

SAFE-World Project/Initiative Summary

Country: Malawi

Project/Initiative Title: PAPPA Project

Nos. farmers: 9500

Hectares: 6000

Agro-Ecological Zone: III

Improvement types

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

Success and Limits to spread

Success	Limits
1b,3e	2b,7b

A. Key Impacts

A2 – Impacts on natural capital

- ?? Increase in biodiversity as we have introduced 4 or 5 new grown crops.
- ?? Soil erosion reduced anecdotal only as farmers are happy with contour ridging and vetiver grass planting.
- ?? Soil fertility has started to increase (measured by increased crop yields over a control)

A3 – Impacts on local community (social capital)

- ?? No change in access to credit because of our work; but credit much less essential as purchased inputs not required.
- ?? Requirement for incentives is reduced when farmers have an example to follow and can see the technology in operation. But general development policies of government and donor work against this by giving free gifts for participation, Food for Walk, "Drought" Recovery programs without discrimination.
- ?? 1142 farmers trained in "A-frame" use for contour ridging: 425 farmers trained in line level use. 82 farmers groups.

A4 – Impacts on households and individuals (human capital)

- ?? Should cope with market changes because of diversification.
- ?? Project affects all in the community including very smallest landowners

A5 – Key changes in farm / regional system

- ?? Maize yield increase where agroforestry has been successfully adopted. On farm research of the projects points to approximately 50% yield increase (against control) and increased gross margin (50%), but not as good as Nitrogen in organic fertilizer.
- ?? Benefits on stream only after year 3-4.
- ?? Vast reduction in input fertilizer costs (purchased) by \$150/ha. to nearly 0 (seed cost only), through first year of this policy, but farmers keen to diversify to other crops and happy with composite maize.
- ?? Around 9500 farmers/households have pegged their ridges for contour realignment about 2/3 of them have realigned their ridges (around 6000 ha.) - around 50000 people.
- ?? Some non-project farmers are keen to do soil and water conservation, a few want to do

agroforestry - though this is much slower as we are waiting to see benefits

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	Agroforestry, contour farming, gully reclamation, water harvesting,
Type 2		
Type 3		
Type 4	x	crop diversification.
Type 5		
Type 6	x	Traditional farmers groups with committees. Our project is not very progressive, though aware of the need for participatory extension.
Type 7		
Type 8		
Type 9		

C. Key Lessons: Success, Spread and Constraints

C2 – Aspects of local/national context contributing to success

- ?? Very close relationship between project and national research institutions in agroforestry and land management.
- ?? Use of PRA approaches in M + E.
- ?? Informal networks with other interested organisations.
- ?? Structural adjustment (liberalization of input prices) has helped our project as fertilizer is now too expensive for most poor farmers so they want alternatives.

C3 – Limitations preventing spread

- ?? Government and international policy and political climate have more effect on many issues than our work - e.g. political changes - deforestation (President Barda was very tough!)
- ?? Also population pressure is overtaking every little effort made.
- ?? Political changes (of government) - less interest in forestry.
- ?? Currency devaluation - huge increase in imported goods - a) opening more land (forests with poor management practices) which has been detrimental, b) change to using

sustainable practices (-good).

?? Top down tradition of extension hinders good development.

?? Distorting effect of support e.g. free fertilizers for "drought" relief - abandoning of sustainable practices we have promoted.

C4 – Policy issues

?? Requirement for incentives is reduced when farmers have an example to follow and can see the technology in operation. But general development policies of government and donor work against this by giving free gifts for participation, Food for Walk, "Drought" Recovery programs without discrimination.

?? Political changes (of government) - less interest in forestry.

D. Contact Point for Project/Initiative

M C Leach PO Box 30102 Lilongwe 3 Malawi
