

# SAFE-World Project/Initiative Summary

**Country: Uganda**

Project/Initiative Title: Development Training and Research Centre – DTRC, Lira

Nos. farmers: 500

Hectares: 2000

Agro-Ecological Zone: III/VI

Improvement types

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

Success and Limits to spread

Success	Limits
1b, 3c, 3e	2b, 3a

## A. Key Impacts

### ***A2 – Impacts on natural capital***

Oil erosion and soil fertility impacts will definitely have to be given time for proper assessment to be done. Even then our initial thrust has been mainly on attitude change, actual practice based on self-reliance and the improvement in income levels. Thus the quantitative variables such as soil quality, water pollution levels and changes in proportion of cropping, forest cover or ground water recharge can be said to be very potentially positive.

### ***A3 – Impacts on local community (social capital)***

Quantitative indicators are not clear but increased involvement, improvement in dressing, ability to send pupils to school etc, have been reported. During our intervention phases there was gross dependency attitudes. However, the spirit of self-reliance, savings and settled production is steadily taking root. Local income level is improving and Credit facilities are beginning to get more clearly accessed and better utilized. Several local resource management groups have sprouted and our training initiatives are gaining more demands and utilization.

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

Famine incidents have been practically subdued mainly as a result of a reawakened conscientisation. A lot of local seasonality and market analysis trends have been deliberately emphasized during our training and research activities. At least farmers are now willing in principle to pool their products together and venture into the market as a group. They are also more cautious about early and cheap sales of their foodstuffs. The extent of the degree of benefit will have to be given time. It should eventually be possible for the vulnerable and the poor to experience better benefit.

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

There has been steady and predictable increase in crop yields about 21/2 years after the start

of the program. In our latest evaluation exercise (July 1995) livestock yields has also been reported to be on the take-off. There is now promising results that new initiatives in both livestock and crop production has been evidently stimulated.

Multiple cropping and green manuring has so far been more readily adaptable. Integrated pest management, soil and water conservation, being more vigorous will require more specialized inputs in terms of intervention on our part. We have scattered activities which could be estimated at an average of 100 km<sup>2</sup>. The estimated number of beneficiaries are basically organized community groups within our program area. Together with some multiplier effect this could number nearly 500 farmers.

### **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	The influential technological innovations include crop rotations, multiple cropping and intercropping, indigenous livestock breeds and plant species richness and diversity and in all locations mixed farming practices.
Type 2		
Type 3	x	use of green manures and legumes, some very limited agroforestry
Type 4		
Type 5	x	The use of participatory rural development approaches has been very significant both for positive results as well as for confidence building. Methods such as PRA, Farmers Participatory Research and Self-reliant, Rural Development Facilitation by our change agents has been quite useful.
Type 6	x	In this way farmers participation is ensured in various stages of the work such as problem identification, planning, management, research, training, monitoring and evaluation.
Type 7		
Type 8		
Type 9		

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

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

Our organizational management is quite open and transparent that each individual volunteer has the freedom and initiative of initiating any contact, approach or program. In this way when local interests are expressed any member or volunteer undertakes to initiate specific measures with whichever community is in need of our support. Local, national and international networks and contacts have also been useful in several ways. Technical support especially information on participatory development has been most handy to us. The flexibility of our organization, the friendly rapport it has with the local farmers and the rich networks we are placed in has been and will always be paramount in the fruitful endeavour of our program.

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

At organizational levels the only set back is financial with related human resources deficiencies. Both would find very favourable places within our flexible organizational framework.

The only other constraint is the age-long tendency of dependency and distorted priorities. This we are aware only needs time and sustained efforts from all actors in order that sustainable agriculture project interventions become widespread.

### ***C4 – Policy issues***

At the Macro-Economic level we feel the major drawback to be on equal terms of global trade, unfavourable/unstable market prices as well as poor methods of channelling international development support.

On the national frontiers the bottlenecks include inappropriate development priorities, political bias, narrow agricultural research focus, lack of real support for sustainable agricultural activities and overemphasis of support for high external input agricultural activities and inputs, (in descending order of gravity).

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

Richard O Apilla Development Training and Research Centre PO Box 581 Lira Uganda
--