

SAFE-World Project/Initiative Summary

Country: Sudan

Project/Initiative Title: Integrated Services for Vegetable and Fruit Farmers Project (ISVFF) - Sudan

Nos. farmers: 17,000

Hectares: 42,500

Agro-Ecological Zone: V

Improvement types

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

Success and Limits to spread

Success	Limits
1b, 3e	3b, 5a

A. Key Impacts

A1 – Productivity

	Before/Without	After/With	% change
Vegetables/ Fruit			50-75%

A2 – Impacts on natural capital

- ?? Before the project started its activities, pesticides and fertilizers were misused. Now there is a great change since the farmers became aware of the proper and correct use of chemicals.
- ?? Due to the regular training programs for the farmers, the amounts of pesticides used have been reduced clearly in the project area. Recent studies through analysis of soil, plant parts and fruits showed that the PPM of pesticides in the project area is below the level and no health difficulties in the project areas.
- ?? No erosion in the soil, soil fertility is normal, farmers use limited amount of Nitrogen which is required to the soil.
- ?? No problem at all in water pollution till now.
- ?? The project is working along the Nile river, fruits and vegetable farms are irrigated continuously from the river Nile.

A3 – Impacts on local community (social capital)

- ?? Labour wage rates have been changed and increased as well as land prices.
- ?? Cost of production became high, migration to and out is limited.
- ?? Local income increased due to increase in production.
- ?? Most of the small scale farmers are self-finance, few ask for credit.
- ?? The project ISVFF is working in three states, through its field stations. Each station serves 800-1000 farmers. 10% of this number is subject to training.

A4 – Impacts on households and individuals (human capital)

- ?? When the project started the new approach (concept) to provide the services in an integrated way, there were two groups of farmers, one is the beneficiary and the other is

the non-beneficiary. After three years of work in the project areas, with the positive results been achieved, the non beneficiary farmers started to cooperate and adopt the new approach. However, the impact of the integrated series has been subject to evaluation study. Results showed clearly that the approach increased the production and income of the small farmers. Due to this the farmers purchased animals, rented new land, improved their houses, married

A5 – Key changes in farm / regional system

- ?? Increase in vegetables production (52-72%), 3 years after start of program.
- ?? Increase in fruit production (50-75%), 3 years after start of program.
- ?? Inputs cost have been changed and increased about 80% year due to inflation.
- ?? Farmers continue to use sustainable farming and land management technique.
- ?? 16,000-18,000 farmers have adopted the new approach (see page 49).
- ?? Small scale farmers use 1-5 ha. Most of them below 5 ha.
- ?? 16,000-18,000 are benefiting from the approach.
- ?? This new approach has been approved by the states ministers (26 state) in their meeting at the beginning of this year to be adopted in all states. This has been supported and approved by the Federal Council of Ministers.

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		
Type 2		
Type 3		
Type 4	X	
Type 5	X	The previous policy for providing services for the small farmers was through different Institutions e.g. Plant Protection Department, Extension Department, Horticulture Department, Seeds Propagation Department etc. But the ISVFF Agriculturists have been trained for four and a half months in the integrated approach, then they joined the field stations with working plan included farmers training, field days, demonstration trials, farmer days, field meetings and field visits etc. as well as the essential inputs in small quantities.
Type 6	X	
Type 7		
Type 8		

Type 9		
--------	--	--

C. Key Lessons: Success, Spread and Constraints

C2 – Aspects of local/national context contributing to success

A good linkage with the concerned organizations has been established, for example, with the research institutions, faculties of agriculture, extension institutions, horticultural institutions. As for the external linkages, with those doing similar work in Egypt, Jordan and Germany.

C3 – Limitations preventing spread

One of the main objectives of the ISVFF is to strengthen the concerned institution with trained personnel to adopt the concept.

Main constraints are:

- ?? Availability of funds to carry out the local training for extensionists, since the Germans left the project last year and now the project is self-dependent.
- ?? Training abroad for the project staff to act later as trainers locally.
- ?? Unfavourable exchange rate which makes the inputs price very high.
- ?? Research work in certain fields (plant nutrition, environmental activities) is weak and limited.
- ?? Means of transport for the crops are very poor (also packing)
- ?? High cost of inputs and their availability in time.
- ?? The re-division of Sudan Country by which it is now 26 states makes it difficult for the project to spread quickly, since there is an urgent need for well-trained agriculturists.

D. Contact Point for Project/Initiative

Dr Elwasila Guddoura Mohamed PO Box 14 Khartoum Sudan
--