



DIALOGUE REPORT ON THE NAADS THAT FARMERS WANT

FAIRWAY HOTEL, KAMPALA, FRIDAY 11TH FEBRUARY 2011

Editor: Morrison Rwakakamba

1. Background to NAADS programme

In 2001, the National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS) Bill was passed by parliament and the NAADS secretariat established as a corporate body. This was followed by phased introduction of the programme linked to broader decentralization of capacity-building initiatives, initially in six trailblazing districts (beginning with a couple of sub counties in each district).

NAADS was aimed at overcoming institutional constraints that were perceived to be undermining farmers' access to quality knowledge and productivity enhancing technologies. The main aim was transformation of public delivery of agricultural extension services into a largely private sector-led delivery system under a client or farmer controlled arrangement. It was expected that the farmers would be empowered to demand and control the delivery of agricultural advisory services through guided enterprise selection, technology promotion, and contracting private service providers.

The 1st phase of NAADS (2001/2-2007/8) cost US \$108million, with 80% of this from donors and the 20% from government and farmers. The 2nd phase (2010/11-) is estimated to cost 120 billion Uganda shillings, with 77% of this figure from the government and 23% from donors.

1.1 Background to UNFFE action research to audit effectiveness of NAADS

In Uganda, the agriculture sector employs over 77% of the population, with 75% of Uganda's 4-5 million households engaged in agriculture, while 68% derive their livelihoods directly from the agriculture sector (UBOS, 2005; UNHS, 2005/6). In spite of heavily capitalized programs like NAADS, for the past 10 years the agriculture sector has lagged behind other sectors, registering a growth of just around 1.3%. The paradox of this trajectory is that Uganda is witnessing a most dramatic shift in the transfer of wealth from majority of Ugandans who are mainly engaged in agriculture, to a minority portion of those engaged in services and industry sectors.

However with the huge sums of money pumped into this programme, its impact on fortunes of farmers is still wanting! Therefore, it is on this poignant call that Uganda National Farmers Federation (UNFFE), a body of farmers in alliance with both horizontal and vertical partners and with support from ESFIM decided to conduct this action research to audit the performance of NAADS programme in order to investigate its effectiveness in relation to farmers in Uganda.

This research is aimed at buttressing the following objectives:

- To deliver a farmers' NAADS blueprint detailing a road map for reform;
- To benchmark and analyse different extension model scenarios with a view of recommending progressive models that deliver what farmers want;
- Map the power/influence matrix to underpin reforms in NAADS;
- To provide evidence so that UNFFE can conduct informed and effective advocacy;
- To facilitate a data driven consensus on the effectiveness/ineffectiveness of NAADS from the farmers' view point.

The methodology of this study is keen on meaningful involvement of farmers, farmer organizations, Agri-proFocus policy working group, NAADS secretariat officials, relevant ministries, development partners and the media. Field fireplace conversations with farmer groups and individual farmer households will be conducted. The research will also focus on the institutional and legal set up as key foundations of NAADS delivery.

As a kick off to this study, UNFFE and task conducted a dialogue with horizontal stakeholders at the national level to seek their views ,opinions and inputs of what they think NAADS programme should focus on, what the action research should look out for, and what can be done to make NAADS a better program for farmers in Uganda. The

other idea behind this dialogue was to achieve a multistakeholder consensus on the objectives of the study and align the UNFFE advocacy agenda.

2. Dialogue proceedings

2.1 Attendance

98% of the invited participants attended.

2.2 Official opening

As means of setting the scene, the consultant / dialogue moderator asked participants to introduce themselves, after which he called upon the Vice president of Uganda National Farmers Federation, Captain Kisaasira Esau Ssalongo to welcome the participants and officially open the dialogue.

The Vice President's remarks touched the following issues;

- In a special way he applauded ESFIM for funding the research
- That years back, government didn't take farming seriously because it knew farmers will always be there to feed themselves and are involved in this activity all year round.
- That in 1992 a forum (now UNFFE, then UNFA) was formed to tirelessly advocate and lobby for a farmer's cause. Till this day UNFFE (with branches country wide) continues to craft ways to work with the government in finding a smooth path for farmers.
- Mr Esau Tisasira asked questions; Government has put in staff and a lot of money in NAADS, so what has UNFFE and other partners done to ensure effective service delivery of NAADS programme? How can we help the government? Are

enough stakeholders brought on board in the planning and implementation of NAADS? He then explained that this is why UNFFE has found it necessary to conduct this audit to generate answers for the so many begging questions.

- Captain Tisasira concluded by stating that NAADS is a good programme with good intentions thus the undeniable necessity for this dialogue to play a critical role in getting the audit on a straight forward match, with a view of straightening up NAADS.
- He officially opened the dialogue

2.3 Communication from a representative from NAADS secretariat

Dr Francis Byekwaso (NAADS Secretariat) started by welcoming this audit from UNFFE and stated that it is the 1st (local) of its kind, thus a great initiative.

He informed participants that: NAADS phase 1 covered an estimated 25% of the farming households, but phase 2 aims at covering all the farming households (4-5 million) and cover the gaps left by phase 1. He stressed that phase 2 was supposed to kick off in July 2010 but was temporarily suspended by the president to straighten up some misdeeds, he also stated that last month (January 2011), the new guidelines were sent to districts countrywide; although the donors have not yet signed the documents and other legalities. Donors are concerned that there might be some hidden agendas behind the Village Farmers Fora (VFF) being formed, given the electioneering period the country is going through. Donors feel NAADS major focus should be universal poverty eradication or universal wealth creation. The current NAADS design strongly focuses on food security for all; all households will be supported with planting materials, livestock, and some other agricultural supplies. Farmers must register through VFF/ **'mayumba kumi'** as well as LCI level.

He underpinned some of the following challenges that the programme encounters:

- Each village will be getting 2 million Uganda shillings, and 100,000 shillings worth of technologies. This is absolutely small money to cause an impact.

- Access to quality seeds is still a dilemma
- Inadequate agricultural extension service providers. In his view there are no quality agricultural advisors in the entire country; with graduates roaming on streets looking for office jobs.
- Ugandans don't produce for markets. 80% of vegetables in Ugandan supermarkets come from Kenya
- Corruption which is at large in local governments.

Participants requested Dr Byekwaso to clarify on some issues amongst which were:

- Government versus donor portion on the NAADS budget;
- NAADS take on PPPs;
- Why the programme is spreading widely yet with a malnourished budget.

Here under were his responses to queries and clarifications from participants:

- For NAADS phase 1, 20% of the budget was government contribution and 80% from donors. For phase 2, the government is contributing 77% and donors 23%.
- MAAIF has researched and come up with a report that pins the corrupt culprits of phase 1. They range from suppliers, coordinators, government officials, to farmers. The whistle blowers policy as well will help to curb the prevalent corruption.
- On the issue of food security and safety, he stated that NAADS has not been addressing these directly. It has been the work of other agencies, although it will take them seriously.
- UBOS statistics indicate that 4-5 million households engage in agriculture. NAADS phase 2 is targeting this entire figure, though mainly through farmer groups and adults (18 years of age).

- NAADS in discussions with NGOs such as world vision and other agencies to reach out to farmers in areas such as Kalangala, Bundibugyo, and northern Uganda. NAADS still needs more stakeholders to come on board and help in effective service delivery. However most NGOs have big names and structures but no feasible impact and work in the communities where they operate which makes it difficult for NAADS to trust such organizations.
- NAADS has over 50 PPPs e.g. with Mukwano, Sendegeya etc However in the agriculture sector, there is lack of a clear framework policy on PPPs.
- By constitution, extension service is a citizen right to be provided by the local government. That's why NAADS struggles to spread widely in an effort to avail the services to all. Although this requires more funding sources and partnerships.
- Phase 2 has a research and extension component; and it will be implemented as Agriculture Technology and Agribusiness Advisory Services (ATAAS) project.

2.4 Presentations by consultants

2.4.1 Gerdien Meijerink (ESFIM international consultant)

She took the participants through Empowering Small scale Farmers In Markets (ESFIM) background and the road to this audit.

Who is ESFIM?

It is made up of AGRINATURA and IFAP. AGRINATURA is a European Consortium for Agricultural Research in the Tropics:

- Wageningen University and Research Centre (**Wageningen UR**)
- Natural Resources Institute (**NRI**)
- Centre de Coopération Internationale en Recherche Agronomique pour le Développement (**CIRAD**)

While IFAP is an International Federation of Agricultural Producers. However, IFP was dissolved in 2010.

What is ESFIM ?

- Supports national farmers' organisations (NFO) in lobby strategies to improve farmers' access to markets.
- Research support to 11 national farmers' organisations:
 - **Africa:** Benin, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, South Africa, Uganda,
 - **Asia:** India, Philippines,
 - **Latin America:** Peru, Uruguay, Costa Rica

Who funds ESFIM?

ESFIM funders include ;

- **IFAD** – International Fund for Agricultural Development
- **AGRICORD** – Alliance of Agri-agencies
- **CTA** – Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation ACP-EU
- Dutch Ministry of Economy, Agriculture and Innovation (**EL&I**) with funds of the Dutch Ministry of Development Cooperation (**DGIS**)

Who are ESFIM's partners ?

- Uganda: Uganda National Farmers Federation (UNFFE)
- **AgriProFocus** - partnership of Dutch donor agencies, credit institutions, companies, training and knowledge institutions, with the goal to promote farmer entrepreneurship in developing countries

What are ESFIM's activities ?

- In 11 countries research partnerships using
 - research support of European and local researchers
 - discussions on smallholder market access
 - farmer driven platforms
 - participatory workshops
- Research on overarching issues

Its activities in Uganda:

- December 2008: workshop in Kampala to identify priorities for UNFFE lobby strategies
- 2009-2010: funding problems, organisational problems (IFAP)
- February 2011: start of research process:
 - Workshop/dialogue (11th Feb 2011)
 - Farmers' conversations (March-April)
- Mid-2011: Lobby activities

2.4.2 Morrison Rwakakamba (ESFIM local consultant)

Mr Morrison took the participants through a roller coaster of events concerning the background, current and future of NAADS:

Tracing the NAADS soul;

- NAADS act and launch in 2001
- Tasked to move farmers from subsistence to commercial agriculture

- Develop a demand-driven, client-oriented and farmer-led agricultural service delivery system, particularly targeting the poor
- Addressing poverty through market-oriented agriculture

Issues that were surrounding NAADS target;

- Poverty
- Labour constraints
- Market failure
- Was information (demanded or supplied) enough to mitigate the constraints and transform farmers?
- Subsistence farming

Key milestones, 2001-06 (source: MAAIF Development Strategy and Investment Plan (2009/10 – 2013/14) ;

- The NAADS independent mid-term review (2005) showed that 74 percent of farmers were adopting improved crop varieties and 36 percent were adopting improved livestock breeds and utilizing recommended management practices.
- NAADS participating farmers realised on average 27 percent higher yields in crop production.
- The agricultural advisory services were extended to cover 70 different enterprises that include crop, livestock, apiculture and aquaculture.
- Farmers through their farmer forums issued and implemented 4,942 privately delivered agricultural advisory services.
- The programme also promoted 41 different types of technologies to support the development of these enterprises.

- Farmers with the technical expertise of researchers and service providers established and managed over 15,000 technology demonstration sites for training and expediting technology adoption.
- Generally adoption of crop varieties among the surveyed farmers was on average 15 percentage points higher for NAADS farmers than non-NAADS participating farmers.

Calls for reform;

- Poor public relations at local government level
- A flawed selection process for the six model farmers
- Continued plummeting of agriculture sector fortunes
- Overpricing of inputs / poor quality technologies to farmers

Counting the cost;

- 108 million US dollars spent on the first phase
- 120 billion Uganda shillings allocated to NAADS in 2010/2011 budget
- Farmers fortunes continue to dwindle (21% contribution to GDP by over 70% of the population)
- Only 6% of farmers seeing an extension worker in a year
- What/where is the fault line?
- What are the farmers' views?

Highlights from the NAADS phase 2;

- To reach as many farming households as possible and alleviate mass poverty, household food security will be pursued through the Village Farmer Forum (VFF) which will be constituted from all members of farmer groups in the village.
- The farmer groups within VFF will provide the basis for planning for food security and mass poverty alleviation as well as household access to improved planting and stocking materials.
- All farmers in the village who are 18 years and above will be mobilized and supported to form new farmer groups or join existing farmer groups.
- Focus on food security and commercialization at Village level
- The support for food security farmers will, on average be Shs 100,000 (one hundred thousand) per farmer for crop based commodities
- Scale of support- 100,000/= , 3 hoes, planting and stocking materials – revolving
- Selection of host farmers to be done by VFF
- Procurement to be done by host farmers, VFFE in consultation with sub county extension workers and sub county chief

Morrison's primary reflection points;

- Leverage a network of extension link farmers at parish level under the UNFFE structure
- Harness PPPs to deepen advisory services/ extension (NGOs, Private companies e.g Mukwano, Good Africa coffee etc)
- Focus on building capabilities for farmer groups
- Resting the debate on some for all or all for some approach!
- Focus on flagship enterprises e.g those identified in DSIP

Morrison concluded his presentation by reminding participants why the dialogue and action research? Here he highlighted the objectives of the audit (which have already been mentioned in the introductory part of this report).

He as well hinted on the next steps after the dialogue; which will include:

- Farmers' fireplace conversations/ dialogues
- Compiling a green print
- National validation and advocacy dialogue

After the presentations, the participants were given a chance to react to the presentations but mainly give their views and opinions of the NAADS they would like to see and what the audit should look out for.

2.5 Tea break

Participants had a tea break where they had a chance to interact with each other and share ideas about what had just been presented.

3. Show time

It was now 'show time' and the stage was open for whoever had registered his/her name at the entrance to put brains at work and verbally contribute to this workshop/dialogue.

Mr Mark Adams from Oxfam inquired if the fisheries sub sector was removed from the general agriculture sector, if the trend as per Morrison's presentation would change. This is because the fisheries sub sector appears to be performing well compared to others of cash crops and the rest; he also commented on the 'some for all or all for some approach'. Someone else inquired on where the research is to be done and the criteria for selecting respondents.

It was now Mr. Moses Ogwal's (from PSFU) turn on the microphone. He kicked off his discussion by hinting on how PSFU can liaise with UNFFE on this research. He then clarified on how we should always look at real terms when comparing sectoral

contribution to the country's GDP. He stated that a fall in the percentage GDP of agriculture's contribution doesn't necessarily mean that the agriculture sector's performance is dwindling as well; in real terms, it means that other sectors such as industry and services are growing at a faster rate than the sector in question (in this case agriculture). He then diverted to an intriguing issue of oil and gave his perspectives. He feels the prospective US\$ 200 billion per month from oil should be invested in infrastructure, health and education amongst other sectors. This will then translate into the Ugandan shilling appreciating by 25% thus strengthening the value of the shilling against other currencies; this will then ultimately boost trade since it will be cheaper to import goods and services. On this note he advised that whatever is talked about concerning farmer's sector and financing should be well viewed with the macroeconomic stability. He cautioned that NAADS and sectors should stop doing things because the constitution mandates them to do so; but rather the citizenry need them for their well-being. He stated that the problem with NAADS is not money, but it is lack of proper partnerships and everybody wanting to do things on their own. He noted that private firms are contracted to distribute quality seeds and other planting materials to farmers, they tend to exploit farmers and at worst supply all to those who will be willing to supply them (private firms) at the end of the harvest season; a case in point Mukwano oil manufacturer's relationship with sunflower growers in northern Uganda. His contributions were cut short given that he was turning contribution into an entire presentation, but good enough he concluded with an exciting point of 13 million pounds (which sent wild frenzy in the room and turned him into darling of many; from the look on the participants' faces, some/ if not all were willing to add him some more minutes of talking hoping he would unleash even bigger things, while others couldn't wait for the dialogue to end and have a one-on-one with him). This money has been given to PSFU by DFID for it to detail and handle enterprises from the greater north. Here farmers and other entrepreneurial groups will be required to contribute 40%, and then receive 60%.

Note: I also didn't pick this arrangement of 60 and 40% since the room was filled with murmurs from the participants; all pointed at the aforementioned mode of exchange (money).

More opinions were now pouring in:

One participant stated; “with 28% Ugandans still living below the poverty line, the issue of some for all and all for some should continue to be looked into.”

Another one said that NAADS should out on the issue of commercialization and direct farmers on marketing and market access i.e. should focus more on market research.

Then Mr. Wamboga from SCIFODE gave his perspective on agricultural research: how does NAADS support this research? How much does it know about this research? For example the 31% decline in coffee exports is a big issue that is mainly attributed to coffee wilt; banana wilt, cassava wilt, cassava streak virus disease, east coast fever in poultry, pneumonia in cattle, African swine fever in pigs etc are all big issues affecting agriculture performance. He stated on a poignant note that coffee wilt resistant varieties which were developed by NARO at Kituuza have not been multiplied and distributed country wide due to lack of funding yet the same disease continues to terrorize coffee shambas day in day out. He therefore would like to experience a version of NAADS that works closely with NARO, SCIFODE and other research firms for the betterment of the programme.

A participant also reminded us that it is not news any more in Uganda to have mind boggling policies on paper with an ebbing implementation on the ground. Therefore this research should go deep into the background and not only implementation of NAADS programme, because in phase 2 there seems to be a strong political interface/approach which will hinder service delivery. Mixing politics with farming; it is inevitable to completely eliminate politics but it can have boundaries. Then how ready are we to deal with issues arising from political farming? The study should review all this.

Lack of a clear strategy to focus on the marginalized and securing livelihoods in the protected areas.

Extension service delivery should be improved through farmer field schools, as this has worked in Karamoja area.

With the Ugandan population now 32million and growing at a rate of 3.2 per annum, it is ironical that there continues to be a shortage of human labour to participate in extensive agriculture production needed to feed the sky rocketing mouths to feed. There should be

bye-laws that compel all family members to engage in farming or at least contributing to family feeding; in an effort to shift from the conventional practice of women catering for the entire family's feeding.

Poor capturing of information/ data which translates into inadequate statistics and ultimately affecting baseline studies.

There should be an affirmative action that compels young people to engage in agriculture. This may ultimately yield quality extension service providers.

Disjointedness in planning. NAADS's focus on extension is not enough. There are issues to do with inputs, credit and market. Farmers are continuously exploited by middlemen. Therefore NAADS should integrate financial service delivery, input supply, market development, and final consumption in addition to extension service in its planning.

Environmentalists should also be integrated in the planning phases. Things like clearing land, agrochemical use, massive obtaining of cuttings/planting materials should all be looked at using a lens of conservation and sustainable natural resource use.

Given the large number of small scale producers, we should into bulk marketing e g through farmer groups. Thus NAADS should target strengthening farmer organisations.

NAADS should also consider generating community based extension service providers i.e. using farmers themselves as advisors (teach as you practice).

Market research, commodity specific research, specialization of extension service providers in different crops, and NAADS also considering perennial crops not only annuals in an effort to ensure sustainability.

Existing stakeholders and their services should be well investigated to avoid duplication. Climate change adaptation should be strongly considered on the agenda in all activities being pursued.

Mr. Sunday hinted on the issue of reconciling the youth who want to farm but don't have land of their own.

A farmer from Mukono strongly emphasized the issue of the fast growing population. He is of the view that NAADS should seriously consider small scale farming. Therefore

integrated planning together with other stakeholders should be conducted through fire place conversations.

Mr. Rwakakamba informed the house that a recent study shows that Uganda's productivity is greatly hindered by a poor mindset. Have we created the mindset of the people NAADS is going to support? Have we imparted it into their minds that farming business is profitable? The research should thus look at ways of changing the mindset.

Ms Marieke van Schie (SNV) liaised from AgroProFocus stressed the issue of putting an effort to document the different agriculture practices in different areas, so as to help in extension work, research and as evidence/guide to farmers.

Mr. Makala stated that credibility of research givers and receivers should be looked into: there is always poor management/delivery of a well-researched product. Thus quality assurance and certification should be taken seriously.

Crash of jurisdictions/mandates of different ministries should be checked.

Is NAADS still in line with the 25 year programme plan? Is its planning budget-led? Is its planning in line with the bulging population?!! Strongly questioned Mr. Wamboga

On the geographic coverage of the research; one participant advised that urban agriculture should be considered and this may require a different approach from rural agriculture.

A look into crops that are area-specific i.e. prioritization versus zoning should be considered.

All actors in the value chain (input suppliers, credit service providers, market players etc) should be integrated in planning stages so as to instill confidence in them and drive away their fear of the risks that come with agriculture.

3.1 Secretary of the day's word

Throughout the dialogue I was soaked into jotting down each and everyone's contribution, no matter the grain in the content. Let me take this moment to express my opinion on the foregoing issue. My take is on NAADS planning in light of food security.

Food security exists when all people at all times have physical or economic access to sufficient safe and nutritious food to meet their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life” (FAO, 1996). Climate change refers to the variability in the characteristic conditions of the earth’s lower surface atmosphere at a specific location. Food security is the outcome of food system processes all along the food chain. Climate change affects food security through its impacts on all components of global, national and local food systems.

Climate change affects all four dimensions of food security: food availability, food accessibility, food utilization and food systems stability. It has an impact on human health, livelihood assets, food production and distribution channels, as well as changing purchasing power and market flows. Its impacts are both short term, resulting from more frequent and more intense extreme weather events, and long term, caused by changing temperatures and precipitation patterns.

NAADS phase 2 strongly focuses on food security; therefore for the programme to achieve its objectives and have a positive impact on the fortunes of farmers, climate change adaptation and mitigation will have to go hand in hand; so adopting an integrated strategic approach represents the best way forward.

3.2 Closing remarks

Mr. Kenneth was tasked to officially close the dialogue; however he made a few administrative announcements concerning transport refund and lunch, after which he called upon UNFFE treasurer to close the workshop. She thanked the organizers and stated that she is very optimistic that this research will generate unprecedented information, strongly help UNFFE to carry out informed advocacy and consequently catapult performance of the agricultural sector to higher levels.