61 | 13.39 |
| 2007 | 156.00 | 134.00 | 22.00 | 85.90 | 14.10 |
| 2008 | 186.00 | 159.00 | 27.00 | 85.48 | 14.52 |
| 2009 | 189.44 | 154.87 | 34.57 | 81.75 | 18.25 |
| 2010 | 209.30 | 172.10 | 37.20 | 82.23 | 17.77 |
| 2011 | 250.00 | 202.10 | 47.90 | 80.84 | 19.16 |
| 2012 | 267.40 | 215.30 | 52.10 | 80.52 | 19.48 |
| 2013 | 282.40 | 230.50 | 51.90 | 81.62 | 18.38 |
| 2014 | 305.40 | 247.50 | 57.90 | 81.04 | 18.96 |
| 2015 | 318.30 | 256.00 | 62.30 | 80.43 | 19.57 |
| 2016 | 356.90 | 287.80 | 69.10 | 80.64 | 19.36 |
| 2017 | 469.20 | 375.40 | 93.80 | 80.01 | 19.99 |
| 2018 | 500.40 | 403.90 | 96.50 | 80.72 | 19.28 |
| 2019 | 534.20 | 419.20 | 115.00 | 78.47 | 21.53 |
| 2020 | 595.70 | 462.30 | 133.40 | 77.61 | 22.39 |
| Average | 203.28 | 166.11 | 37.17 | 84.33 | 15.67 |

---- Not Available
Source: Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation, Agricultural Economics Bulletins, The Economic Affairs Sector, Different Issues.

Table (2): The Time Trend Equations for The contribution of New and Old Lands and The Cropped and Cultivated Areas of Old and New Lands.

|  | The contribution to total <br> Value of Agricultural <br> Production (1990-2020) |  | Cropped <br> Area <br> (1990-2021) |  | Cultivated <br> Area <br> $(\mathbf{1 9 9 0 - 2 0 2 1 )}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Y | Old Lands | New <br> Lands | Old Lands | New Lands | Old <br> Lands | New Lands |
| Intercept | 90.6423 | 9.3577 | $12,208,378$ | 376,929 | $6,686,407$ | 198,085 |
|  | $(135.85)$ | $(14.025)$ | $(117.61)$ | $(3.42)$ | $(99.44)$ | $(2.28)$ |
| Time | -0.4351 | 0.4351 | $(22,680)$ | 153,125 | $(21,026)$ | 107,986 |
|  | $((10.82))$ | $(10.82)$ | $((4.01))$ | $(25.50)$ | $((5.73))$ | $(22.79)$ |
| $\mathbf{R}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | 0.82 | 0.82 | 0.36 | 0.96 | 0.53 | 0.95 |
| F | 117.14 | 117.14 | $(0.00) 16.04$ | $(0.00) 650.04$ | 32.85 | 519.59 |
| statistic | $(0.000)$ | $(0.000)$ |  |  | $(0.00)$ | $(0.00)$ |

Numbers in parentheses are ( t ) values . $\quad \mathrm{Y}=$ The dependent variable $\quad \mathrm{X}=$ Time Variable

Table 3 shows that the total cultivated area in the newly reclaimed land was about 3.1 million feddans as an annual average for the period 20172021. The largest effort of land reclamation took place in the Nubaria region with an estimated area of about one million feddans. The Nubaria region is located in the middle between Cairo Governorate and Alexandria Governorate. It is also affiliated with Beheira

Governorate at the administrative level. About 823 thousand feddans were reclaimed in the governorates of Lower Egypt. The third largest region that witnessed land reclamation efforts was the New Valley governorate with a total area of about 424 thousand feddans. Matruh came in the fourth place with an average of about 416 thousand feddans.

Table (3): Total Cultivated Area of New Lands in Egypt (Feddans), ( 2017-2021).

| Governorates | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | Average |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Alexandria | 103,837 | 96,319 | 79,734 | 67,450 | 73,579 | 84,184 |
| Behairah | 139,304 | 123,549 | 125,777 | 117,545 | 140,908 | 129,417 |
| Gharbia | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Kafr_El Sheikh | 12,483 | 11,277 | 13,237 | 36,754 | 9,263 | 16,603 |
| Dakahlia | 63,698 | 60,498 | 60,166 | 61,420 | 59,713 | 61,099 |
| Damietta | 9,764 | 12,998 | 13,527 | 8,821 | 3,654 | 9,753 |
| Sharkia | 189,642 | 201,315 | 230,140 | 156,752 | 151,895 | 185,949 |
| Ismailia | 177,754 | 186,129 | 226,819 | 222,927 | 238,185 | 210,363 |
| Port Said | 83,564 | 84,266 | 88,103 | 49,188 | 60,102 | 73,045 |
| Suez | 26,304 | 26,594 | 25,545 | 26,969 | 26,612 | 26,405 |
| Menoufia | 33,268 | 1 | - | - | - | 16,635 |
| Kalyoubia | 195 | 198 | - | - | - | 197 |
| Cairo | 19,327 | 19,395 | 19,553 | 19,582 | 19,662 | 19,504 |
| Lower Egypt | 859,140 | 822,539 | 882,601 | 767,408 | 783,573 | 823,052 |
| Giza | 38,996 | 37,976 | 36,100 | 45,852 | 52,110 | 42,207 |
| Beni Suef | 45,751 | 45,566 | 44,528 | 42,862 | 41,678 | 44,077 |
| Fayoum | 19,061 | 17,798 | 22,976 | 26,175 | 21,201 | 21,442 |
| Menia | 55,095 | 72,204 | 69,754 | 75,465 | 71,103 | 68,724 |
| Middle Egypt | 158,903 | 173,544 | 173,358 | 190,354 | 186,092 | 176,450 |
| Asyut | 46,349 | 49,045 | 51,059 | 45,579 | 44,409 | 47,288 |
| Suhag | 45,551 | 39,478 | 40,058 | 40,361 | 45,094 | 42,108 |
| Qena | 44,404 | 58,793 | 60,042 | 54,492 | 57,964 | 55,139 |
| Luxor | 40,353 | 46,744 | 50,951 | 48,312 | 48,883 | 47,049 |
| Aswan | 127,140 | 109,885 | 118,048 | 158,808 | 214,304 | 145,637 |
| Upper Egypt | 303,797 | 303,945 | 320,158 | 347,552 | 410,654 | 337,221 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Total | $1,321,840$ | $1,300,028$ | $1,376,117$ | $1,305,314$ | $1,380,319$ | $1,336,724$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| New Valley | 361,451 | 402,396 | 437,510 | 408,705 | 512,304 | 424,473 |
| Matruh | 344,374 | 408,735 | 480,683 | 354,760 | 489,525 | 415,615 |
| Red Sea | 1,169 | 689 | 693 | 694 | 560 | 761 |
| North Sinai | 97,378 | 40,506 | 29,369 | 37,201 | 24,567 | 45,804 |
| South Sinai | 27,226 | 27,349 | 26,654 | 27,399 | 31,134 | 27,952 |
| NoubArea | 994,765 | $1,023,857$ | $1,065,524$ | 972,822 | 998,526 | $1,011,099$ |
| Out of Valley | $1,826,363$ | $1,903,532$ | $2,040,433$ | $1,801,581$ | $2,056,616$ | $1,925,705$ |
| G. Average | $3,148,203$ | $3,203,560$ | $3,416,550$ | $3,106,895$ | $3,436,935$ | $3,262,429$ |

---- Not Available
Source: Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation, Agricultural Economics Bulletins, The Economic Affairs Sector, Different Issues.

Table 4 shows the cropping intensity in old lands as well as in the new lands. The cropping intensity is calculated as the total cropped land divided by the total arable land. In other words it indicates the number of times each feddan is cultivated in a given year. For example if the cropping intensity is 2 that
mean that each feddan is cropped twice in a given year. As an average for the study period of 1990-2021 the cropping intensity was about 1.87 for the old land and about 1.47 for the new lands. That means that the old lands are used more intensively than new lands.

Table (4): Arable and Cropped Areas in New and Old Lands (1990-2021)

| Year | Arable Area |  |  | Cropped Area |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Old Lands | New Lands | Old Lands | NewLands |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | $6,596,500$ | 321,383 | $11,859,731$ | 321,383 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 1}$ | $6,626,845$ | 396,356 | $12,009,594$ | 396,356 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 2}$ | - | - | - | - |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 3}$ | $6,531,782$ | 646,906 | $11,835,168$ | 944,800 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 4}$ | $6,399,921$ | 772,884 | $11,897,302$ | $1,105,294$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 5}$ | $6,973,564$ | 839,179 | $12,601,502$ | $1,212,959$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 6}$ | $6,603,462$ | 960,032 | $12,271,490$ | $1,438,194$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 7}$ | $6,713,788$ | $1,012,139$ | $12,322,166$ | $1,506,864$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 8}$ | $6,295,202$ | 335,760 | $11,712,092$ | 567,813 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 9}$ | $6,279,864$ | 557,852 | $11,707,486$ | $2,231,049$ |
| Average | $5,902,093$ | 649,166 | $10,821,653$ | $1,080,524$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $6,237,956$ | $1,594,754$ | $11,698,459$ | $2,223,407$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | $6,405,334$ | $1,540,240$ | $11,823,148$ | $2,204,428$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | $6,486,922$ | $1,661,118$ | $11,953,962$ | $2,396,312$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | $6,457,817$ | $1,655,402$ | $12,018,202$ | $2,455,414$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | $6,623,286$ | $1,655,368$ | $12,145,099$ | $2,406,131$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $6,648,330$ | $1,736,438$ | $12,288,919$ | $2,616,060$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $6,656,160$ | $1,754,826$ | $12,280,391$ | $2,640,070$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $6,536,055$ | $1,887,024$ | $12,349,877$ | $2,826,048$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | $6,454,076$ | $1,978,110$ | $12,229,128$ | $3,007,849$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $6,156,531$ | $2,626,683$ | $11,634,760$ | $3,859,804$ |
| Average | $6,466,247$ | $1,808,996$ | $12,042,195$ | $2,663,552$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $6,117,723$ | $2,623,399$ | $11,629,804$ | $3,704,676$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | $6,071,219$ | $2,548,208$ | $11,648,550$ | $3,704,958$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | $6,019,395$ | $2,780,044$ | $11,638,827$ | $3,926,526$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | $6,182,507$ | $2,771,816$ | $11,661,557$ | $3,828,566$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | $6,082,176$ | $2,834,289$ | $11,657,917$ | $4,031,716$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $6,155,756$ | $2,939,949$ | $11,602,804$ | $4,034,289$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $6,147,646$ | $2,953,558$ | $11,685,750$ | $4,114,949$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $5,985,065$ | $3,148,203$ | $11,716,474$ | $4,321,719$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | $5,983,131$ | $3,209,337$ | $11,105,001$ | $4,956,367$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | $5,916,256$ | $3,416,550$ | $11,149,097$ | $5,066,069$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | $6,345,813$ | $3,106,895$ | $11,659,265$ | $4,626,353$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | $6,159,545$ | $3,436,935$ | $11,416,673$ | $4,958,353$ |
| Average | $6,097,186$ | $2,980,765$ | $11,547,643$ | $4,272,878$ |
| G. Average | $6,349,988$ | $1,925,859$ | $11,845,490$ | $2,826,928$ |

---- Not Available
Source: Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation, Agricultural Economics Bulletins, The Economic Affairs Sector, Different Issues.

Overall, however, cropping intensity is gaining larger momentum in the new lands compared with old land. Table 2 reveals that unlike the old lands the increase in cropping intensity in the new lands was statistically significant during the study period. The cropped area in the new lands has increased by a statistically annual average of about 153 thousand feddans during the period 1990-2021.

## The Wheat Crop:

Table 5 shows that the annual average of the cultivated area of wheat was about 1.96 million feddans in the old lands and about 0.3 million feddans
in the new lands during the period 1990-1999. These averages rose to 2.26 million feddans for the old lands and 0.46 million feddans for the new lands in the subsequent period of 2000-2009. During the recent period of 2010-2021 the averages rose to 2.61 million feddans for the old lands and 0.62 million feddans for the new lands. Overall the wheat acreage during the study period of 1990-2021 was about 2.77 million feddans on annual average basis. The contribution of the new lands to the national wheat acreage increased from about 11.3 percent in 1990-1999 to about 22.43 in 2010-2021.

Table (5): Area and Yield of Wheat Crop (1990-2021

| Year | Area (Fed) |  | Yield (Ardab/Fed) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Old Lands | New Lands | Old Lands | New Lands |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | $1,853,270$ | 101,426 | 14.95 | 7.35 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 1}$ | $2,063,753$ | 151,317 | 13.77 | 9.67 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 2}$ | $1,934,228$ | 157,425 | 15.06 | 10.57 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 3}$ | $1,829,212$ | 342,118 | 16.23 | 7.42 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 4}$ | $1,737,542$ | 373,402 | 15.6 | 6.61 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 5}$ | $2,100,057$ | 411,757 | 16.42 | 8.88 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 6}$ | $1,986,840$ | 434,078 | 17.06 | 9.98 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 7}$ | $2,084,971$ | 401,160 | 16.63 | 10.8 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 8}$ | $2,038,086$ | 383,045 | 17.77 | 11.48 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 9}$ | $1,999,571$ | 379,879 | 18.77 | 12.57 |
| Average | $1,962,753$ | 313,561 | 16 | 10 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $2,030,826$ | 432,439 | 18.64 | 13.66 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | $1,932,704$ | 409,091 | 18.71 | 13.53 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | $2,001,238$ | 449,190 | 18.82 | 14.47 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | $2,107,549$ | 398,629 | 19.02 | 13.89 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | $2,182,066$ | 423,417 | 19.16 | 14.28 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $2,471,217$ | 514,069 | 18.93 | 14.58 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $2,537,537$ | 526,164 | 18.64 | 14.94 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $2,220,710$ | 494,819 | 18.81 | 14.99 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | $2,448,393$ | 471,911 | 18.70 | 15.66 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $2,653,818$ | 493,210 | 18.52 | 15.57 |
| Average | $2,258,606$ | 461,294 | 19 | 15 |


| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $2,474,225$ | 527,156 | 16.41 | 13.62 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | $2,498,317$ | 550,284 | 18.78 | 16.26 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | $2,561,472$ | 599,188 | 19.1 | 16.22 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | $2,750,089$ | 627,787 | 19.19 | 16.39 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | $2,771,306$ | 621,694 | 18.53 | 16.92 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $2,749,915$ | 718,949 | 19.09 | 16.09 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $2,669,512$ | 683,639 | 19 | 16.92 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $2,374,705$ | 547,010 | 19.6 | 17.54 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | $2,560,530$ | 596,305 | 17.9 | 16.47 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | $2,531,769$ | 603,178 | 18.5 | 16.95 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | $2,775,321$ | 627,327 | 18.08 | 16.72 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | $2,653,683$ | 765,744 | 19.73 | 17.32 |
| Average | $2,614,237$ | 622,355 | 19 | 16 |
| G. Average | $2,299,514$ | 475,525 | 18 | 14 |

Source: Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation, Agricultural Economics Bulletins, The Economic Affairs Sector, Different Issues. Wheat ardab unit $=150 \mathrm{~kg}$.

The average crop yield of the wheat crop per feddan was about 16 ardab for the old lands and 10 ardab for the new lands during the period 1990-1999. Table 5 shows that this average increased to 19 ardab for the old lands and 16 ardab for the new lands during the recent period of 2010-2021.The yield gap between the old land and the new lands has been narrowing over the time period of 1990-2021. The time trend equations in table 6 reveal that the crop yield for wheat has been steadily growing at statistically significant rates of 0.32 ardab for the new lands and 0.11 ardab for the old lands during the study period. In other words, the incremental increase of the wheat yield was almost three times its counterpart for the old lands during the study period.
White Maize Crop:

Table 7 indicates that the average acreage per annum of the white maize crop during the study period of 1990-2021 reached 1.52 million feddans for old lands and 0.11 million feddans for the new lands. If we break down the study period to three sub-periods we would find out how the share of new lands progressed over time. The average acreage of white maize crop during the period 1990-1999 was 1.6 million feddans for the old lands and 0.06 million feddans for the new lands per annum. During the period 2000-2009 the average yearly acreage reached 1.5 million feddans for the old lands and 0.13 million feddans for the new lands. Finally, the average annual acreage reached about 1.52 million feddans for the old lands and about 0.11 million feddans for the new lands during the period 2010-2021.

Table (6): The Time Trend Equations of Crop Yields (1990-2021)

|  | Wheat |  | Maize (White) |  | Maize (Yellow) |  | Tomatoes (All Seasons) |  | Potatoes (All Seasons) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intercep t | Old Lands | New Lands | Old Lands | New Lands | Old Lands | New Lands | Old Lands | New Lands | Old Lands | New <br> Lands |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 16.047 \\ & 4 \\ & (40.87) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 8.4900 \\ & (18.14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20.909 \\ & 2 \\ & (31.91) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.3057 \\ & (15.89) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20.770 \\ & 5 \\ & (33.54) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19.503 \\ & 4 \\ & (25.60) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 12.9343 \\ & (28.98) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 9.7686 \\ & (19.98) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.6354 \\ & (44.43) \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Time | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1148 \\ & (5.527) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3156 \\ & (12.75 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.1340 \\ (3.867) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.3391 \\ (12.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.1125 \\ (3.12) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1100 \\ & (2.480) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.2076 \\ (8.796) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.2274 \\ (8.796) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1065 \\ & (9.724) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.2110 \\ (11.90 \end{gathered}$ |
| $\mathbf{R}^{2}$ | 0.50 | 0.84 | 0.33 | 0.83 | 0.27 | 0.19 | 0.72 | 0.72 | 0.77 | 0.83 |
| F | 30.55 | 162.59 | 14.95 | 150.49 | 9.74 | 6.15 | 77.36 | 77.38 | 94.56 | 141.58 |
| statistic | (0.000) | $0.000)$ | (0.000) | (0.000) | 0.0016) | $0.0197)$ | (0.000) | (0.000) | (0.000) | $0.000)$ |

Numbers in parentheses are t values

Table (7):: Area and Yield of White Maize Crop,(1990-2021)

| Year | Area (Fed) |  | Yield(Ardab/Fed) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Old Lands | New Lands | Old Lands | New Lands |
| 1990 | 1,545,556 | 1,850 | 19 | 7 |
| 1991 | 1,675,262 | 968 | 19 | 10 |
| 1992 | 1,642,111 | 6,510 | 19 | 11 |
| 1993 | 1,593,684 | 67,506 | 19 | 7 |
| 1994 | 1,669,383 | 70,230 | 20 | 7 |
| 1995 | 1,671,274 | 80,105 | 19 | 9 |
| 1996 | 1,670,025 | 98,234 | 21 | 10 |
| 1997 | 1,520,537 | 115,477 | 23 | 11 |
| 1998 | 1,608,565 | 88,964 | 23 | 11 |
| 1999 | 1,471,363 | 89,594 | 24 | 13 |
| Average | 1,606,776 | 61,944 | 20.6 | 9.6 |
| 2000 | 1,532,266 | 90,780 | 24 | 14 |
| 2001 | 1,599,525 | 110,729 | 25 | 14 |
| 2002 | 1,414,618 | 137,249 | 25 | 14 |
| 2003 | 1,457,575 | 122,236 | 25 | 14 |
| 2004 | 1,437,011 | 134,136 | 25 | 14 |
| 2005 | 1,646,700 | 143,983 | 26 | 15 |
| 2006 | 1,460,340 | 106,138 | 26 | 15 |
| 2007 | 1,483,987 | 120,671 | 25 | 15 |
| 2008 | 1,482,500 | 160,869 | 25 | 16 |
| 2009 | 1,540,530 | 174,493 | 25 | 16 |
| Average | 1,505,505 | 130,128 | 25.10 | 14.70 |
| 2010 | 1,567,327 | 123,451 | 23 | 14 |
| 2011 | 1,365,514 | 116,699 | 24 | 16 |
| 2012 | 1,673,496 | 165,710 | 24 | 16 |
| 2013 | 1,587,299 | 136,651 | 24 | 16 |
| 2014 | 1,587,957 | 130,437 | 24 | 17 |
| 2015 | 1,615,268 | 125,511 | 23 | 16 |
| 2016 | 1,428,119 | 113,195 | 23 | 17 |
| 2017 | 1,338,085 | 119,469 | 24 | 18 |
| 2018 | 1,375,013 | 113,809 | 23 | 16 |
| 2019 | 1,248,004 | 117,451 | 23 | 17 |
| 2020 | 1,293,597 | 112,762 | 24 | 17 |
| 2021 | 1,319,870 | 110,867 | 23.84 | 21.85 |
| Average | 1,449,962 | 123,834 | 24 | 17 |
| G. Average | 1,516,324 | 106,460 | 23 | 14 |

Source: Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation, Agricultural Economics Bulletins, The Economic Affairs Sector, Different Issues. $\quad$ Ardab unit of maize $=140 \mathrm{~kg}$

The average annual yield per feddan for the white maize crop in the old lands progressed from 20.6 ardab for the period 1990-1999 to 25.1 for the period 2000-2009 and then to 24 ardab for the recent period of 2010-2021. A similar pattern is found for the crop yield in the new lands. The average annual crop yield was about 9.6 ardab for the period 1990-1999 and subsequently increased to 14.7 ardab for the period 2000-2009. The crop yield has increased during the period 2010-2021 where the annual average reached 17 ardab. Overall, the white maize crop yield increased over the study period $1990-2021$ by statistically
significant annual rates of 0.13 ardab for the old lands and 0.34 ardab for the new lands. Clearly, the incremental yield improvement for the white maize crop is higher for the new lands than its counterpart for the old lands.

## The Yellow Maize Crop:

Table 8 indicates that the average acreage per annum of the yellow maize crop during the study period of 1990-2021 reached about 245 thousand feddans for old lands and about 59 thousand feddans for the new lands. The average acreage of yellow
maize crop during the period 1990-1999 was 35.6 thousand feddans for the old lands and 26.5 thousand feddans for the new lands per annum. During the period 2000-2009 the average yearly acreage reached 113 thousand feddans for the old lands and 24
thousand feddans for the new lands. Finally, the average annual acreage reached about 478 thousand feddans for the old lands and about 106 thousand feddans for the new lands during the period 20102021.

Table(8): Area and Yield of Yellow Maize Crop,(1990-2021)

| Year | Area (Fed) |  | Yield(Ardab/Fed) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Old Lands | New Lands | Old Lands | New Lands |
| 1990 | - | - | - | - |
| 1991 | - | - | - | - |
| 1992 | - | - | - | - |
| 1993 | 711 | 16,150 | 18 | 15 |
| 1994 | 11,317 | 34,658 | 19 | 22 |
| 1995 | 33,858 | 24,614 | 19 | 20 |
| 1996 | 59,515 | 33,641 | 20 | 19 |
| 1997 | 42,766 | 33,583 | 25 | 20 |
| 1998 | 33,813 | 23,859 | 23 | 20 |
| 1999 | 67,435 | 19,478 | 20 | 18 |
| Average | 35,631 | 26,569 | 20 | 19 |
| 2000 | 43,030 | 13,376 | 22 | 17 |
| 2001 | 56,386 | 6,812 | 25 | 23 |
| 2002 | 99,029 | 17,596 | 24 | 26 |
| 2003 | 71,230 | 6,719 | 22 | 23 |
| 2004 | 97,934 | 15,836 | 24 | 24 |
| 2005 | 127,479 | 22,099 | 24 | 21 |
| 2006 | 121,204 | 20,318 | 23 | 20 |
| 2007 | 143,731 | 33,455 | 23 | 21 |
| 2008 | 179,475 | 37,519 | 23 | 21 |
| 2009 | 195,507 | 67,041 | 24 | 21 |
| Average | 113,501 | 24,077 | 23 | 22 |
| 2010 | 246,364 | 61,106 | 21 | 22 |
| 2011 | 213,455 | 62,894 | 22 | 22 |
| 2012 | 260,149 | 57,721 | 23 | 20 |
| 2013 | 351,058 | 64,188 | 23 | 22 |
| 2014 | 392,466 | 74,672 | 24 | 23 |
| 2015 | 434,240 | 84,711 | 22 | 20 |
| 2016 | 531,235 | 142,107 | 23 | 22 |
| 2017 | 666,752 | 175,412 | 24 | 23 |
| 2018 | 732,287 | 114,516 | 23 | 21 |
| 2019 | 646,360 | 136,341 | 23 | 23 |
| 2020 | 594,237 | 151,881 | 24 | 22 |
| 2021 | 666,036 | 150,130 | 23.93 | 22.45 |
| Average | 477,887 | 106,307 | 23 | 22 |
| G. Average | 245,485 | 58,705 | 22 | 21 |

---- Not Available
Source: Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation, Agricultural Economics Bulletins, The Economic Affairs Sector, Different Issues. Ardab unit of maize $=140 \mathrm{~kg}$

The average annual yield per feddan for the yellow maize crop in the old lands progressed from 20 ardab for the period 1990-1999 to 23 for the period 2000-2009 and then has been fixed at 23 ardab for the recent period of 2010-2021. Similarly, the yellow maize crop yield in the new lands has increased over time. The average annual crop yield was about 19 ardab for the period 1990-1999 and subsequently increased to 22 ardab for the period 2000-2009. The crop yield in the new lands has been stable at an annual average of 22 ardab during the period 2010-2021. In general, the yellow maize crop yield increased over the study period 1990-2021 by statistically significant annual rates of 0.112 ardab for the old lands and 0.11 ardab for the new lands. The incremental yield improvement for the yellow maize crop in the old lands is almost equal to its counterpart for the new lands.

## The Tomatoes Crop:

Table 9 outlines the evolution of the tomatoes crop in old lands and new lands. The average annual acreage of tomatoes during the period was about 264 thousand feddans in the old lands and about 168 thousand feddans in the new lands. For the period 1990-1999, the average acreage was about 298 thousand feddans in the old lands and about 53 thousand feddans in the new lands. Afterwards, the average acreage of the tomato crop during the period 2000-2009 jumped to about 333 thousand feddans in the old lands and 168 thousand feddans in the new lands. In other words, the acreage of tomatoes has increased between the periods of 1990-1999 and 20002009 by 11.8 percent in the old lands and 219 percent in the new lands. That is the tomatoes acreage has more than doubled in a time span of ten years.

The tomato crop yield as an average for the study period 1990-2021 was about 16 tons per feddan for the old lands and 14 tons per feddan for the new lands. With regards to the first period of 1990-1999 the average tomato yield was about 14 tons for the old lands and 11 tons for the new lands. The crop yield of tomatoes showed some improvement in the second period of 2000-2009. As the table reveals the average yield increased to 17 tons for the old lands and 13 tons for the new lands. Finally, table 6 makes clear that the tomato crop yield has increased annually during the study period by statistically significant rates of 0.21 tons in the old lands and 0.23 tons in the new lands.

## The Potatoes Crop:

Table 10 shows the evolution of the potatoes crop in old lands and new lands. The average annual
acreage of potatoes during the period was about 249 thousand feddans in the old lands and about 57 thousand feddans in the new lands. For the period 1990-1999, the average potato acreage was about 187 thousand feddans in the old lands and about 22 thousand feddans in the new lands. Subsequently, the average acreage of the potato crop during the period 2000-2009 jumped to about 214 thousand feddans in the old lands and 31 thousand feddans in the new lands. In other words, the acreage of potatoes has increased between the periods of 1990-1999 and 20002009 by 14 percent in the old lands and by 41 percent in the new lands.

The potato crop yield as an average for the study period 1990-2021 was about 10 tons per feddan for the old lands and 11 tons per feddan for the new lands. With regards to the first period of 1990-1999 the average potato yield was about 9 tons for the old lands and 8 tons for the new lands. The crop yield of potatoes showed slight improvement in the second period of 2000-2009. As the table reveals the average yield stayed at 11 tons for the old lands and increased to 12 tons for the new lands. Finally, table 6 reveals that the potato crop yield has increased annually during the study period by statistically significant rates of about 0.11 tons in the old lands and 0.21 tons in the new lands.

## Recommendations:

The study reveals that agricultural production in the new lands is becoming important as its contribution is steadily increasing over time. The contribution of the new lands to the production of main crops like wheat and maize to the production of cereal crops is improving over time. And the production of vegetables like potatoes and tomatoes in the new lands is vastly improving. The study reveals that the potato crop yield has increased annually during the study period by statistically significant rates of about 0.11 tons in the old lands and 0.21 tons in the new lands.

To further enhance crop production in the new lands the research and development institutions that serve desert farming should be strengthened. In addition modern inputs like seeds, chemical fertilizers, machinery, and modern irrigation technologies should become more readily available to farmers in the new lands. Of special importance is the need to develop the solar energy systems for farming operations in the new lands. Finally, additional attention should be devoted to the improvement of marketing and postharvest technology in the new lands.

Table (9): Area and Yield of Tomato Crop (1990-2021)

| Year | Area (Fed) |  | Yield(Ton/Fed) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Old Lands | New <br> Lands | Old Lands | New Lands |
| 1990 | 370,525 | 452 | 11 | 10 |
| 1991 | 327, 420 | 566 | 12 | 10 |
| 1992 | 341,698 | 20,177 | 13 | 8 |
| 1993 | 289,341 | 61,582 | 13 | 15 |
| 1994 | 119,055 | 27,428 | 12 | 10 |
| 1995 | 300,329 | 55,105 | 17 | 12 |
| 1996 | 324,485 | 77,691 | 15 | 12 |
| 1997 | 309,154 | 92,175 | 15 | 13 |
| 1998 | 316,917 | 45,572 | 15 | 10 |
| 1999 | 306,298 | 144,501 | 14 | 11 |
| Average | 297,534 | 52,525 | 14 | 11 |
| 2000 | 307,892 | 157,265 | 16 | 12 |
| 2001 | 281,783 | 148,424 | 16 | 12 |
| 2002 | 322,651 | 132,337 | 16 | 12 |
| 2003 | 324,645 | 134,638 | 17 | 12 |
| 2004 | 341,251 | 123,240 | 18 | 13 |
| 2005 | 361,020 | 134,361 | 18 | 13 |
| 2006 | 359,370 | 164,695 | 18 | 13 |
| 2007 | 378,347 | 158,861 | 17 | 13 |
| 2008 | 387,793 | 184,051 | 18 | 12 |
| 2009 | 262,041 | 337,574 | 18 | 17 |
| Average | 332,679 | 167,545 | 17 | 13 |
| 2010 | 231,470 | 283,732 | 17 | 16 |
| 2011 | 222,600 | 283,223 | 16 | 16 |
| 2012 | 242,851 | 272,374 | 17 | 16 |
| 2013 | 223,855 | 264,898 | 17 | 16 |
| 2014 | 197,425 | 312,137 | 17 | 16 |
| 2015 | 184,550 | 283,960 | 17 | 16 |
| 2016 | 176,143 | 264,090 | 18 | 16 |
| 2017 | 157,411 | 238,160 | 18 | 16 |
| 2018 | 148,817 | 240,212 | 20 | 16 |
| 2019 | 153,971 | 254,732 | 18 | 16 |
| 2020 | 139,411 | 240,600 | 19 | 16 |
| 2021 | 114,772 | 242,124 | 21 | 17 |
| Average | 182,773 | 265,020 | 18 | 16 |
| G. Average | 264,447 | 168,154 | 16 | 14 |

Source: Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation, Agricultural Economics Bulletins, The Economic Affairs Sector, Different Issues.

Table (10): Area and Yield of Potatoes Crop (1990-2021)

| Year | Area (Fed) |  | Yield(Ton/Fed) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Old Lands | New Lands | Old Lands | New Lands |
| 1990 | - | - | - | - |
| 1991 | - | - | - | - |
| 1992 | 184,626 | 7 | 9 | 5 |
| 1993 | 126,568 | 5,549 | 8 | 7 |
| 1994 | 147,376 | 6,797 | 9 | 8 |
| 1995 | 261,635 | 31,196 | 9 | 8 |
| 1996 | 266,654 | 42,674 | 8 | 9 |
| 1997 | 165,610 | 30,886 | 9 | 9 |
| 1998 | 179,715 | 31,746 | 9 | 9 |
| 1999 | 160,386 | 24,453 | 10 | 11 |
| Average | 186,571 | 21,664 | 9 | 8 |
| 2000 | 154,434 | 24,251 | 10 | 10 |
| 2001 | 169,264 | 20,500 | 10 | 10 |
| 2002 | 175,297 | 21,343 | 10 | 10 |
| 2003 | 170,621 | 26,630 | 10 | 10 |
| 2004 | 217,126 | 30,911 | 10 | 10 |
| 2005 | 270,556 | 30,106 | 10 | 11 |
| 2006 | 193,841 | 26,357 | 11 | 10 |
| 2007 | 226,569 | 30,464 | 11 | 10 |
| 2008 | 294,289 | 33,133 | 11 | 10 |
| 2009 | 267,100 | 62,621 | 11 | 11 |
| Average | 213,910 | 30,632 | 10 | 10 |
| 2010 | 278,656 | 55,987 | 11 | 11 |
| 2011 | 325,165 | 65,646 | 11 | 10 |
| 2012 | 349,718 | 72,158 | 11 | 11 |
| 2013 | 300,661 | 80,718 | 11 | 11 |
| 2014 | 328,564 | 80,971 | 11 | 12 |
| 2015 | 342,357 | 95,029 | 11 | 13 |
| 2016 | 287,611 | 89,020 | 10 | 12 |
| 2017 | 318,870 | 95,990 | 11 | 13 |
| 2018 | 308,264 | 99,812 | 12 | 13 |
| 2019 | 293,750 | 128,865 | 12 | 13 |
| 2020 | 392,960 | 167,858 | 11 | 14 |
| 2021 | 317,941 | 184,611 | 12 | 14 |
| Average | 320,376 | 101,389 | 11 | 12 |
| G. Average | 249,206 | 56,543 | 10 | 11 |

---- Not Available
Source: Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation, Agricultural Economics Bulletins, the Economic Affairs Sector, Different Issues.
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