

# SAFE-World Project/Initiative Summary

**Country: Malawi**

Project/Initiative Title: IFAD – MoA

Nos. farmers: 3000                      Hectares: 2500

Agro-Ecological Zone: II

Improvement types

1x	2	3x	4	5	6x	7	8	9
----	---	----	---	---	----	---	---	---

Success and Limits to spread

Success	Limits
6a,7	1b,7

## A. Key Impacts

### A1 – Productivity

	Before/Without	After/With	% change
Maize	500-700 kg/ha	1000-1400 kg/ha	100

### A2 – Impacts on natural capital

Soil fertility improvements

### A4 – Impacts on households and individuals (human capital)

Improved children’s health

### A5 – Key changes in farm / regional system

Currently farmers with no access to purchased inputs obtain 500-700 kg of maize per ha. If they used the full range of technologies now being promoted they might double this yield

## B. Types of Sustainable Agriculture Improvements

Type 1: Better use of available renewable natural capital

Type 2: Intensification of single sub-component of farm system

Type 3: Diversify by adding new productive natural capital and regenerative components

Type 4: Better use of non-renewable inputs and technologies

Type 5: Social and participatory processes leading to group action for making better use of natural capital

Type 6: Human capital building through training-learning programmes

Type 7: Access to Finance

Type 8: Add value by processing to reduce losses and increase returns

Type 9: Add value by direct or organised marketing of produce to consumers

	Yes/No	Narrative
Type 1	x	?? Contour ridging with A frame ?? Contour vetvier grass lines

Type 2		
Type 3	x	?? Soya beans in rotation with maize ?? Pigeon pea, glyrcidia, sesbania and tephrosia as intercrops ?? Faidherbia and Albida for agroforestry
Type 4		
Type 5		
Type 6	x	?? Participatory methods ?? Group organisation ?? womens' church groups
Type 7		
Type 8		
Type 9		

### **C. Key Lessons: Success, Spread and Constraints**

#### ***C1 – Key Lessons Learned***

- ?? technologies to counteract soil degradation are not being developed by farmers because the rate of change from a stable situation has been so rapid
- ?? introduced technologies need very detailed testing before promotion
- ?? adoption is very slow

#### ***C2 – Aspects of local/national context contributing to success***

- ?? awareness of farmers that yields are dropping as a result of soil degradation under continuous maize cropping
- ?? sharp rise in fertiliser prices
- ?? Intensive supervision and management by expatriate staff combined with large grants from Ministry of Agriculture – well beyond local capacity to sustain with local tax funding

#### ***C3 – Limitations preventing spread***

- ?? Farmers do not see sufficient speedy impact on crop growth. They compare agroforestry to nitrogen fertiliser use and are unimpressed
- ?? Some technologies are too demanding of labour at critical times
- ?? Without supplementary fertiliser (which farmers cannot afford) many legumes grow poorly and slowly and so have no impact
- ?? Most agricultural staff are not really convinced of the benefits of the technologies being developed
- ?? A sharp decline in fertiliser use leading to low crop yields and increased rate of soil degradation

#### ***C4 – Policy issues***

- ?? Extremely low morale in M of A field staff resulting from drastic reduction in real incomes combined with a collapse of discipline and supervision

#### ***C5 – Scaling-up***

- ?? Needs better refining of the technologies
- ?? Better matching of technology to labour availability

?? Strategies which make fertiliser available as an essential adjunct to “organic” methods on starving soils

**D. Contact Point for Project/Initiative**

Stephen Carr Private Bag 5 Zomba Malawi
--