

Appendices

Appendix 1.

Checklist For Roles Of PDC's

1. To monitor distribution and redistribution of planting material under multiplication
2. To participate in the identification of the right beneficiaries (consider the poor and women as a priority) to multiply planting material.
3. Facilitate enforcement of byelaws to ensure protection of planting materials from damage or loss.
4. Facilitate the formulation of byelaws to safe guard planting materials and ensure sustainability of the multiplication process
5. To ensure sustainability of development activities including multiplication of improved planting material.
6. To keep records of all multiplication activities
7. To mobilize farmers to participate in development activities and to access available services
8. To link groups and farmers to development programs e.g. NAADS, Private Sector input stockists etc.
9. To inform and sensitise the community on any new developments
10. Any others identified by the community
11. Evaluate the progress of the multiplication exercise

NOTE: The members of the PDC are volunteers who have willingly accepted to avail themselves to serve the community.

Appendix 2- Roles Of Production Committee

1. Mobilize farmers (group members) for timeliness of multiplication activities
2. Coordinate activities related to seed multiplication in the group.
3. Identify group members (farmers) to benefit from planting material (seed) with the approval of the whole group.
4. Train group members and other beneficiaries on seed production and storage before seed is given to them
5. Facilitate distribution and redistribution of seed to identified group members.
6. Monitor farmers during the crop production cycle in field management of the crop to ensure good yield.
7. Follow up group members and ensure seed is paid back
8. Liaise with the Parish Development Committee when need arises to enforce byelaws to recover seed from those who cause losses or fail to pay back.
9. Guide the group in evaluation of seed multiplication activities each season
10. Follow up group members who have received seed to ensure each retains seed to plant the next season.
11. Keep records of all seed multiplication activities, including all record of seed quantities replanted by group members, and sold for seed to other farmers
12. Write reports on seed multiplication issues to the PDC & Extension staff.

Appendix 3 -**FARMERS' GUIDE ON PRODUCTION OF GROUNDNUTS**

Importance

Groundnut is grown as both food and cash crop. It's a source of protein and oil. It also has the advantage of generating residual nitrogen in the soil.

Varieties: Improved varieties include Red Beauty, Igora 1, Serenut 1, Serenut 2, Serenut 3 and Serenut 4.

Suitable conditions

The best soils required are deep, well-drained sandy, sandy loam or loamy sand soils.

Rotation

A rotation of 3 years or longer usually reduce disease/weed problem. Cereals (i.e. maize, sorghum and millet), cassava, sweet potato and sunflower are good rotational crops.

Groundnuts should not be grown after cotton, although cotton can be used in rotation after groundnuts but not immediately.

Other legumes and tomatoes should be avoided in the rotation as may cause a build up of nematodes and soil-borne diseases.

Land preparation:

Prepare land early. A smooth seed- bed is required to provide a good soil to seed contact after sowing. The good land preparation provides suitable soil conditions for rapid and uniform germination, good root penetration and growth, and steady pod development.

Fertilizer: If possible, fertilize with SSP (at a rate of 100-125kg/ha / 40-50 kg/acre) or TSP (at 80-90 kg/ha /32-36kg/acre) before planting.

Planting:

Seed selection: Pods to be shelled 1-2 weeks before sowing and only good quality seed to be selected for sowing.

Certified seed should be purchased at regular intervals, preferably every 2-3 years.

Seed dressing: Dress seed with thiram to control fungal and bacterial growth. Can be applied as a dust at 120g of thiram/100kg of seed. The dust must be uniformly mixed with the seed.

Planting time: Planting should be done as soon as there is adequate moisture in the ground and should be early in the season.

Spacing/Planting depth: Sow at 5-6 cm depth.

Recommended spacing at 45cm x 7.5-10cm for bunch type varieties (i.e.Red

Beauty) and at 45 x 10-15 cm for Semi-erect type varieties (i.e Igola 1, Serenut 1 and Serenut 2)

Weeding

Ensure good weed control. Generally, 2-3 weedings are recommended. Early weeding is important, particularly 3-6 weeks after sowing i.e. before flowering. At least another weeding during pegging. Weeds, make harvesting cumbersome and cause a lot of pods to remain behind in the soil.

Avoid covering the bottom of the plants with earth (Avoid earthing up plants when using hoe), as it increases diseases, reduce flowering and pod development.

It is advisable to weed by hand pulling once flowering and pegging begins
For less disturbance of any developing pods.

Herbicides can be used for control of weed. Pre emergence such as Lasso can be used before crop and weed emergence, and post –emergence i.e. spray Basagran and Fusilade Super following emergence.

Pests and Diseases:

Diseases:

Groundnut rosette disease: Symptoms are 'chlorotic' (yellow and stunted) and 'green' (green and stunted).

Control:

Early planting

Avoid wide spacing

Rosette resistant varieties

Spray with systematic insecticide against aphids if a high yielding non-resistant variety is grown. Dimethoate can be sprayed at a dosage of 50ml in 20 l of water, 14 days after crop emergence and at 10-days intervals for a total of four sprays.

Leaf spot: Early and Late leaf spot.

Early leaf spot occurs as early as 2 weeks after crop emergence. Symptom: Lesions are circular, dark brown on the upper surface with chlorotic (yellow) halos surrounding the darker lesions and a lighter shade of brown on the lower surface of the leaflets.

Late leaf spot occurs later in the season. It has nearly circular lesions which are darker than those of early leaf spot.

Control:

Crop rotation

Burying crop debris during land preparation

Early sowing.

Aphid: It transmits rosette disease and cause damage of the plant tissue when feeding.

Control: Aphid resistant varieties, Spray using dimethoate.

Harvest:

Harvest when 70% or more pods are mature. Use darker markings on inside of shell as an indicator of maturity (pods with shells turning dark brown inside i.e. pick about 3 from different plants, break them open and determine the % age of pods shell which have turning dark inside). Seed should be plump and correct colour for variety. If crop is severely defoliated (95%) or sprouting has begun, harvest straight away. Clean excess soil from pods. Wilt/dry in windrows for 3-5 days.

Post harvest:

Drying:

- Do not leave harvested groundnuts in windrows for long especially during wet weather.
- Remove as much dirt (soil) and trash from pods during drying as soon as possible.
- Drying must begin immediately after lifting to prevent moulding and spoilage.
- Dry pods on mats for a further 2-5 days.

- If A-frames or cocks used, dry for 3-4 weeks and then pick off the pods. Do not dry any further after picking.

Storage

- Before storing remove poor, damaged, shriveled, rotten or fungus-infected pods.
- Store pods in gunny bags in a cool, dry, good sanitation, pest control and well ventilated store.
- Do not store moist groundnuts.
- Store groundnuts in shell.
- Do not use plastic or poly-weave bags.

Appendix 4

Groundnut Multiplication Group Competitions Marking Scheme

District: _____

Sub-County: _____

No.		Scoring scheme	Maximum Points	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	Beneficiaries	0.5 points for each beneficiary who has received seed	10										
2	Repayment of seed	Deduct 2 points for each beneficiary who didn't pay back seed. Group earns all 20 points if it has no defaulters	20										
3	Record keeping a) New distribution b) Redistribution c) Record of defaulters d) Training e) Reports to PDC/ sharing of information f) Redistribution plan	5 points if well documented in tracking forms (complete – with date, name, source, qty, signed & witnessed) @ 1 point 5 points as above 5 points names (1), qty (1), clear recovery plan (2), action taken (1) 5 points report (3) & attendance list (2), 5 points any communication on the above earns 2 points, copies of forms 3 points 5 points - list of names 3 points, quantities 1 point, timing 1 point	30										

**Appendix 4:
Final Technical Report CPP R8105 (ZA 0495)**

AT Uganda Ltd.

No.		Scoring scheme	Maximum Points	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4	Multiplication byelaws	5 points – if available, 1 point Reviewed 2 points Applied 2 points	5										
5	Participation of PDCs	If visited group 1 point, visitors book 1 point, witness distribution 1.5 point, monitoring & solve problems 1.5 points	5										
6	Participation of production committee	Involved in training 3 points Involved in monitoring 3 points, involved in documentation 3 points and others 1 point	10										
7	Poverty focus	≥ 75% Poor, 5 points 60 – 74% Poor, 3 points 50 – 59% Poor, 2 points	5										
8	Women focus	≥ 50% women - 5 points 40 – 49% - 3 points < 40% - 0 points	5										
9	Multiplication initiative	1.0 point for each member who bought seed (serenut)	5										
10	Marketing of excess seed (distribution – use of excess seed)	Each person who sold some earns 0.5 of a point	5										
	Other comments												
	Total Score		100										
	Overall Ranking												

Summary of Prizes

Best two groups in district/zone 1 G.nut sheller each.

First and second groups in each sub-county 1 Ewing Grinder

Appendix 5 Monthly Group Activity Progress/Monitoring Report

Month: _____ **District:** _____ **Sub-County:** _____

No	Unit	Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	Beneficiaries	No. of beneficiaries who have received seed total _____ Women _____ Men _____										
2	Repayment of seed	No. of defaulters quantity not paid back _____										
3	Record keeping a) New distribution b) Redistribution c) Record of defaulters d) Training e) Reports to PDC/ sharing of information f) Redistribution plan	If well documented Qty & No. of benef Qty & No. of benef Qty & action to be taken No. of trainings, attend & topics Copies of reports List of names, qty & timing										
4	Multiplication byelaws	Any available Reviewed Applied										

Appendix 5:
Final Technical Report CPP R8105 (ZA 0495)

AT Uganda Ltd.

No	Unit	Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
5	Participation of PDCs	If visited group, witness distribution, monitoring & solve problems										
6	Participation of production committee	No of training involved _____ No of monitoring visits _____ Documentation file etc										
7	Multiplication initiative	No. of Members who bought seed (serenut) _____ Acreage planted by members _____										
8	Marketing of excess seed (distribution – use of excess seed)	No members who sold some seed in the group Marketing plan										
9	Group savings	Amount saved by group										
10	Other income generating activities (IGAs)	Types of IGAs a group has										
	Other comments											

Appendix 6 AT UGANDA LTD.		Groundnut Project		FPPA WORK PLAN		January – December 2004	
Activities	Target	Who	When	Indicator	Payment rate	Comments	
Preseason duties	1	All FPPAs	January	Attendance list ,Work plan	15,000	transport refunds	
Planning meeting at sub-county level	1 per sub-county	FPPA, PCs & PDCs	Early February	Attendance list & work plans (10)	20000		
Training of farmers on seed production	10 ATU groups	PDCs, PCs & FPPAs	Feb – March	Attendance list & reports	20,000		
Training of PDCs and PCs on record keeping	10 groups & 2 PDCs	FPPAs	Feb – March	Attendance list & reports	15,000		
G.nut distribution & Redistribution	10 ATU groups	PDCs & PCs	By end of Feb	Tracking filled forms	10,000		
G.nut distribution & Redistribution	10 partner groups	PDCs & PCs	By end of Feb	Filled & signed tracking forms	10,000		
Impact survey (march)	Random sample	FPPA – May switch	March	Filled questionnaires			
Training of FPPAs on collective marketing	All 16 FPPAs	Mr. Kateu Mr. Okwakol Mr. Omony	May (last week)	Attendance list & training notes	50,000	FPPAS 2 NATS, Transport refund & token to trainers.	
Training of groups on collective marketing	10 groups (ATU)	FPPAs	June	Attendance list, reports & group marketing plans	20,000		
Updating of the registers & group records	10 groups & 2 parishes	PDCs, PCs & FPPAs	June	Updated PDC beneficiary registers Group beneficiary records Updated group membership registers	30,000		
Training of farmers on seed production	10 partner groups	PC & FPPA	October – November	Attendance list & reports	10,000		
Joint meeting between	4 meetings	PDCs, PCs, FPPAs	Date be fixed	Progress reports &	20,000	Each 1 SDA	

Appendix 6:
Final Technical Report CPP R8105 (ZA 0495)

AT Uganda Ltd.

Activities	Target	Who	When	Indicator	Payment rate	Comments
groups, PDCs, PCs & FPRAs		& ATU staff	by AT	attendance lists		
Joint field monitoring (PDCs, PCs & FPRAs) – Ongoing	3 Field monitoring visits	PDCs, Pcs, & FPRAs	At planting time March – April Weeding – April – May Harvesting June – July	Monitoring report	15,000	Each 1 SDA
Identification of partner groups	10 groups	PDCs, PCs & groups	August – October	Lists of partner group members (10)	10,000	
Training of farmers on seed production	10 ATU groups		November	Attendance list & reports	20,000	
End of season evaluation	10 groups	FPRA	August – September	Evaluation reports (10)	10,000	
Exchange visits	1 visit per sub-county	RC & FPRA		Visit report Updated group registers	10,000	
Special duties				Report	15,000	

Appendix 7-Guidelines for Training of Production Committees.

1. Each group to identify 3 members of the Production Committee who are capable of being trained and can train others (contact farmers)
2. Parish Development Committees to attend
3. Training to last 2 days, lunch will be provided (125,000/=) each sub-county
4. Training by FPRAs and Field Assistants
5. Topics to be covered include: -
 - basic crop husbandry practices & principles
 - layout & set up of demonstrations – theory and practical
 - recommendations on such crops as; ***G.nuts, Fingure millet, sorghum, beans, maize, cowpeas, cassava.***
6. Each sub-county to set training dates in the last week of February (funds for meals).
7. Each group then prepares a work plan for training of group members to ensure that members are trained.
8. Notes on specific crops will be provided in the 3rd week of February.

Appendix 8a -AT (Uganda) Ltd

Groundnuts Multiplication & Redistribution Register

District: _____ Sub-county: _____ Parish: _____ Village: _____

Name	Sex	Well-being category	Qty of seed taken	Sign	Next beneficiary	Sex	Well-being category
1					a)		
					b)		
					c)		
2					a)		
					b)		
					c)		
3					a)		
					b)		
					c)		

Appendix 8b -GROUNDNUTS MULTIPLICATION AGREEMENT

I _____ of _____
Village _____ Parish, _____ Sub-county,
_____ District, hereby acknowledge receipt of _____ Kgs of
_____ variety G.nuts from AT (Uganda). I understand that the G.nuts seeds
are intended for multiplication in order to assist the farmers in this District to improve
their food security.

I understand and agree that:

- I am to plant and care for this G.nuts according to extension advice and protect it from damage.
- This G.nuts is to be harvested and paid back two times the quantity of seed initially received, after a period of 3-4 months for redistribution to other poor farmers, at the instruction of the FPRA
- The balance of the harvest belongs to me and may be purchased by other farmers.
- I am to keep proper records of any distribution of G.nuts so that AT (Uganda) can follow up and advise these farmers too.
- I am cooperate with the FPR extension staff in collecting any required information that will help the assessment of the performance of this new G.nuts variety.

Sex of farmer: _____ Number of Beneficiaries (Men: _____
Women: _____)

Well-being ranking: (VP=Very poor, P=poor, M=moderate, R=rich): _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____ File Number: _____

Witnessed by: _____

(Chairperson Parish Development Committee

(Chairperson LCI)

Parish

Appendix 8c. SEED MULTIPLICATION TRACKING FORM (NEW SEED DISTRIBUTION)

District: _____ Sub-county: _____ Parish: _____ Village: _____

Name of Farmer/Group: _____

[if group, specify total number of members in group _____ men _____ women _____

Date group received seed: ___/___/200__ Crop: _____ Varieties received _____, _____, _____

Quantity: RECEIVED by the whole group _____ (bags/Kgs/number of tubers) Quantity to be returned by multipliers _____ (bags/Kgs)

Record of Distribution of Seed

Date of Distribution	Source of Seed (Specify code of supplier)	Name of Person Receiving	Sex	Well-Being Status	Village of Person Receiving	Variety Received	Quantity Received	Quantity to Be Paid back	Signature of Person Receiving	Signature of Witness (PDC)

Appendix 8d. SEED MULTIPLICATION TRACKING FORM (REDISTRIBUTION)

District: _____ Sub-county: _____ Parish: _____ Village: _____
Name of Farmer/Group: _____ [if group, specify total number of members in group _____ men _____ women _____]

Date of return of seed to group for redistribution: ___/___/200__ Crop: _____ Varieties received _____, _____, _____

Quantity: RECEIVED from multipliers returning _____ (bags/Kgs) Quantity to be returned by next multipliers _____ Quantity not paid back _____

Record of Distribution of Seed Returned

Date of Distribution	Name of person Paying back	Name of person Receiving	Sex	Well-Being Status	Village of Person Receiving	Variety Received	Quantity Received	Quantity to Be Paid back	Signature of Person Receiving	Signature of Witness (PDC)

Appendix 9-END OF SEASON EVALUATION FORM

Name of Group: _____ Sub-county: _____ Parish: _____

	Farmer 1	Farmer 2	Farmer 3	Farmer 4	Farmer 5	Farmer 6	Farmer 7	Farmer 8
1. Quantity of seed received								
2. Variety								
3. Source of seed (new or redistribution)								
4. Planting date								
5. Spacing used								
6. Date of first weeding								
7. Date of 2 nd weeding								
8. Harvest date								
9. Yield (bags, basins)								
10. Pests seen if any and control used								
11. Diseases seen if any								
12. What you did not like about variety								
13. What you like about variety								
14. Other comments								

General comments by whole group about variety (Record on back)

Appendix 10 -CHECKLIST FOR SEED MULTIPLICATION BYELAWS

Issues to consider

- 1.The repayment rate, which must be twice the amount initially received.
- 2.Training is a must before one receives seed.
- 3.How to deal with defaulters:
 - Incase of failure to pay back due to low yields resulting from poor management of the crop, the farmer pays cash value of the expected amount of seed.
 - Incase of failure to pay back due to drought the farmer may be allowed to re-multiply or pays back half of quantity expected and the rest in the next season.
 - To avoid loses which may occur incase a beneficiary leaves the village or group before paying back the seed, each farmer receiving seed must have a next of kin witnessing the receipt of seed by signing.
4. Seed for multiplication should be planted within the parish for easy monitoring.
5. All seed distribution, repayment and redistribution should be at parish level meetings for transparency and accountability.
- 6.Seed should be distributed according to agreed distribution plans.
- 7.Beneficiaries should allow visits by PDC's, PC's staff and other farmers to the multiplication gardens.
8. Only quality seed will be accepted for repayment, otherwise the beneficiary pays the full cash value for the amount expected from him/her.

NB: Make sure all critical issues that affect repayment are taken care of.

Appendix 11:

**Farmer Led Groundnut Multiplication in Uganda.
NR International Contract Number (ZA0494)
Implemented by AT Uganda Ltd.**

DRAFT REPORT

**Impact Assessment Report for Farmer Led Groundnut
Multiplication in Uganda**

Grace Tino, Rita Laker-Ojok, and Sarah Namisi

December 2004

This report is an output from a research project funded by the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID) for the benefit of developing countries. The views expressed here are not necessarily those of DFID.
Crop Protection Programme– Project R8105.



AT Uganda Ltd.

DFID CPP

SAARI

Table Of Contents

1. Executive Summary	1
2. Introduction	2
2.1 General Background	2
2.2 Area Description.....	2
2.3 Project Summary/Background.....	3
2.4 Project Targets.....	3
2.5 Project Approach/Methodology	4
2.6 Survey Methodology.....	4
3. Survey Findings	5
3.1 General Socio-Economic Information.....	5
3.1.1 Distribution Of Sex Of Respondents.....	5
3.1.2 Distribution Of Sex Of Household Head By Sex Of Respondent	5
3.1.3 Distribution of Respondents by Education status	6
3.1.4 Household Composition	7
3.1.5 Sources of household income	8
3.1.6 Crop Contribution to household income	9
3.1.7 Land Area Cultivated.....	12
3.1.8 Crop Contribution To Household Income In Terms Of Areas Under Crop	12
3.1.9 Consumption of Groundnuts	15
3.2 Training	15
3.2.1 Sources Of Information On Groundnut Production.....	16
3.2.2 Attendance Of Trainings By Beneficiaries.....	17
3.2.3 Organization of Training	17
3.2.4 ADOPTION OF RECOMMENDED PRACTICES	19
3.2.5 Diffusion Of Adoption Of Recommended Production Practices	21
3.2.6 Benefits From Training	22
3.3 Multiplication.....	24
3.3.1 Variety Assessment.....	27
3.3.2 Seed multiplication by beneficiaries	29
3.4 Distribution	33
3.4.1 Repayment	33
3.4.2 Reasons for Non-repayment	33
3.4.3 Repayment Rates By Gender.....	34
3.4.4 Informal Distribution Of Seed Through Sales And Gifts.	34

3.5	Socio-Economic Impact Of The Project.	36
3.5.1	Standard of living.....	36
3.5.2	Benefits from project.	37
3.5.3	Negative Impact Of The Project.	38
3.5.4	Major Challenges In Groundnut Production	39
3.5.5	Marketing Issues.	40
3.5.6	Value Addition	41
3.5.7	Market Access Problems.....	42
3.6	Conclusion.....	43
4.	Appendices	44

List of Tables

<i>Table 1 Distribution of Sex of Respondents</i>	5
<i>Table 2a Sex of Household Head, Beneficiaries</i>	5
<i>Table 2b, Non beneficiaries-Neighbours</i>	6
<i>Table 2c, Non beneficiaries- Parish</i>	6
<i>Table 3. Distribution of Education</i>	6
<i>Table 4. Average Household Composition</i>	7
<i>Table 5. Sources of Household Income</i>	8
<i>Table 6a. Cash Crop Priorities for Beneficiaries Before Project</i>	9
<i>Table 6b. Cash Crop Priorities for Beneficiaries In 2004</i>	10
<i>Table 6c. Cash Crop Priorities for Non-Beneficiaries Before the Project</i>	10
<i>Table 6d. Cash Crop Priorities for Non-Beneficiaries In 2004</i>	11
<i>Table 7. Average Land Area Cultivated</i>	12
<i>Table 8a. Cropping Pattern for Beneficiaries Before the Project</i>	13
<i>Table 8b. Cropping Pattern for Beneficiaries In 2004</i>	13
<i>Table 8c. Cropping Pattern for Non-Beneficiaries Before the Project</i>	14
<i>Table 8d. Cropping Pattern for Non-Beneficiaries In 2004</i>	14
<i>Table 9. Changes in Staple Food Consumption for Beneficiaries and Non-beneficiaries</i>	15
<i>Table 10a. Sources of Information on Groundnut Production for Beneficiaries</i>	16
<i>Table 10b. Sources of Information on Groundnut Production For Non-Beneficiaries by Type of Respondent</i>	16
<i>Table 11. Training Attendance by Beneficiaries and Non-Beneficiaries</i>	17
<i>Table 12. Who Organized Training?</i>	17
<i>Table 13. Ideas from Training</i>	18
<i>Table 14. Adoption of Improved Production Practices</i>	19
<i>Table 15 Benefits from Training</i>	22
<i>Figure 1 Change in Groundnut Varieties Grown Over Time</i>	23
<i>Figure 2 Sources of Seed for Beneficiaries</i>	23
<i>Figure 4 Sources of Seed for Non Beneficiaries in the Neighborhood</i>	24
<i>Table 16a Variety Assessment by Beneficiaries and Non-Beneficiaries</i>	27
<i>Table 16b Variety Assessment Summary</i>	28
<i>Table 17 Projected total Hectares by District</i>	29
<i>Table 18 Projected Total Beneficiaries by District</i>	29
<i>Table 19 Overall Average Quantity Received per Beneficiary</i>	29
<i>Table 20 Average Quantity Received by Men and Women (Basins)</i>	30
<i>Table 22 Estimated Total Number of Bags Produced from Seed Distributed by the Project</i>	30

<i>Table 24 Projected Total Area Planted by Beneficiaries saved seed by district, 2002-2004</i>	<i>31</i>
<i>Table 25 Projected Total Production by district (kg)</i>	<i>31</i>
<i>Table 26 Projected Total Area Planted 2002-2004 from Seed Given and Replanted, by district</i>	<i>32</i>
<i>Table 27 Total estimated production for 2004 only (kg)</i>	<i>32</i>
<i>Table 28 Estimated Total who Repaid by Variety.....</i>	<i>33</i>
<i>Table 29 Reasons for Non-Repayment.....</i>	<i>33</i>
<i>Table 30 Projected Total Repayment Gender by Variety</i>	<i>34</i>
<i>Table 31 Estimated number of Beneficiaries who Sold Seed by Variety</i>	<i>35</i>
<i>Table 32 Estimated Total Number of Farmers Who Bought Seed by Variety.....</i>	<i>35</i>
<i>Table 33 Estimated Number other people Given Seed as Gifts</i>	<i>35</i>
<i>Table 34 Estimated Total Area That Can Be Planted By This Seed by District</i>	<i>35</i>
<i>Table 35a Change Of Standard Of Living by Gender By Category.....</i>	<i>36</i>
<i>Table 35b Reasons for Change in Standard of Living</i>	<i>37</i>
<i>Table 36a Benefits from Groundnuts Multiplication</i>	<i>37</i>
<i>Table 36b Assets Bought.....</i>	<i>38</i>
<i>Table 37 Major Challenges in Groundnut Production.....</i>	<i>39</i>
<i>Table 38a. Point Of Sale For Groundnuts.....</i>	<i>40</i>
<i>Table 38b Average Price of Groundnuts</i>	<i>41</i>
<i>Table 38c How Did You Sell It</i>	<i>41</i>
<i>Table 38d Number Who Add Value To Groundnut.....</i>	<i>41</i>
<i>Table 38e How Add Value to your crops?</i>	<i>41</i>
<i>Table 38f Market Access Problems.....</i>	<i>42</i>
<i>Appendix 2. Staple Food Consumption Patterns for Beneficiaries and Non-Beneficiaries.....</i>	<i>46</i>

Impact Assessment Report for Farmer Led Multiplication of Rosette Resistant Groundnut Varieties

1. Executive Summary

The project entitled Farmer-Led Multiplication of Rosette Resistant Groundnut Varieties for Eastern Uganda is funded by the Crop Protection Programme of DFID under contract with NR International.

This three-year project was aimed at addressing the problem of low groundnut production caused by groundnut rosette disease through provision of rosette resistant varieties to the poor households for multiplication. The Project was expected to achieve the following targets:

- ❖ *Annual production of groundnuts by 9,000 poor participating farmers of whom 50% should be women, increased by 50% by EOP;*
- ❖ *16 Extension staff, 300 community leaders (160 contact farmers and 140 local leaders), and 2000 households trained in groundnut seed production, storage and multiplication;*
- ❖ *Sufficient foundation seed to plant 400 acres (161.9 Ha) of new varieties obtained and multiplied by EOP;*
- ❖ *Redistribution and further multiplication of selected groundnut varieties produces sufficient seed to plant at least 2,500 Ha by EOP;*
- ❖ *Local leadership takes responsibility for planning, implementing, and monitoring a pro-poor strategy of planting material redistribution during the last year of the project.*

An extensive survey was conducted in September 2004 to assess the impact of the project to date.

Analysis of survey findings reveals that the intended project purpose has significantly been achieved. as demonstrated by the following:

- ✓ *3 new varieties, namely Serenut 2, 3 and 4, which are resistant to groundnut rosette disease have been introduced to farmers over the 3 years of the project.*
- ✓ *The varieties have been evaluated by the beneficiaries and have been accepted for being rosette resistant, tolerant to drought, high yielding and good tasting among other attributes*
- ✓ *Seed availability for the introduced varieties has increased substantially and large quantities are being sold enabling other non participating farmers to benefit thus disseminating the new varieties.*
- ✓ *Up to 17,154 people have accessed the seed through the formal project arrangements, sales and gifts by individuals. This is 8,154 more than the projected target of 9000 recipients. 3,634 beneficiaries received directly from the project, 5,910 obtained through purchase of seed from farmer multipliers and 7,610 through gifts or payments in kind.*
- ✓ *52% of beneficiaries are women who benefiting by accessing the seed and from the resultant production. Benefits are evenly spread between men and women.*
- ✓ *Redistribution of the varieties is continually increasing under the guidance of local leadership, but at somewhat less than anticipated repayment rate*
- ✓ *Seed to plant 3,275.6 hectares has been given out. Of this distribution direct from project was sufficient to plant 1,092 hectares. An additional 2,183.6 hectares is projected to have been planted through seed sales and gifts. The resulting total is far more than 2,500 ha total in the original target.*

- ✓ *Estimated production from 2004 alone can plant up to 4,725.8 hectares if all is committed to seed.*
- ✓ *Use of home saved is the most reliable way groundnuts farmers ensure seed availability and is being widely practiced by beneficiary farmers.*
- ✓ *Training of FPRAs, local leaders and farmers was done. 93.6% of the beneficiaries (3402 people) were trained by the project. This is a lot more than the target of 2000 farmers. Training capacity is now well established among the local leaders and extension staff.*
- ✓ *Ideas from the training were widely adopted and helped to increase production and ensure seed quality.*
- ✓ *Local leaders i.e. Parish Development Committees (PDCs) and Group level Production Committees (PCs) have been involved in the whole process of training and redistribution.*
- ✓ *Agricultural activities are constrained by weather and socio economic factors thus the desired multiplication and repayment rates were not met fully. The project area suffered a significant drought in four of the six seasons of project implementation. This clearly demonstrated the importance of drought resistance as a characteristic of improved groundnut varieties.*
- ✓ *The respondents did not identify any significant negative project impacts, however the challenge of marketing the growing groundnut surplus seems to be an important emerging issue.*

The project has generally achieved its purpose and contributed to improved livelihoods of the target communities through availability of reliable groundnut varieties leading to increased groundnut production contributing to increased food and income availability in the project area.

Unfortunately it was not possible to assess whether annual groundnut production by the beneficiary households had actually increased by 50% by end of project. The design of both the baseline data and the impact survey were faulty in this regard and did not provide sufficient detail to be able to specifically address this question.

2. Introduction

2.1. General Background

The project entitled “Farmer Led Multiplication of Rosette Resistant Groundnuts Varieties for Eastern Uganda” is a three-year project funded by DFID Crop Protection Programme managed by Natural Resources International (NRI) Ltd and implemented by AT Uganda Ltd. The Project was a result of a call for proposals for promotional projects to promote or apply (disseminate) research outputs of NRI Crop Protection Program. The Project operates in 5 districts of Eastern Uganda namely Kumi, Pallisa, Tororo, Mbale and Sironko.; and began on 1st February 2002 and will end on 31st March 2005.

2.2. Area Description

The project operates in sixteen (16) sub-counties. The sub-counties include: Nabuyoga, Nagongera, Mazimasa, and Kachonga in Tororo district; Lyama, Kadama, Kasodo, Butebo in Pallisa district; Kidongole, Malera, Nyero and Ngora in Kumi district; Bukhalu, Butandiga in Sironko district and Busiu and Butiru in Mbale district. In each sub-county the project operates in two parishes and with ten farmer groups with a total membership of **4217** farmers

in the 160 groups. These groups earlier participated in seed multiplication under LIFE project earlier implemented by AT Uganda Ltd.

The area falls in the montane (Mbale and Sironko) and Teso farming systems characterized by crop – livestock mixture. The dominant annual food crops include beans, Groundnuts, finger millet, cassava, sorghum and maize. However, Mbale and Sironko differ from the rest of the region in that in addition to the food crops mentioned above bananas are also grown for food and income. Cotton is a common industrial crop in the Teso systems, Sironko and lowlands of Mbale, while Arabica Coffee is the main commercial crop grown in the medium and high altitude areas of Mbale where it is intercropped with bananas.

2.3. Project Summary/Background

The baseline survey for an earlier project (LIFE Project) in the same project area identified the need to address groundnut rosette disease as a major constraint to groundnuts production, a major crop grown for food and income; thus the basis for focus on groundnuts as a crop.

Considering that groundnut seed rate is high and the risk of crop failure from rosette disease is high, lack of seed is a major reason why poor households don't grow Groundnuts, even though groundnut production is very profitable. Eastern Uganda used to produce large quantities, however, decline in production is explained by the lack of cash to buy chemicals to control rosette. Therefore rosette control through disease and vector resistance is more economical, sustainable, and appropriate, especially for resource poor farmers.

To address this situation this project promotes farmer-led multiplication of rosette resistant Groundnuts varieties by poor households under the supervision of local authorities. It is expected to increase Groundnuts production and ensure that poor people have access to new varieties through delivery of the following outputs:

- Extension staff, local authorities and farmers trained in Groundnuts production, multiplication and storage;
- Foundation seed for new rosette resistant varieties obtained and multiplied by farmers group members;
- Multipliers return double the amount of planting materials received, for redistribution and further multiplication;
- The process of collection, redistribution and monitoring of multiplied seed effectively handed over to local leadership for management.

The project design is basically that of a dissemination project and not a research project. Lessons from previous projects indicate that farmer led multiplication of improved varieties is one way to ensure that poor but able farmers access and utilize improved varieties, practices and knowledge required for increased productivity.

2.4. Project Targets.

The Project is expected to achieve the following targets:

- ❖ Annual production of groundnuts by 9000 poor participating farmers of whom 50% should be women, increased by 50% by EOP;
- ❖ 16 Extension staff, 300 community leaders (160 contact farmers and 140 local leaders), 2000 households trained in groundnut seed production, storage and multiplication;
- ❖ Sufficient foundation seed to plant 400 acres (161.9 Ha) of new varieties obtained and multiplied by EOP;
- ❖ Redistribution and further multiplication of selected groundnut varieties produces sufficient seed to plant at least 2500 Ha by EOP;

- ❖ Local leadership takes responsibility for planning, implementing, and monitoring a pro poor strategy of planting material redistribution during the last year of the project.

2.5. Project Approach/Methodology

The model for multiplication of seed used is a replication with modifications of a project approach already practiced with other crops in an earlier project implemented by AT Uganda Ltd. (LIFE Project) with the same stakeholders. The approach emphasizes participation of key stakeholders in this case beneficiary farmer groups, Production Committees (PCs), Parish Development Committees (PDCs), Extension Staff who work as Farmer Participatory Research Assistants (FPRAs) and sub-county local government authorities in planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluating project activities.

The Process Involves;

- a) Training of FPRAs as trainers on groundnuts production
- b) Setting up of local leadership structures at group level i.e. PCs to handle seed multiplication issues and another structure at parish level PDCs to coordinate and monitor the groups. Each group is represented on the PDC, which also has local government representatives from the village and parish level, especially local councilors and the parish chief.
- c) Participatory identification and assignment of roles to the local leadership i.e. PC and PDCs to ensure seed given out is protected and repaid for further multiplication. Their roles include among others training of beneficiaries on groundnuts production,(farmer-led extension), monitoring management of crops in the field, facilitating identification of beneficiaries, distribution and recovery of seed for redistribution, and keeping record of beneficiaries.
- d) Delivery of seed by the project to individuals in groups is based on distribution plans i.e. plan of how multiplication should take place and the order in which new materials should filter through the group members to ensure that all have access within the shortest possible time. The plan is drawn up by groups assisted by PCs and PDCs considering the able poor and women as a priority to receive seed first.
- e) Acknowledgement of receipt of seed and multiplication terms, especially on quantities to be paid back, is signed by all beneficiaries, and in the interest of accountability, transparency, and easy follow up, witnessed by PDCs at group/public meetings.
- f) Local leaders keep a register of all receipts.
- g) Beneficiaries are responsible for custody and storage of seed since distribution is done soon after harvest, and provide land and labor to produce the crop.

2.6. Survey Methodology

The survey was carried out to evaluate the achievement of the project outputs and purpose. The survey was based on a multi-stage sample from the entire project area. Sampling of sub counties, parishes, groups, and respondents was completely random. In sampling the sub counties, the number of participating sub counties in a district was considered. Two sub counties were selected in Districts with four sub-counties and one for those with two. One parish was sampled in each sub county and three groups in each parish. In each group ten members were sampled. A total of 8 sub counties, 8 parishes, 24 groups, and 240 group members were thus sampled.

A control group was also sampled including five people who were neighbors to beneficiaries sampled in each group. The neighbours were randomly selected, thus 15 were sampled in each sub county. A total of 120 non-beneficiary neighbours were thus picked for interview..

A parish not neighboring the participating parish in the sub county was randomly picked from among the non-participating parishes, and 15 households were randomly picked from one village, which was also picked at random. A total of 120 non-beneficiary respondents were thus sampled from this category to test for diffusion outside of the project parishes.

Enumerators based in the parishes were identified and trained to conduct the survey. Consideration was taken to ensure both neutrality and familiarity with the local language. Development of survey questionnaires and training of the enumerators was facilitated by a biometrician from the Faculty of Agriculture at Makerere University in Kampala Uganda. The survey was conducted in the last two weeks of September 2004. Analysis of data was done by a hired statistician, in consultation with the Project Leader, who has vast skills in data analysis.

3. Survey Findings

3.1. General Socio-Economic Information

General Socio-economic information was collected on both the beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries sampled. The following analysis presents a general background on the sample characteristics and the livelihoods strategies of people in the project area.

Distribution Of Sex Of Respondents

Table 1 Distribution of Sex of Respondents

Category	Male		Female		Total count
	Count	%	Count	%	
Beneficiaries	95	40	145	60	240
NB = Neighbours	66	55	54	45	120
NB = Parish	79	66	41	34	120

Findings indicate that of the respondents sampled and surveyed, 40% were male and 60% female. This was based on a random sample. However, it should be noted that the project was targeting to reach at least 50% women, and the overall project population is actually estimated to comprise about 52% female group members.

Figures for non-beneficiary parish clearly have more men. The lists used for sampling were those of household heads in the village. For non-beneficiaries neighbors, all neighboring households were listed and also picked at random.

Clearly among beneficiaries more women were represented but occurred by chance since the sampling was random. It does, however, tend to confirm the fact that the project actual reached more than 50% women.

Distribution Of Sex Of Household Head By Sex Of Respondent

Table 2a Sex of Household Head, Beneficiaries

Sex of resp	Male headed		Female headed		Total Beneficiaries
	Count	%	Count	%	
Male	94	99	1	1	95
Female	121	83	24	17	145

All resp	215	90	25	10	240
----------	-----	----	----	----	-----

Table 2b, Non beneficiaries-Neighbours

Sex of resp	Male headed		Female headed		Total Non-beneficiary Neighbours
	Count	%	Count	%	
Male	66	100	0	0	66
Female	44	81	10	19	54
All resp	110	92	10	8	120

Table 2c, Non beneficiaries- Parish

Sex of resp	Male headed		Female headed		Total Non-beneficiary Parish
	Count	%	Count	%	
Male	78	99	1	1	79
Female	33	80	8	20	41
All resp	111	93	9	8	120

Analysis of the distribution of sex of household head by sex of respondent shows that;

- ❖ For beneficiaries (table 2a), 90% of all respondents came from male-headed households and only 10% from female-headed households. 99% of male respondents came from male-headed households and only 1% from female-headed household. Meanwhile 83% of female respondents came from male-headed households and 17% from female-headed households.
- ❖ For non-beneficiary neighbors (table 2b) 92% of all respondents came from male-headed households and 8% from female-headed households. 100% of all male respondents came from male-headed households, while 81% of female respondents came from male-headed households & 19% from female-headed households.
- ❖ For non-beneficiary parish (table 2c), 93% of all respondents came from male headed households; 7% from female headed households. 99% of the male respondents came from male headed household and only 1% from female headed households. 80% of female respondents came from male headed households and only 20% from female headed households.

It is clear that households in the communities in the project area are predominately male headed (92%) and few (8%) are female headed. About 81% of all females come from male-headed households and have no resources (production) of their own. so have to depend on what the head of the household offers.

Success of the project in a predominately male dominated setting is a sign of clear understanding of project by male heads or because these men are also members of the groups and group byelaws were very clear.

Distribution of Respondents by Education status

Table 3. Distribution of Education

Formal Education	Beneficiaries		Non Beneficiaries	
	Count	%	Count	%
Illiterate	39	16%	24	10%
Primary	126	53%	143	60%
Secondary	51	21%	53	22%

Tertiary	23	10%	18	8%
No information	1	0%	2	1%
	240	100%	240	100%

Findings indicate that 16% illiterates were reached by the project compared to the 10% proportion in the community. The largest proportion of both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries is comprised of those that reached primary level with a slightly higher proportion among non-beneficiaries. The proportion of those who reached secondary and tertiary is almost similar for both categories.

This confirms that the composition of beneficiaries is generally representative of that of the community they live in and definitely more effort was put in reaching more poor households, the illiterate and primary categories, without leaving out the other categories. The secondary and tertiary categories play an important role and are instrumental in assisting with record keeping in the groups.

Household Composition

Table 4. Average Household Composition

Average Family composition	Beneficiary HH	Non Ben HH
part male child	0.12	0.06
part male youth	0.59	0.48
part male adult	1.37	1.22
part male elder	0.16	0.10
part female child	0.14	0.08
part female youth	0.71	0.53
part female adult	1.45	1.34
part female elder	0.08	0.10
non-part male child	1.18	1.18
non-part male youth	0.23	0.27
non-part male adult	0.17	0.11
non-part male elder	0.02	0.05
non-part female child	0.98	1.33
non-part female youth	0.27	0.26
non-part female adult	0.12	0.07
non-part female elder	0.06	0.08
Total HH	7.66	7.28

Summary composition	Beneficiary HH	Non Ben HH
Male child	1.30	1.24
male youth	0.83	0.74
Male adult	1.54	1.33
Male elder	0.18	0.15
Female child	1.13	1.42
Female youth	0.98	0.79
Female adult	1.57	1.41
female elder	0.14	0.18
Total HH	7.66	7.28
	Beneficiary HH	Non Ben HH
Male adult	1.54	1.33
Male dependents	2.30	2.14
Female Adult	1.57	1.41
Female dependents	2.25	2.39

Total HH	7.66	7.28
	Beneficiary HH	Non Ben HH
Dependency Ratio	1.46	1.65

	Beneficiary HH	Non Ben HH
Participating Adults	2.82	2.5649
Labor Equiv of Other part	0.84	0.64
Non part dependents	3.04	3.364
	6.69	6.569

Survey analysis indicates that the average size of the households in the project area is 8 (7.66 & 7.28) for both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, with the same proportion of males and females.

These households have on average 3 adults involved in farming activities, with low participation of children in farming activities (largely as a result of recent development in universal primary education.) Each household has a labor force equivalent to 4 adults and on average has about 3 dependants. Generally there is low participation of children in farm work with apparently no difference between the female and male child. However, there is slightly more female labor compared to male labor. The trend is similar for both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries though the latter group has slightly more dependants.

Apparently there is a small or low family labor force. This puts a lot of demands on the family labor at times of peak labor demand, especially during weeding and harvest. Thus requiring additional labour, which they have to hire or seek other alternatives; such as provide part of the harvest in exchange for labor. This was the case especially for groundnuts, which led to high informal distribution of the new varieties because many could not afford to pay cash for labor and workers requested payment in kind because the new varieties were highly prized.

Sources of household income

Table 5. Sources of Household Income

Sources of Income	2002						2004					
	Beneficiary			Non beneficiary			Beneficiary			Non beneficiary		
	count	%	Avg Rank	count	%	Avg Rank	count	%	Avg Rank	count	%	Avg Rank
Farming	240	100.0%	1.02	239	100%	1.03	239	99.6%	1.02	237	98.8%	1.03
Trade	26	10.8%	1.92	27	11%	1.93	26	10.8%	1.96	26	10.8%	1.96
Employment	26	10.8%	1.96	22	9%	1.91	28	11.7%	1.89	25	10.4%	1.72
Animal Rearing	10	4.2%	2.20	12	5.0%	2.25	14	5.8%	2.29	0	0.0%	-
Other Non-Farm	3	1.3%	2.00	1	0%	0.00	2	0.8%	2.00	3	1.3%	-

99.9% of households surveyed indicated farming as the major source of income including those who are involved in trade and the employed. Trade and employment come next, and are very close in rank. Unfortunately the enumerators did not make a clear distinction between formal employment and casual labour, so it is not possible to distinguish between the two in

the survey results. This is clearly a shortcoming in the data. The survey results also seem to indicate a very low involvement in non-farm income generating activities for both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. Practical experience however, would tend to indicate that this is likely to be more a reflection of the failure to probe adequately on the part of the enumerators, who simply accepted the response of farming as the main source of income without asking further.

Despite the weakness of the data, however, it is clear that households in the area are heavily dependent on farming for their rural livelihoods. This calls for efforts to make farming more profitable and productive if households are to earn more money. There is also need for interventions that minimize risk of crop failure to ensure stable rural incomes. High dependence on farming also has a direct effect on the availability of cash for farm inputs and farming operation and on land use and availability

Crop Contribution To Household Income

Table 6a. Cash Crop Priorities for Beneficiaries Before Project

Beneficiaries Before		Cassava	Cotton	Gnuts	Other Legumes	Maize	Millet	Rice	Sorghum	Sweet Potato
Kumi	total number	35	8	35	17	20	18	1	7	17
	Percent growing	58%	13%	58%	28%	33%	30%	2%	12%	28%
	Average Rank	2.0	1.4	2.0	2.9	1.3	2.2	3.0	3.7	1.8
Pallisa	total number	45	52	39	28	36	32	36	38	30
	Percent growing	75%	87%	65%	47%	60%	53%	60%	63%	50%
	Average Rank	4.3	1.8	3.8	7.0	5.2	3.6	3.2	4.0	6.5
Tororo	total number	50	11	38	29	48	48	22	26	29
	Percent growing	83%	18%	63%	48%	80%	80%	37%	43%	48%
	Average Rank	2.2	4.6	3.1	4.3	2.7	2.7	3.0	3.5	4.1
Mbale	total number	10	0	11	24	29	28	0	14	16
	Percent growing	33%	0%	37%	80%	97%	93%	0%	47%	53%
	Average Rank	3.0	0.0	4.0	2.6	1.5	2.9	0.0	3.8	4.3
Sironko	total number	6	24	24	30	29	19	0	0	5
	Percent growing	20%	80%	80%	100%	97%	63%	0%	0%	17%
	Average Rank	4.3	3.2	4.1	2.0	1.0	4.1	0.0	0.0	4.6
Overall	total number	146	95	147	128	162	145	59	85	97
	Percent growing	61%	40%	61%	53%	68%	60%	25%	35%	40%
	Average Rank	2.9	2.5	3.2	3.9	2.6	3.0	3.1	3.8	4.5
	Overall Rank	3	7	2	5	1	4	9	8	6

Table 6b. Cash Crop Priorities for Beneficiaries In 2004

Beneficiaries 2004		Cassava	Cotton	Gnuts	Other Legumes	Maize	Millet	Rice	Sorghum	Sweet Potato
Kumi	total number	30	1	45	12	21	12	3	4	21
	Percent growing	50%	2%	75%	20%	35%	20%	5%	7%	35%
	Average Rank	2.4	2.0	1.8	2.9	1.5	2.1	1.0	3.5	1.6
Pallisa	total number	40	44	39	27	32	30	35	39	32
	Percent growing	67%	73%	65%	45%	53%	50%	58%	65%	53%
	Average Rank	3.6	2.6	4.5	6.7	4.8	3.0	3.4	3.9	6.5
Tororo	total number	42	13	51	25	37	33	15	31	26
	Percent growing	70%	22%	85%	42%	62%	55%	25%	52%	43%
	Average Rank	2.6	4.0	2.8	4.6	3.1	2.1	3.2	3.0	4.0
Mbale	total number	10	1	27	24	22	24	0	12	13
	Percent growing	33%	3%	90%	80%	73%	80%	0%	40%	43%
	Average Rank	3.9	3.0	1.3	2.6	3.0	3.3	0.0	4.2	3.9
Sironko	total number	20	4	30	30	30	22	0	0	3
	Percent growing	67%	13%	100%	100%	100%	73%	0%	0%	10%
	Average Rank	4.4	4.5	2.9	2.1	1.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	5.0
Overall	total number	142	63	192	118	142	121	53	86	95
	Percent growing	59%	26%	80%	49%	59%	50%	22%	36%	40%
	Average Rank	3.2	3.0	2.7	3.9	2.8	2.9	3.2	3.6	4.3
	Overall Rank	2	7	1	4	2	3	8	6	5

Table 6c. Cash Crop Priorities for Non-Beneficiaries Before the Project

Non-Beneficiaries Before		Cassava	Cotton	Gnuts	Other Legumes	Maize	Millet	Rice	Sorghum	Sweet Potato
Kumi	total number	31	6	14	15	26	19	7	5	16
	Percent growing	52%	10%	23%	25%	43%	32%	12%	8%	27%
	Average Rank	2.0	1.2	2.1	2.4	1.5	1.9	1.1	3.0	1.3
Pallisa	total number	38	50	40	27	36	32	32	38	29
	Percent growing	63%	83%	67%	45%	60%	53%	53%	63%	48%
	Average Rank	4.1	1.9	4.0	7.2	3.9	3.5	4.4	4.2	6.4
Tororo	total number	43	13	35	34	43	43	20	24	18
	Percent growing	72%	22%	58%	57%	72%	72%	33%	40%	30%
	Average Rank	2.5	2.6	3.3	3.9	2.4	2.7	2.3	3.2	4.0
Mbale	total number	9	2	4	29	24	23	2	9	17
	Percent growing	30%	7%	13%	97%	80%	77%	7%	30%	57%
	Average Rank	4.1	3.0	3.8	1.9	1.5	3.0	3.0	4.2	4.3
Sironko	total number	13	22	15	30	30	10	0	0	3
	Percent growing	43%	73%	50%	100%	100%	33%	0%	0%	10%
	Average Rank	3.8	3.0	3.8	2.0	1.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	4.7
Overall	total number	134	93	108	135	159	127	61	76	83
	Percent growing	56%	39%	45%	56%	66%	53%	25%	32%	35%
	Average Rank	3.1	2.3	3.5	3.5	2.2	3.0	3.3	3.8	4.4
	Overall Rank	3	6	5	2	1	4	9	8	7

Table 6d. Cash Crop Priorities for Non-Beneficiaries In 2004

Non-Beneficiaries 2004		Cassava	Cotton	Gnuts	Other Legumes	Maize	Millet	Rice	Sorghum	Sweet Potato
Kumi	total number	18	1	19	18	24	11	9	1	23
	Percent growing	30%	2%	32%	30%	40%	18%	15%	2%	38%
	Average Rank	2.4	2.0	2.4	2.2	1.4	1.4	1.3	3.0	1.1
Pallisa	total number	32	32	35	27	36	32	33	33	31
	Percent growing	53%	53%	58%	45%	60%	53%	55%	55%	52%
	Average Rank	4.3	3.0	4.9	6.2	3.6	2.8	4.4	4.0	6.0
Tororo	total number	44	25	32	27	44	41	24	26	19
	Percent growing	73%	42%	53%	45%	73%	68%	40%	43%	32%
	Average Rank	2.9	3.2	3.1	3.8	2.7	3.0	2.7	3.3	4.5
Mbale	total number	9	2	6	28	20	20	2	9	19
	Percent growing	30%	7%	20%	93%	67%	67%	7%	30%	63%
	Average Rank	3.7	3.5	2.7	1.8	1.8	3.5	3.0	3.8	4.2
Sironko	total number	17	7	27	30	30	18	0	3	3
	Percent growing	57%	23%	90%	100%	100%	60%	0%	10%	10%
	Average Rank	3.9	3.9	3.1	2.0	1.0	4.3	0.0	4.7	5.0
Overall	total number	120	67	119	130	154	122	68	72	95
	Percent growing	50%	28%	50%	54%	64%	51%	28%	30%	40%
	Average Rank	3.4	3.2	3.5	3.2	3	3.1	3.4	3.7	4.1
	Overall Rank	4	9	5	2	1	3	8	7	6

Among crops grown for income i.e. cassava, cotton, groundnuts, legumes, maize, millet, rice, sorghum and sweet potato, only groundnuts clearly had a high positive overall increase of 19% of people growing it for income. The rest of the crops clearly declined.

Groundnuts also had its ranking as a source of income move from 2nd place to 1st place among beneficiaries, however it maintained at 5th place among non-beneficiaries.

The increase in groundnuts is clearly a result of project intervention, although we do note that the percentage of households growing the crop for income before this project was not the same for beneficiaries as non-beneficiaries. The difference in the starting point is believed to be the result of earlier project group demonstration activities on groundnut production. The demonstrations were supplemented by training in Farming as A Business (FAAB), which analyzed the returns to various crops and helped farmers to realize how profitable groundnut production could be.

The steady rise throughout the project area can be attributed to introduction of new varieties to the beneficiaries. However, among non-beneficiaries there was also a significant increase in numbers growing the resistant varieties in Sironko. This could be due to a slump in prices of other key crops grown (maize & beans) while groundnuts, which were a relatively new crop in the area, became more profitable.

Each district clearly has its own combination of major crops grown for income. It can be seen however, by the improved average ranking, that groundnuts is clearly gaining importance as a source of income in the project area.

Land Area Cultivated

Table 7. Average Land Area Cultivated

Area of land cultivated	Beneficiary				Non-Beneficiary			
	2001		2004		2001		2004	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<.5 acres	1	0.4%	1	0.4%	7	2.9%	8	3.3%
.5-1 acres	15	6.3%	6	2.5%	29	12.1%	21	8.8%
1-3 acres	121	50.4%	96	40.0%	99	41.3%	104	43.3%
>3-5 acres	86	35.8%	90	37.5%	81	33.8%	72	30.0%
>5 acres	15	6.3%	44	18.3%	21	8.8%	34	14.2%
no data	2	0.8%	3	1.3%	3	1.3%	1	0.4%
Total	240	100.0%	240	100.0%	240	100.0%	240	100.0%
Overall Average	3.23 acres		3.91 acres		3.24 acres		3.54 acres	

For beneficiaries the area cultivated generally increased over the life of the project for many households. The majority, however fall in the category of “1 to 3 acres” with the next largest category having “more than 3 to 5 acres”. A significant proportion (12%) moved to the category of more than 5 acres, leading to a reduction in the number falling into the category of 0.5 to 1 acres. The average area cultivated increased from 3.23 acres in 2001 to 3.91 acres in 2004.

However, non-beneficiaries report a higher proportion with “less than 1 acre”, at 15% in 2001 with a decline to 12% in 2004. This is on the upper side compared to 6.7% for beneficiaries. The trend for other categories is similar to that of the beneficiaries. The average land size for this group only increased from 3.24 to 3.54 acres in 2004 – a much smaller increase than for beneficiaries.

The average area cultivated indicates both labour and land limitations. This may be part of the reason for the reduction in the quantities of seed distributed per beneficiary from the original 4 basins at the start (enough to plant half acre) to between 1 to 3 basins at the end of the project. The quantities given to each beneficiary is also affected however, by the desire to make sure all group members receive in good time. There is also a difference in the relative importance attached to groundnuts as a cash crop in some areas. For example, groundnuts are less well established in Sironko and Mbale where beans and maize are the key cash crops.

Crop Contribution To Household Income In Terms Of Areas Under Crop

Table 8a. Cropping Pattern for Beneficiaries Before the Project

Beneficiaries Before		Beans	Cassava	cotton	Gnuts	Maize	Millet	Potatoes	Sorghum
Kumi	total number	10	55	9	47	25	24	18	11
	Percent growing	16.7%	91.7%	15.0%	78.3%	41.7%	40.0%	30.0%	18.3%
	Average Rank	3.4	2.2	2.1	1.9	3.0	2.3	2.8	3.8
Pallisa	total number	13	43	47	41	24	39	18	43
	Percent growing	21.7%	71.7%	78.3%	68.3%	40.0%	65.0%	30.0%	71.7%
	Average Rank	4.4	2.6	2.4	3.5	3.5	2.7	4.3	3.2
Tororo	total number	19	49	5	40	47	48	26	25
	Percent growing	31.7%	81.7%	8.3%	66.7%	78.3%	80.0%	43.3%	41.7%
	Average Rank	4.0	2.2	4.0	3.4	2.8	2.0	3.6	3.3
Mbale	total number	25	11	0	11	29	28	18	13
	Percent growing	83.3%	36.7%	0.0%	36.7%	96.7%	93.3%	60.0%	43.3%
	Average Rank	2.4	3.0	0.000	4.0	1.6	2.8	4.3	3.9
Sironko	total number	30	7	23	23	30	18	5	0
	Percent growing	100.0%	23.3%	76.7%	76.7%	100.0%	60.0%	16.7%	0.0%
	Average Rank	2.1	4.0	3.2	3.9	1.1	4.2	4.6	0.000
Overall	total number	97	165	84	162	155	157	85	92
	Percent growing	40%	69%	35%	68%	65%	65%	35%	38%
	Average Rank	3.0	2.5	2.7	3.1	2.4	2.6	3.8	3.4
	Overall Rank	4	1	6	2	3	3	6	5

Table 8b. Cropping Pattern for Beneficiaries In 2004

Beneficiaries 2004		Beans	Cassava	cotton	Gnuts	Maize	Millet	Potatoes	Sorghum
Kumi	total number	4	50	11	58	23	18	23	11
	Percent growing	6.7%	83.3%	18.3%	96.7%	38.3%	30.0%	38.3%	18.3%
	Average Rank	4.5	2.5	3.5	1.6	2.6	2.4	2.7	3.3
Pallisa	total number	11	40	39	49	22	36	27	41
	Percent growing	18.3%	66.7%	65.0%	81.7%	36.7%	60.0%	45.0%	68.3%
	Average Rank	4.6	3.0	2.5	3.6	3.5	2.4	4.0	2.5
Tororo	total number	15	42	13	56	38	37	21	26
	Percent growing	25.0%	70.0%	21.7%	93.3%	63.3%	61.7%	35.0%	43.3%
	Average Rank	4.3	2.5	3.5	2.7	2.8	2.0	3.8	3.1
Mbale	total number	28	12	1	27	24	24	14	13
	Percent growing	93.3%	40.0%	3.3%	90.0%	80.0%	80.0%	46.7%	43.3%
	Average Rank	2.6	0.000	3.0	1.1	2.9	3.4	4.4	4.2
Sironko	total number	30	19	4	30	30	22	5	1
	Percent growing	100.0%	63.3%	13.3%	100.0%	100.0%	73.3%	16.7%	3.3%
	Average Rank	2.1	4.3	4.8	3.0	1.1	4.3	4.4	5.0
Overall	total number	88	163	68	220	137	137	90	92
	Percent growing	37%	68%	28%	92%	57%	57%	38%	38%
	Average Rank	3.1	2.7	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.8	3.7	3.0
	Overall Rank	6	2	7	1	3	3	5	4

Table 8c. Cropping Pattern for Non-Beneficiaries Before the Project

Non-Beneficiaries Before		Beans	Cassava	Cotton	Gnuts	Maize	Millet	Potatoes	Sorghum
Kumi	total number	7	49	7	32	28	26	20	15
	Percent growing	11.7%	81.7%	11.7%	53.3%	46.7%	43.3%	33.3%	25.0%
	Average Rank	3.6	1.7	2.4	2.7	2.4	2.4	1.8	4.0
Pallisa	total number	3	50	44	37	28	42	18	44
	Percent growing	5.0%	83.3%	73.3%	61.7%	46.7%	70.0%	30.0%	73.3%
	Average Rank	4.7	3.3	2.6	3.0	3.1	2.2	4.2	3.1
Tororo	total number	22	43	14	35	44	43	17	20
	Percent growing	36.7%	71.7%	23.3%	58.3%	73.3%	71.7%	28.3%	33.3%
	Average Rank	3.6	2.3	3.2	3.3	2.5	2.5	3.1	3.1
Mbale	total number	29	8	2	4	28	23	19	10
	Percent growing	48.3%	13.3%	3.3%	6.7%	46.7%	38.3%	31.7%	16.7%
	Average Rank	1.8	3.8	3.0	3.8	1.5	3.3	4.4	4.1
Sironko	total number	28	13	22	16	30	11	3	0
	Percent growing	93.3%	43.3%	73.3%	53.3%	100.0%	36.7%	10.0%	0.0%
	Average Rank	2.1	3.6	3.1	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Overall	total number	89	163	89	124	158	145	77	89
	Percent growing	37%	68%	37%	52%	66%	60%	32%	37%
	Average Rank	2.6	2.6	2.8	2.7	1.9	2.3	3.2	3.4
	Overall Rank	5	1	6	4	2	3	8	7

Table 8d. Cropping Pattern for Non-Beneficiaries In 2004

Non-Beneficiaries 2004		Beans	Cassava	Cotton	Gnuts	Maize	Millet	Potatoes	Sorghum
Kumi	total number	10	48	0	48	29	19	24	16
	Percent growing	16.7%	80.0%	0.0%	80.0%	48.3%	31.7%	40.0%	26.7%
	Average Rank	3.8	1.9	0.0	2.6	1.9	3.3	1.8	3.4
Pallisa	total number	10	45	0	47	30	40	14	45
	Percent growing	16.7%	75.0%	0.0%	78.3%	50.0%	66.7%	23.3%	75.0%
	Average Rank	4.7	3.1	0.0	3.4	3.1	2.0	4.1	2.8
Tororo	total number	21	42	1	33	41	37	17	21
	Percent growing	35.0%	70.0%	1.7%	55.0%	68.3%	61.7%	28.3%	35.0%
	Average Rank	3.7	2.4	4.0	3.1	2.5	2.9	3.5	2.9
Mbale	total number	28	7	0	6	25	21	19	11
	Percent growing	46.7%	11.7%	0.0%	10.0%	41.7%	35.0%	31.7%	18.3%
	Average Rank	1.8	3.6	0.0	3.3	1.5	3.4	4.2	3.9
Sironko	total number	28	16	0	25	30	20	6	2
	Percent growing	93.3%	53.3%	0.0%	83.3%	100.0%	66.7%	20.0%	6.7%
	Average Rank	2.1	3.8	0.0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Overall	total number	97	158	1	159	155	137	80	95
	Percent growing	40%	66%	0.4%	66%	65%	57%	33%	40%
	Average Rank	2.8	2.6	4.0	2.5	1.9	2.3	3.0	3.0
	Overall Rank	5	2	8	1	3	4	7	6

For both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries overall groundnuts have assumed the 1st position in terms of area under the crop compared to other crops grown. The rest have slightly declined or remained the same.

The ranking also groundnuts improved as it declined for other crops. The ranking of area under crop for groundnuts moved from 4th to 1st place and from 2nd to 1st place among non-beneficiaries and beneficiaries respectively.

(There is apparently also a marked percentage increase for other crops promoted by AT Uganda's LIFE project. These include cassava, beans, millet, and sorghum). Groundnuts seems to have assumed more importance in Sironko and Mbale, which are predominantly maize and bean growing areas. Increased acreage devoted to a crop indicates a gain in importance for that crop, thus groundnuts is becoming more important throughout the project area.

Consumption of Groundnuts

Table 9. Changes in Staple Food Consumption for Beneficiaries and Non-beneficiaries

Staple Food Consumption	2002				2004			
	Beneficiary		Non beneficiary		Beneficiary		Non beneficiary	
Rating of Main Types of Sauce Consumed	Avg Rating	Overall Rank	Avg Rating	Overall Rank	Avg Rating	Overall Rank	Avg Rating	Overall Rank
Greens (without Gnuts)	1.71	1	1.55	1	1.85	1	1.63	1
Beans (without Gnuts)	1.87	2	1.73	2	1.93	4	1.77	2
Gnuts in combination with greens, legumes or meat	2.02	3	2.18	3	1.85	1	2.08	3
Groundnuts alone (binyewa)	2.08	4	2.25	5	1.89	3	2.13	4
Fish (without Gnuts)	2.13	5	2.18	3	2.07	5	2.14	5
Meat (without Gnuts)	2.44	6	2.47	6	2.34	6	2.42	6
Chicken (without Gnuts)	2.79	7	2.86	7	2.75	7	2.80	7
Cowpeas (without Gnuts)	2.98	8	2.93	8	3.05	8	2.96	8
Green grams (without Gnuts)	3.48	9	3.47	9	3.44	9	3.44	9

Note a rating of 1= Eaten Daily, 2= Frequently (2-3 times/week) 3= Occasionally, 4=rarely or never

Findings indicate that before the project groundnuts was consumed by most households in the project area, both beneficiary and non-beneficiary. Beans and greens without groundnuts and groundnuts in combination with other foods were the main sauces.

The trend has remained the same for non-beneficiaries, however, there is an improvement on the trend for beneficiaries with increased consumption of groundnuts in combinations with other foods and also increased consumption of groundnuts alone. Beans, cowpeas, and groundnuts clearly are a major plant protein source for most households as animal protein foods are rarely eaten except for fish.

The increase consumption can be attributed to greater availability of groundnuts as a result of increased production from the improved rosette resistant and drought tolerant varieties.

3.2. Training

Training formed a major part of the multiplication process. This was necessary to ensure that knowledge and skills for high production and seed quality are imparted to the beneficiaries. Beneficiary training was conducted at various levels by the extension staff (referred in the document as Farmer Participatory Research Assistants or FPRAs), the Parish Development Committees (PDC's) and Group Production Committees (PCs).

Sources Of Information On Groundnut Production

Table 10a. Sources of Information on Groundnut Production for Beneficiaries

District	FPRA		Prod Committee		PDC		Other Farmers		Brochures	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Kumi	-39	65%	-17	28%	-15	25%	-7	12%	-2	3%
Pallisa	-39	65%	-22	37%	-1	2%	-12	20%	0	0%
Tororo	-56	93%	-49	82%	-46	77%	-2	3%	-3	5%
Mbale	-5	17%	-20	67%	-5	17%	0	0%	0	0%
Sironko	-16	53%	-14	47%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Table 10b. Sources of Information on Groundnut Production For Non-Beneficiaries by Type of Respondent

District	FPRA		Prod Committee		PDC		Other Farmers		Brochures	
	nbn	nbp	nbn	nbp	nbn	nbp	Nbn	nbp	nbn	nbp
Kumi	20%	10%	0	0	0	0	57%	73%	0	3%
Pallisa	0	3%	3%	0	3%	0	80%	77%	0	0
Tororo	10%	7%	3%	3%	3%	3%	10%	23%	0	3%
Mbale	0	0	13%	0	7%	0	0	0	0	0
Sironko	0	0	0	0	0	0	93%	53%	0	0

(nbn= Neighbours, nbp = Parish)

Respondents were asked to identify the most important sources of information that helped them improve their groundnut production. Analysis of the data indicates that;

- ✓ FPRAs were the main source of information on groundnut production, followed by production committees (PCs) who are members of groups and then the PDCs.
- ✓ The high response given in Tororo is due to the fact that the FPRAs in the two sub-counties surveyed are not employed elsewhere and might have had more time to interact with farmers unlike in other sub-counties where FPRAs are also fulltime Government extension staff.
- ✓ The low response from Mbale is likely to be due to high level of delegation of training responsibility from the FPRA to the PDCs and PCs. Clearly production committees who play the role of contact farmers and group trainers and PDCs (local leaders) played an important role in promoting information flow on groundnut production. These are structures of local leadership that were put in place to ensure continuity of service delivery to communities in the absence of FPRAs and after project
- ✓ Low PDC participation in Pallisa and Sironko reflects the weakness of these structures in the sub counties surveyed.
- ✓ In Kumi, Pallisa and Tororo which happened to be groundnut growing areas other farmers, were another source of information. This also reflects the importance of the crop in those areas (see table 8b&8d). In such areas more information on the crop is available.
- ✓ Use of printed material is apparent low, with only 2 districts having responses indicating brochures as source of information on groundnuts. This raises questions on appropriateness of the use of the brochures, which were distributed to all beneficiaries.

This seems to indicate that community based trainers (PC) and other local leaders are an effective way of passing on information to other farmers. It also confirms that local leaders were trained and are working to ensure that others get trained.

Attendance Of Trainings By Beneficiaries

Table 11. Training Attendance by Beneficiaries and Non-Beneficiaries

Attendance by Beneficiaries				Attendance by Non-Beneficiaries			
District	Beneficiary			Neighbours		Parish	
	Count	%	Shared Information?	Count	%	Count	%
Kumi	53	88%	68%	4	7%	3	5%
Pallisa	49	82%	48%	2	3%	0	0%
Tororo	59	98%	87%	3	5%	4	7%
Mbale	30	100%	100%	3	10%	0	0%
Sironko	30	100%	20%	0	0%	0	0%

- ✓ Table 11 above shows that beneficiary attendance of organized trainings was very high for all the districts. 93.6% of the beneficiaries attended. That might explain the high level of adoption for most recommended practices. The percentage also agrees with the adoption rates reported by the districts, with Mbale and Sironko having the highest. Using these percentages, the projected estimate is that a total of 4,066 beneficiaries were trained. This clearly exceeds the project target of training 2,000 farmers.
- ✓ Findings also a significant level of information sharing. This helps to explain the adoption rates recorded among non-beneficiaries, indicating they might have accessed information through informal contact with Beneficiary farmers.
- ✓ The analysis also shows that other farmers who are non beneficiaries had very few alternative training opportunities.

Organization of Training

Table 12. Who Organized Training?

District	Beneficiaries								Non-Beneficiaries									
	FPR		Prod Committee		PDC		NAADS		FPR		Prod Committee		PDC		NAADS		Other	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Kumi	-43	72%	-12	20%	-19	32%	0	0%	-4	7%	-1	2%	-1	2%	-1	2%	-1	2%
Pallisa	-41	68%	-14	23%	-1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	-2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Tororo	-53	88%	-43	72%	-52	87%	-5	8%	-3	5%	-1	2%	-1	2%	-2	3%	-1	2%
Mbale	-3	10%	-13	43%	-16	53%	0	0%	0	0%	-2	7%	-1	3%	0	0%	0	0%
Sironko	-16	53%	-15	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Again the survey reveals that among beneficiaries most trainings were organized by FPRAs and others by PCs and PDCs this seems to confirm the response on source of information on table 11 and the trend is the same.

This confirms that training, took place and the role played by the FPRAs, local leaders (PDCs) and contact farmers (PCs) in training.

The indication of NAADs in Tororo is true as one of the surveyed sub-counties is also under the NAADs programme. The few responses on other organisers also indicate a low presence of other actors in the project area so the project was the main source of production information and training.

For non-beneficiaries table 12 suggests that the few who attended trainings actually attended training organized by the project through FPRA, PDCs, PCs. This is possible since the trainings were not restricted to beneficiaries only. This is further supported by the almost non-existence of training organized by others as indicated by the non-beneficiary responses.

The low proportions attending training also might indicate that there were a few interested farmers in the communities who wanted to benefit from the project, while others or did not bother since they were not part of the lined up beneficiaries.

Table 13. Ideas from Training

New ideas from training	Beneficiaries		Non-beneficiaries	
	Count	%	Count	%
Spacing	137	57%	17	7%
Row cropping	30	13%	8	3%
Storage & drying	86	36%	12	5%
Land prep & soil fertility	60	25%	12	5%
Planting	60	25%	14	6%
Weeding	76	32%	7	3%
Site selection	36	15%	5	2%
Improved production	46	19%	4	2%
Disease & pest control	39	16%	2	1%
Test for maturity	23	10%	5	2%
Savings	7	3%	0	0%
Marketing	11	5%	1	0%
Post Harvest handling	9	4%	6	3%
Varieties	6	3%	3	1%
Others	5	2%	1	0%
No answer	3	1%	45	19%
Total	634	264%	97	40%

Analysis of responses from beneficiaries shows many responses received in the areas of site selection, land preparation, soil fertility measures, planting, weeding, spacing, row cropping, storage and drying, disease and pest control, testing for maturity, varieties and post harvest handling. Of these areas the highest response of learning is in spacing with 57%, this is confirmed by the marked difference in adoption rates for spacing reported among beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. The training seems to have helped the beneficiaries

Proper storage, drying and weeding were the other areas frequently mentioned with 36% and 32% respectively. Land preparation, soil fertility and planting also had 25%. These are areas critical for high production of quality seed. Beneficiaries also seemed to have reflected on trainings on savings and marketing received from AT Uganda in a previous project.

Clearly more beneficiaries were exposed to training as compared to non-beneficiaries this is based on the number and nature of responses given. The ideas learnt from training relate closely to adoption rates for recommended practices presented below (see table 14). The fact

that more responses were received from beneficiaries also suggests greater exposure to the training as compared to non-beneficiaries. In summary the training must have been relevant

ADOPTION OF RECOMMENDED PRACTICES

The following table illustrates the adoption of improved production practices taught in the training.

Table 14. Adoption of Improved Production Practices

Practice	Rating	Kumi	Kumi	Pallisa	Pallisa	Tororo	Tororo	Mbale	Mbale	Sironko	Sironko
		Ben	Non-ben	Ben	Non-ben	Ben	Non-ben	Ben	Non-ben	Ben	Non-ben
Site selection	1	98%	90%	98%	90%	93%	67%	100%	43%	100%	7%
	2	2%	3%	0%	2%	0%	3%	0%	0%	0%	77%
	3	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	2%	0%	0%	0%	7%
Land preparation	1	98%	93%	95%	90%	97%	72%	100%	43%	100%	90%
	2	0%	0%	3%	2%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Timely planting	1	98%	93%	97%	90%	92%	67%	100%	43%	100%	90%
	2	0%	0%	2%	2%	3%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	3	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Spacing	1	75%	28%	82%	12%	92%	17%	100%	23%	93%	0%
	2	22%	58%	8%	10%	2%	15%	0%	0%	7%	10%
	3	2%	7%	8%	70%	5%	40%	0%	20%	0%	80%
Improved variety	1	97%	72%	83%	42%	98%	28%	100%	13%	100%	17%
	2	0%	15%	5%	3%	0%	7%	0%	0%	0%	7%
	3	0%	7%	10%	47%	0%	37%	0%	30%	0%	67%
Weed control	1	85%	73%	83%	80%	92%	47%	97%	43%	100%	90%
	2	13%	20%	15%	12%	5%	23%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	3	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Pest control	1	58%	65%	62%	58%	28%	37%	97%	23%	100%	0%
	2	38%	27%	17%	7%	37%	12%	0%	0%	0%	13%
	3	2%	2%	20%	27%	32%	23%	0%	20%	0%	77%
Fertilizer use	1	22%	28%	47%	5%	15%	7%	97%	20%	100%	0%
	2	27%	22%	15%	15%	23%	12%	0%	3%	0%	0%
	3	48%	43%	37%	72%	60%	53%	0%	20%	0%	90%
Timely harvest	1	92%	90%	98%	92%	92%	70%	97%	43%	100%	0%
	2	7%	3%	0%	0%	2%	2%	0%	0%	0%	83%
	3	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%
Proper drying	1	97%	93%	90%	88%	92%	67%	97%	43%	100%	77%
	2	2%	0%	7%	3%	2%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	3	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	2%	0%	0%	0%	13%
Proper storage	1	88%	93%	88%	87%	92%	62%	97%	43%	100%	77%
	2	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%	5%	0%	0%	0%	3%
	3	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	2%	0%	0%	0%	7%

**Nb 1 means fully adopts /follows. 2 = not fully, follow/adopt but with modification
3 = not follow/adopt at all**

Table 14 indicates a very high level of adoption for most practices by beneficiaries. For site selection, land preparation, timely planting, use of improved varieties, spacing, weed control, timely harvest, proper drying and storage it was at 75-100% with the rest of the beneficiaries adopting with slight modifications.

Except for Mbale and Sironko which had a high adoption of pests control measures and soil fertility improvement at 97 – 100%, the rest of the districts ranged from 28 – 66% for pest control, with a high level of adoption with modifications standing at 17 – 38% and non adoption at 2 – 32%. The adoption of soil fertility measures is even much lower in Kumi Pallisa and Tororo at 15 – 47%. Adoption with modification stands at 23 to 27% and non adoption standing at 37 to 60%.

The findings for non-beneficiaries generally indicate better adoption for site selection, land preparation, timely planting, weed control, proper drying and storage at between 62 to 93%. However, adoption of spacing is very low at 0 to 28%, with also a low adoption with modifications at 0 to 58% and a high level of non-adoption standing at between 7 to 80%.

Clearly full adoption of pests control measures is fairly high in Kumi, Pallisa and lower in Tororo & Mbale. The level of non-adoption is quite high. The trend is similar for soil fertility measures but with much lower adoption.

It is quite clear that for beneficiaries training in the area of spacing was useful in promoting adoption while the high use of improved varieties can be attributed to access to improved varieties supplied by the multiplication activities of the project. However, non -beneficiaries didn't have both opportunities

Where use of money is required to facilitate adoption, this is clearly low. This is clear evidence of cash limitation among rural farmers. This could be the case as most beneficiaries targeted are from the poor segment of the community. Generally it is the same for non-beneficiaries too but the adoption with modification among beneficiaries is higher suggesting that the knowledge from the training was utilized despite capital limitations.

Diffusion Of Adoption Of Recommended Production Practices

Table 15. Diffusion of Adoption of Improved Production Practices

Practice	Rating	% Beneficiaries	% Neighbours	% Parish
1. Site selection	Adopting	97.5%	81.5%	86.3%
1. Site selection	Partial	0.4%	18.5%	10.8%
2. Land preparation	Adopting	97.5%	100.0%	99.0%
2. Land preparation	Partial	1.3%	0.0%	1.0%
3. Timely planting	Adopting	96.7%	96.7%	99.0%
3. Timely planting	Partial	1.3%	2.2%	1.0%
4. Spacing	Adopting	86.3%	19.6%	22.5%
4. Spacing	Partial	8.8%	31.5%	23.5%
5. Improved variety	Adopting	94.6%	52.2%	45.1%
5. Improved variety	Partial	1.3%	9.8%	7.8%
6. Weed control	Adopting	89.6%	80.4%	84.3%
6. Weed control	Partial	8.3%	18.5%	15.7%
7. Pest control	Adopting	61.7%	55.4%	51.0%
7. Pest control	Partial	22.9%	16.3%	15.7%
8. Fertilizer use	Adopting	45.4%	16.3%	14.7%
8. Fertilizer use	Partial	16.3%	15.2%	15.7%
9. Timely harvest	Adopting	95.0%	82.6%	86.3%
9. Timely harvest	Partial	2.1%	17.4%	11.8%
10. Proper drying	Adopting	94.2%	97.8%	93.1%
10. Proper drying	Partial	2.5%	2.2%	2.0%
11. Proper storage	Adopting	91.7%	92.4%	94.1%
11. Proper storage	Partial	0.8%	1.1%	2.9%

High levels of full adoption are observed for site selection, land preparation, timely planting, weed control, timely harvest, proper drying and storage, with percentage of full adoption ranging from 80.4% to 100%. Adoption from beneficiaries is slightly higher at 89.6% to 97.56% than reported for neighbours to beneficiaries at 80.4 to 100%, and non-beneficiaries in other parish at 84.3 to 99%

However, a big variation is observed in spacing, with beneficiaries at 86.3% while neighbours are at 19.6% and non-beneficiary parish at 22.5%.

The high level among beneficiaries can be attributed to training, this is indicated by the high score given to spacing as one of the ideas learnt. However, there seems to be no diffusion to non-beneficiaries as spacing and row cropping are linked and most farmers find row cropping of closely spaced crops tedious. This was also expressed as a challenge by a few respondents (see table...).

Diffusion of improved varieties is higher for neighbours compared to those in the non-beneficiary parish This agrees with the analysis of source of varieties showing that (see table ...) more neighbours were able to access the new varieties from the beneficiaries compared to non-beneficiaries in the other parish. However, the relatively high adoption for both categories is due to red beauty, a susceptible improved variety and Igola1.

Diffusion of Pest control seems likely to be very insignificant since the difference between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries are small. The general low level compared to other

practices can be attributed to requirement for cash to implement control measures yet income is low among rural farmers .However it should be borne in mind that beneficiaries were helped by use of rosette resistant varieties. However, the issue is also expressed as a challenge in groundnut production (see table 37).

Adoption of use of soil fertility measures is lowest for both beneficiaries and all non-beneficiaries as compared to other practices, which might also indicate insignificant diffusion adoption or none at all. The reason could still be due to low incomes and need for cash if adoption is to take place.

Generally diffusion of adoption seems to be low and only in the area of use of improved seed. Since the rest cannot be directly attributed to project.

Benefits From Training

Table 15 Benefits from Training

Benefits	Beneficiaries		Non-beneficiaries	
	Count	%	Count	%
High yield	180	75%	51	21%
Increased income	58	24%	3	1%
Food security	40	17%	3	1%
Improved methods save labor	18	8%	12	5%
Better health & nutrition	7	3%	3	1%
Knowledge/skills	34	14%	18	8%
None	5	2%	5	2%
No answer	41	17%	178	74%
Total	342	143%	95	40%

Higher yields is clearly the main benefit for beneficiaries. All the other responses mentioned are directly linked to it.

Figure 1 Change in Groundnut Varieties Grown Over Time




Figure 2 Sources of Seed for Beneficiaries





Figure 4 Sources of Seed for Non Beneficiaries in the Neighborhood



3.3. Multiplication

Small quantities of foundation seed of improved varieties resistant to rosette disease namely Serenut 2, 3, and 4 were given to beneficiaries to multiply with each having an obligation to return twice the amount of seed received for redistribution to others. This would ensure quantities increase and go round to many people.

Findings from beneficiaries (figure 1 above) indicate that before the project none of the varieties promoted by the project was being grown. The only rosette resistant variety grown was Igola1. The other varieties grown were mainly the red seeded local varieties especially Erudu Red and a susceptible improved variety Red Beauty, and some tan ones. The Project introduced Serenut 2 in 2002 and Serenut 3 and 4 in 2003 and 2004. From then the number of farmers growing them has increased dramatically. (Other varieties reported as obtained from the project were supplied in an earlier project for on farm trials.)

For sources of these varieties (figure 2 above), it is clear that Serenut 2,3 and 4 were basically introduced by the Project and deliveries were made each year right from 2002 to 2004. Other sources of seed for farmers are their own home saved seed and purchases from open market. The trend for use of home saved seed is continually rising from 13% in 2001 to 71% in 2004. This also indicates high retention of new varieties for replanting.

The number of farmers accessing seed from their groups also increased from 6% to 17.5% in 2004 showing that multiplied varieties are being redistributed. It is also clear that very few farmers buy seed from Stockists and from other farmers. A few farmers reported buying the improved varieties from ATU groups, though the numbers are still very low. This could be due to the fact that group members expected to benefit from the material given by the project.

The percentage of farmers growing Red Beauty and Erudu Red, which are susceptible to rosette, is generally declining though still high. However, Igola1 is generally stable maybe because it is resistant to rosette. The strategy here may be to ensure that both food and cash

needs are taken care of, since the red varieties are preferred for certain segments of the market.

Access to introduced varieties by beneficiaries increased from 29.5% in 2002 to 59.5% in 2004.

For non-beneficiaries (figure 3 above) by 2001 most varieties grown were not resistant to rosette disease, Red beauty and Erudu Red being the major ones. The only rosette variety was Igola1. Serenut 2 was introduced in 2002 while Serenuts 3, and 4 were only introduced later in 2004 with only very few accessing the resistant varieties compared to the beneficiaries. *This seem to follow the pattern of multiplication by the beneficiaries, implying that the other farmers were actually getting these varieties from the beneficiaries.*

Considering the sources of seed for non-beneficiaries, most used home saved seed. The percentage increased from 24% in 2001 to 82% in 2004 slightly above 79%. There was comparatively a higher purchase of seed from multiplication farmers and other farmers at 3.6% to 4.5% maybe because they had no chance to get through the project arrangement or because they appreciated the varieties. A number of them 15% also got new varieties freely through participating groups in 2004, indicating that the spread to previously non-beneficiary farmers has begun. This trend is expected to continue as the volume of multiplication materials continues to grow.

From 2003 Serenut 2 steadily increased. There was an increasing number growing Igola1, rising from 30% in 2001 to 52% in 2004, while the rosette susceptible varieties (Red Beauty & Erudu red) declined though the number growing remained high especially for Erudu red. Non-beneficiaries neighbors have accessed more rosette resistant varieties introduced by the project as compared to those in the non-beneficiaries from another parish. Those farther from the project exhibit an increased number growing Igola1 as a strategy to minimize risk of crop failure due to Rosette.

Generally farmers have continued to grow the more marketable susceptible varieties Red Beauty & Erudu Red alongside the rosette resistant varieties to balance the demand for cash and food which is sure with rosette resistant varieties. This also confirms the findings of the variety assessment on table 16 below

The overall findings indicate that more farmers have been able to access-improved rosette resistant varieties through the project compared to other members of the same communities, who were not specifically targeted. It is also obvious that most farmers use home saved seed (and therefore promoting or emphasizing purchase through Stockists may not be the best option.) This is also justified by the high seed rate of groundnuts which necessitates a high cash investment in order to purchase certified seed each season, which most farmers cannot afford.

The large numbers buying seed from the market in the beginning might be due to very low yields that there was not enough to be spared for seed.

It seems resistance to rosette is an important criteria for selection of varieties, and therefore the reason why Igola1 is constantly grown by beneficiaries and increasingly popular among non-beneficiaries who have no easy access to other resistant varieties like Serenut 2, 3 and 4. On the other hand, the issue of color, which determines marketability of the varieties, is

another important factor which has made the number of farmers growing the susceptible red varieties remain high.

The Varieties introduced for multiplication (Serenut 2,3, and 4) have significantly multiplied and are being passed on to other farmers. Since most farmers' use home saved seed, recipients are actually retaining the new varieties and replanting them. Informal seed multiplication and distribution systems seem a faster way to enable resource poor farmers to access improved varieties since new varieties take long to reach farmers through the formal system of stockists. This is further suggested by the numbers accessing seed from the project as beneficiaries and neighbours as compared to those in the other parish who, after 3 years, have still had very limited access to the new varieties.

Variety Assessment

Table 16a Variety Assessment by Beneficiaries and Non-Beneficiaries

Beneficiaries Likes Percentage										Dislikes percent									
Variety	Number Growing	High yielding	Rosette Resistant	Tolerate drought	Good taste	Matures early	Market-able	Good price	Other	Low Yield	Not Rosette Resistant	Not tolerant to drought	Poor taste	Late maturing	Low market	Low price	Too labour intensive	Too much weeding	Other
Serenut 2	171	95%	73%	77%	42%	11%	12%	20%	6%	3%	4%	7%	20%	29%	19%	8%	28%	9%	9%
Serenut 3	56	77%	54%	50%	52%	38%	38%	36%	4%	11%	23%	27%	9%	9%	16%	0%	41%	2%	4%
Serenut 4	75	92%	60%	61%	69%	52%	19%	11%	1%	4%	9%	12%	1%	3%	33%	29%	12%	3%	7%
Red Beauty	64	75%	19%	42%	94%	61%	64%	41%	2%	9%	81%	42%	0%	11%	0%	3%	5%	0%	0%
Erudu Red	95	44%	3%	2%	85%	63%	52%	18%	7%	20%	87%	80%	2%	5%	3%	8%	2%	1%	1%
Igola 1	58	76%	59%	74%	14%	5%	12%	12%	5%	9%	7%	3%	67%	41%	16%	9%	22%	7%	7%
Etesot	20	30%	0%	5%	95%	0%	15%	40%	0%	20%	30%	70%	0%	20%	5%	0%	30%	0%	5%

Non-Beneficiaries Likes Percentage										Dislikes percent									
Variety	Number Growing	High yielding	Rosette Resistant	Tolerate drought	Good taste	Matures early	Market-able	Good price	Other	Low Yield	Not Rosette Resistant	Not tolerant to drought	Poor taste	Late maturing	Low market	Low price	Too labour intensive	Too much weeding	Other
Serenut 2	57	93%	86%	88%	35%	7%	19%	25%	0%	0%	2%	4%	7%	28%	12%	9%	35%	5%	0%
Red Beauty	51	73%	6%	55%	86%	67%	76%	71%	0%	10%	76%	20%	0%	2%	2%	2%	2%	0%	0%
Erudu Red	97	41%	5%	2%	88%	41%	45%	38%	3%	13%	78%	80%	2%	7%	4%	10%	3%	0%	0%
Igola 1	57	81%	72%	77%	30%	0%	19%	4%	4%	0%	4%	14%	58%	37%	11%	16%	19%	9%	0%
Etesot	29	62%	14%	14%	76%	0%	28%	41%	17%	10%	48%	62%	0%	38%	7%	3%	28%	7%	0%
Serenut 3	4	50%	75%	75%	50%	50%	25%	25%	0%	0%	25%	25%	0%	0%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Considering the concerns in question i.e. yield, resistance to rosette, tolerance to drought, taste, crop duration, marketability and price, the farmer’s variety assessment presented in table 16a above reveals the following.

Among beneficiaries the introduced varieties i.e. Serenut 2,3 4 and Igola1 were ranked highly for good yields, tolerance to drought and resistance to Rosette while Red Beauty and the local varieties ranked high for good taste, early maturity, marketability and good price. This agrees with the low percentage scores for the same issues when considering dislikes for each variety. (The exception is for Serenut 3 – whose mixed ratings can be attributed to the fact that initial distribution of the variety was plagued by the difficulty of getting pure seed. Some of the seed distributed was actually NOT Serenut 3 and the local variety substituted was actually quite susceptible to Rosette.)

The non-beneficiary assessment for likes follows a similar trend to that of beneficiaries. However, the percentage score for each attribute was slightly higher when considering resistance to rosette and tolerance to drought for Serenut 3, 4 and Igola1 (however there were only few respondents). A similar trend is seen for the dislikes, however, in ranking of varieties according to preference Serenut 3 & 4-ranked quite low probably because of the limited familiarity of non-beneficiaries with these new varieties.

The assessment confirms that Serenut 2 is preferred to for its high yield, tolerance to drought, and resistance to rosette; however, the marketability and good price offered for some susceptible varieties is the main reason for farmers continuing to grow them.

The findings further indicate that the Serenut 2, 3, 4 have high yields, tolerant to drought and resistance to rosette as the major positive attributes with other attributes especially crop duration (maturity period). and taste with only average scores.

The issue of being able to have a crop clearly comes out. So the farmers grow both new and old varieties to spread risks and to take care of food and cash needs. The findings also indicate acceptability and appropriateness of the varieties to beneficiaries targeted. *This also indicates that the new varieties have a high chance of being retained for multiplication and distribution in the community.*

Overall ranking of the varieties put the introduced varieties first and high on the list for preference. This implies that key concerns in choice varieties included yield, resistance to rosette and tolerance to drought. Since they did not score very high on other attributes as compared to other varieties. Red varieties certainly are seen to be more marketable which could be the major reason for growing them despite the other negative attributes.

Table16b Variety Assessment Summary

Variety	Beneficiary		Non-Ben	
	Count	Avg Rank	Count	Avg Rank
Serenut 2	171	1.46	57	1.09
Serenut 3	56	1.55	4	2.00
Serenut 4	75	1.61	6	2.67
Serenut 1	10	2.00	3	1.33
Red Beauty	64	2.17	51	1.41
Erudu Red	95	2.38	97	1.41
Igola 1	58	2.51	57	1.63
Etesot	20	2.67	29	2.00
Erudu White	4	4.00	1	2.00

Seed multiplication by beneficiaries

Analysis shows that an estimated 4,420 beneficiaries (see table 18 below) have accessed seed of all the improved varieties introduced by the Project from 2002 to first season of 2004. (The number is reduced to 3,188 if Serenut 3 is excluded due to mixing of varieties). **52% of the beneficiaries were women and 48% men (table 30 in appendix)** These farmers received sufficient seed to plant up to 530.4 Ha (table 17below).

Table 17 Projected total Hectares by District

District	Serenut 2	Serenut 3	Serenut 4
Kumi	3,529	174	193
Pallisa	943	343	337
Tororo	2,233	479	689
Mbale	739	26	79
Sironko	210	175	332
grand total	7,653	1,197	1,630
Hectares	387.29	60.60	82.48
Grand total ha.	530.37		

Table 18 Projected Total Beneficiaries by District

District	Serenut 2	Serenut 3	Serenut 4
Kumi	1,118	58	58
Pallisa	377	162	189
Tororo	764	225	345
Mbale	343	13	53
Sironko	210	175	332
grand total	2,812	632	976
total all varieties	4,420		

Overall the quantities given to individuals for planting varied from 1 to 3 basins depending on locations. More was given out in Kumi, Pallisa and Tororo, and less in Mbale and Sironko. The district trend for quantities received is similar to that of number of beneficiaries. However quantities vary among districts based on the average quantities given out to each individual. Kumi and Tororo gave out more seed to each beneficiary compared to Sironko, Mbale and Pallisa (see table 19).

Table 19 Overall Average Quantity Received per Beneficiary			
District	Serenut 2	Serenut 3	Serenut 4
Kumi	3.16	3.00	-
Pallisa	2.50	2.13	1.79
Tororo	2.92	2.13	2.00
Mbale	2.15	-	1.50
Sironko	1.00	1.00	1.00
Total	2.69	1.91	1.68

In terms of quantities given out, the same proportions of the total quantities were given out to men and women. This means there was no discrimination against women as all had equal opportunity to receive the same amounts (table 30)

Table 20 Average Quantity Received by Men and Women (Basins)

Sex	Serenut 2	Serenut 3	Serenut 4
Male	2.67	2.00	1.40
Female	2.69	1.85	1.87
Total	2.69	1.91	1.68

Table 21 Estimated Total Given Out To Men And Women By Variety (Basins)

District	Serenut 2	Serenut 3	Serenut 4
Male	3,588	634	652
Female	3,853	618	986
Total	7,441	1,252	1,638

Table 18 indicates that generally more beneficiaries 2,812 have accessed Serenut 2 followed by Serenut 4, and then Serenut 3, The reason being that Serenut 2 was the first to be introduced and has multiplied for at least 3 years compared to the other two varieties which were introduced a year later and whose supply from research was more constrained. The difference between Serenut 4 and Serenut 3 is due to the loss of some seed of Serenut 3 as result of variety mixing. *Also Serenut 3 seems not to be as drought tolerant as the other two.* The high numbers for some varieties in some districts is explained by high numbers randomly sampled by chance for those with those varieties.

However findings indicate that Tororo and Kumi Districts have had more people receiving the seed than other Districts, especially **Mbale**, with Sironko and Pallisa at almost the same level. The numbers may be low due to the many new group members sampled who reported having not yet received seed in those districts. Project groups in these areas are expanding rapidly, a demonstration of the keen interest in

it should be noted that new members joined groups because they wanted to get the new varieties through the group arrangement and also some other members left the groups after receiving seed. This affected the sample frame

The analysis also indicates an estimated total seed production [see table 22] from the seed distributed to be 9943 bags of Serenut 2, 1141 bags of Serenut 3 and 1739 bags of Serenut 4. These give average yields per hectare of 26 bags for Serenut 2, 19 bags for Serenut 3 and 21 bags for Serenut 4.

Table 22 Estimated Total Number of Bags Produced from Seed Distributed by the Project			
District	Serenut 2	Serenut 3	Serenut 4
Kumi	4,368	135	106
Pallisa	773	175	189
Tororo	2,330	479	712
Mbale	2,132	46	191
Sironko	341	306	541
grand total	9,943	1,141	1,739
total all varieties	12,824		

Table 23 Estimated Total Number Of Beneficiaries who Replanted Seed They Received for Multiplication, By District.

District	Serenut 2	Serenut 3	Serenut 4
Kumi	926	19	-
Pallisa	404	81	40
Tororo	300	180	180
Mbale	871	26	66
Sironko	332	157	52
grand total	2,832	463	339
total all varieties	3,634		

Up to 3,634 beneficiaries reported replanting the seed they received (own saved). [Table 23 above] This clearly indicates, that farmers have not lost the varieties given to them and up to 561.6 Ha were replanted (see table 24 below) and an estimated total production in MT of 318.9 of Serenut 2, 36.8 of Serenut 3 and 16.3 of Serenut 4 was realised. [Table 25 below]

Table 24 Projected Total Area Planted by Beneficiaries saved seed by district, 2002-2004

District	Serenut 2	Serenut 3	Serenut 4
Kumi	323	2	-
Pallisa	173	32	10
Tororo	123	61	51
Mbale	394	13	28
Sironko	112	52	13
grand total	1,124	161	102
HA	455.13	65.13	41.22
total all varieties	561		

Table 25 Projected Total Production by district (kg)

District	Serenut 2	Serenut 3	Serenut 4
Kumi	161,112	579	-
Pallisa	28,038	2,384	1,414
Tororo	18,205	9,215	5,394
Mbale	73,616	1,584	5,346
Sironko	37,990	23,056	4,192
grand total	318,961	36,817	16,346
total all varieties	372,124		

Analysis further shows on table 26 below that an estimated **1,092** hectares were planted using seed produced by all who received seed from the project from 2002 to 2004. This includes seed received direct from the project, and the area replanted by beneficiaries with saved seed in subsequent years.

District	Serenut 2	Serenut 3	Serenut 4
Kumi	764.10	24.10	24.10
Pallisa	290.38	74.91	52.18
Tororo	401.74	120.80	136.72
Mbale	485.93	16.50	37.95
Sironko	138.64	74.23	54.58
grand total	2,080.78	310.55	305.54
HA	842.42	125.73	123.70
total all varieties	1,092		

In 2004 alone Project beneficiaries are estimated to have produced enough seed to plant a total of 4,726 Ha of the new varieties of groundnuts, if all the production were to be used for seed. The distribution of this production by District is shown in table 27 below.

District	1_ Serenut 2	2_ Serenut 3	3_ Serenut 4	
Kumi	144,914	4,628	3,182	
Pallisa	19,594	5,010	6,464	
Tororo	29,892	9,889	15,283	Area that could be planted using this seed in 2005.
Mbale	61,142	1,584	4,356	
Sironko	25,676	23,580	18,340	Total Prod.
Total	281,218	44,691	47,625	373,534
avg/ben	74.32	11.81	12.59	acres
				11,672.93
				hectares
				4,725.88

Findings clearly indicate variations in the rate of multiplication across the districts. This is so because of the relative importance of the crop in the districts. Kumi is definitely a groundnuts growing area with higher land availability. Even in terms of the quantities of seed given out Kumi rates higher than the rest. (see table 19 above).

It is quite clear that the introduced varieties have multiplied substantially from the initial 161.9 ha provided by the project to beyond the target of 2500 ha. This has been facilitated by the guidelines on multiplication and training offered to beneficiaries.

Assessment of the varieties also indicates acceptability of the varieties especially for their resistance to rosette disease, tolerance to drought and high yields; the ,major concerns that had in the past affected the production of groundnuts so the varieties actually addressed the farmers need and thus helped in multiplication of the varieties

3.4. Distribution

The project plan was to have each beneficiary return twice the amount received for redistribution to other members of the groups and community until all benefit with time

Repayment

Findings estimate that 3,373 beneficiaries repaid seed representing 74.8% for Serenut 2, 86% for Serenut 3 and 74.4 % Serenut 4 without considering repayments for 2004 (table 28 below) which are yet to be redistributed and reported. **This is lower than the 100% expected and is explained by the following reasons for failure to pay back in full.**

District	Serenut 2	Serenut 3	Serenut 4
Kumi	829	-	19
Pallisa	364	189	121
Tororo	345	150	210
Mbale	356	13	26
Sironko	210	192	349
grand total	2,103	544	726
Total all varieties	3,373		
proportion repaying	74.8%	86.0%	74.4%
Note that repayments for 2004 have not all been received			

Reasons for Non-repayment

Beneficiaries were asked why they did not repay in full and the following responses were given;

Table 29 Reasons for Non-Repayment

Beneficiaries		
Why didn't Repay in full	Count	%
Low Yield	28	54.9%
Drought	8	15.7%
Fell sick	3	5.9%
Was wrong variety	2	3.9%
Still being dried	2	3.9%
Recipients not ready	4	7.8%
Seed of poor quality	1	2.0%
Retained some for replanting	1	2.0%
Poor storage	1	2.0%
All beneficiaries had got Serenut 4	1	2.0%

51

N/A to Non-Beneficiaries.

1. The two major reason givens were low yield (54.9% and drought (15.7 %). drought could have caused the low yields. Other responses indicated like seed still being dried and recipients not ready actually indicate delayed repayment but seed was available for repayment (so they actually did not fail).
2. Likewise the response of “seed was wrong variety and seed of poor quality relate to non-repayments due to mixing of varieties indicated earlier in the report. This actually affected repayment and reduced the quantities available for redistribution and was not the fault of the beneficiary.
3. The case reporting none repayment because all members had received suggests that at the time of the survey some groups had actually given seed to all their members and were awaiting further instructions on whom to pass the seed to.
4. Very few failed to manage their fields due to sickness and thus realized low yield which affected quantities available for repayment and were allowed to replant the next season

The major issue therefore was low yields due to drought. However this seems to contradict the responses on variety assessment. The PDCs must have been a bit more lenient as yields of these varieties were good even with drought.

Repayment Rates By Gender

Repayment rates by gender are almost similar except, more men were repaying Serenut 4 compared to women, in terms of both numbers and quantities (table 30 below)

District	Serenut 2	Serenut 3	Serenut 4	Combined
Male	1,025	280	373	1,678
Female	1,069	292	361	1,722
Total	2,094	571	734	3,399
Male	76.4%	88.2%	80.0%	78.9%
Female	74.8%	87.5%	68.4%	75.2%
proportion repaying	75.5%	87.9%	73.9%	77.0%
Note that repayments for 2004 have not all been received				

A final report on repayment will be presented once the final repayment figures for the 2004 harvest are recorded.

Informal Distribution Of Seed Through Sales And Gifts.

After repayment of seed by a beneficiary use of the balance of the seed was at the disposal of the beneficiary. Findings show that overall an estimated 2,768 beneficiaries (Table 31 below) sold surplus seed to **5,910** people (Table 32 below) presumably for seed since the varieties were highly priced (see table....) and still scarce in the communities. These quantities sold could plant 1,504.9 Ha.

Table 31 Estimated number of Beneficiaries who Sold Seed by Variety

District	Serenut 2	Serenut 3	Serenut 4
Kumi	733	-	19
Pallisa	162	-	-
Tororo	135	30	75
Mbale	898	26	26
Sironko	297	227	140
grand total	2,224	283	260
total all varieties	2,768		

Table 32 Estimated Total Number of Farmers Who Bought Seed by Variety

District	Serenut 2	Serenut 3	Serenut 4
Kumi	1,601	-	19
Pallisa	377	27	-
Tororo	315	120	150
Mbale	2,785	79	53
Sironko	140	192	52
grand total	5,217	418	274
total all varieties	5,910		

Estimated total quantity of seed sold by Variety (basins)

District	Serenut 2	Serenut 3	Serenut 4
Kumi	10,143	-	231
Pallisa	1,603	-	-
Tororo	929	45	180
Mbale	8,039	40	40
Sironko	4,192	3,039	1,258
grand total	24,905	3,124	1,708
total all varieties	29,737		

Projected income from sales by district

District	Serenut 2	Serenut 3	Serenut 4
Kumi	57,168,662	-	1,465,533
Pallisa	12,815,782	-	-
Tororo	5,623,739	434,517	1,163,711
Mbale	54,361,996	307,996	264,000
Sironko	18,588,027	13,798,667	4,279,333
grand total	148,558,206	14,541,179	7,172,577
Estimated Total sales for seed			170,271,962
avg income from sales/hh			44,998

Table 33 Estimated Number other people Given Seed as Gifts

District	Serenut 2	Serenut 3	Serenut 4
Kumi	2,140	-	116
Pallisa	579	27	81
Tororo	899	135	464
Mbale	2,548	79	53
Sironko	210	17	262
grand total	6,376	258	976

Total sales and gifts (Basins)

District	Serenut 2	Serenut 3	Serenut 4
Kumi	13,035.5	-	462.8
Pallisa	1,862.4	6.7	32.3
Tororo	1,760.5	164.8	344.6
Mbale	15,985.2	224.4	290.4
Sironko	4,419.1	3,056.7	1,502.1
grand total	37,062.8	3,452.6	2,632.3

Table 34 Estimated Total Area That Can Be Planted By This Seed by District

District	Serenut 2	Serenut 3	Serenut 4	Acres	
				Total	HA
Kumi	1,629.4	-	57.9	1,687	683.11
Pallisa	232.8	0.8	4.0	238	96.23
Tororo	220.1	20.6	43.1	284	114.88
Mbale	1,998.2	28.1	36.3	2,063	835.02
Sironko	552.4	382.1	187.8	1,122	454.35
grand total	4,632.8	431.6	329.0	5,393	2,183.59

Beneficiaries also gave the new varieties to other people as gifts). An estimated **7,610** farmers received seed as gifts (Table 33 above). This includes people who demanded to be paid for their labor during harvest in terms of seed and not cash an indicator of appreciation of the varieties. The combined sales and gifts were sufficient to plant a total of 2,183.59 Ha (Table 34 above).

The gender analysis (see appendix Table **) indicates that

- ✓ men sold comparatively more seed compared to women. Women are thought to have been reserving more of what they produce probably for food and (seed).
- ✓ Gender analysis further reveals that a larger share of the surplus production was sold by Men (57.3% compared to 42.7%) for women. The main reason could be that most women consider food security as priority so they tend to keep more for food. It further indicates that more men bought seed compared to women for all the varieties, however the reason might be that it is men who go to the market to sell and buy or who could afford the highly priced seed new varieties.
- ✓ The analysis found almost no difference in prices offered by women and men for Serenut 2, however, the difference is big for Serenut 3, with women selling at a lower price. Of the 3 varieties; Serenut 2 is better price. Considering the higher quantities sold by men at similar prices to those offered by women; men therefore got more income compared to women (table **j).
- ✓ Table 30k indicates that men gave away Serenut 2 to more people (54.8 of those receiving gifts got them from men compared to 45.2% who received from women). In contrast women gave Serenut 3 to more people compared to men (34.1%). The proportions for Serenut 4 are similar.
- ✓ Table 30m clearly indicates that more seed was sold and given out as gifts by men for all varieties compared to women. However, the quantities varied for each variety. It might mean that sale or giving away of household produce by women is controlled by men since most household are mainly male headed and production resources are generally controlled by men. The other reason could be that women reserve much of their production for food while men tend to sell theirs for money.

The trend considering gender clearly shows that women are actively participating and benefiting economically and socially (by being able to contribute to household needs- food assets and income) from the seed multiplication activities and equal chances as men.

3.5. Socio-Economic Impact Of The Project.

Standard of living

Respondents were asked whether their standard of living had changed since before the project. The results are shown below.

Table 35a Change Of Standard Of Living by Gender By Category

	Beneficiaries			Non Beneficiaries (Neighbour)			Non Beneficiaries (Parish)		
Sex	Improved	Decreased	Same	Improved	Decreased	Same	Improved	Decreased	Same
Male	71.6%	10.5%	17.9%	53.0%	25.8%	21.2%	41.8%	34.2%	24.1%
Female	74.5%	9.0%	16.6%	59.3%	25.9%	14.8%	48.8%	22.0%	29.3%
Overall	73.3%	9.6%	17.1%	55.8%	25.8%	18.3%	44.2%	30.0%	25.8%

Table 35b Reasons for Change in Standard of Living

Reasons for Improvement	Beneficiaries		Non-beneficiaries	
	Count	%	Count	%
New Groundnut Varieties	16	6.7%	0	0.0%
Improved Yield	77	32.1%	48	20.0%
Improved Income	63	26.3%	59	24.6%
Better Feeding/Nutrition	56	23.3%	45	18.8%
Business/Employment opportunities	2	0.8%	6	2.5%
Reasons for Lack of Improvement	Count	%	Count	%
Low Yield	5	2.1%	38	15.8%
Poor Soils/.limited Land	6	2.5%	0	0.0%
Drought	23	9.6%	10	4.2%
Low Income	8	3.3%	23	9.6%
Many Dependents/Health Problems	13	5.4%	26	10.8%
Food Insecurity	2	0.8%	16	6.7%
Other	4	1.7%	0	0.0%
No Answer	18	7.5%	18	7.5%

A higher percentage of beneficiaries (73.3% Table 35a) report an increase in standard of living mainly attributed to improved yields, improved incomes and better nutrition. Up to 6.7% of beneficiaries attribute the increase in standard of living directly to new groundnut varieties.

In contrast, only about 50% of non-beneficiaries, reported an increased standard of living, with Neighbours (55.8%) showing more improvement than other Non-beneficiaries from the other Parish (44.2%). Generally those reporting an increased standard of living attributed it to improved income, improved yield and better nutrition, but with lower percentages compared to beneficiaries.

However 21.3% of the non-beneficiaries and 17.1% of the beneficiaries said their standard of living had decreased. The major reasons, in order of number of responses, being drought, health problems/many dependants for beneficiaries and; low yield, health problems/many dependants, low income and food insecurity for non-beneficiaries.

Benefits from project.

Table 36a Benefits from Groundnuts Multiplication

Reported Project Benefits	Beneficiaries		Benefits Reported by Non-Beneficiaries	Non Ben Neighbours		Non Ben Parish	
	count	%		count	%	count	%
Better feeding	154	64%	No Impact	65	54%	83	69%
Physical Assets	68	28%	Better quality	46	38%	28	23%
Better health	54	23%	Better Seed	31	26%	20	17%
Increased HH income	43	18%	Information Skills	10	8%	8	7%
Better Education	39	16%	More gnuts in Mkt.	6	5%	11	9%
Social Status	17	7%	Other	4	3%	3	3%
Others	2	1%					
n=240 beneficiaries, multiple answers allowed			n=120 per type of non-beneficiary. Multiple answers possible				

As shown in table 36a above, beneficiaries cited a number of benefits. The most frequent response was “better feeding” at 64 %. This agrees with the findings on consumption of groundnuts which has shown an increase in consumption of groundnuts as a protein source.

28% of Beneficiaries reported buying physical assets as a result of increased income from sales of the surplus produced. This also agrees with the high numbers that sold seed (Table 31). The nature of the assets bought however seems to indicate that there was not much to spend probably due to small quantities sold and also due to the need to use the same income for other household requirements. Income from sales helped beneficiaries to access essential household necessities and also buy livestock especially small stock i.e. poultry, pigs and goats, as well as cows. These are major sources of investment in rural areas and also a popular form of saving.

Table 36b Assets Bought

Asset summary	Count	% of those who bought assets	% of all respondents
Goats	28	23.9%	11.7%
Household Goods	25	21.4%	10.4%
Poultry	13	11.1%	5.4%
Building Materials	12	10.3%	5.0%
Pigs	10	8.5%	4.2%
Bicycle	9	7.7%	3.8%
Furniture	6	5.1%	2.5%
Inputs	5	4.3%	2.1%
Cows	4	3.4%	1.7%
Land	4	3.4%	1.7%
Scholastic Material	1	0.9%	0.4%
Total	117	100.0%	48.8%

23% indicated improved health as a benefit from the project. 18% reported increased incomes and 16% cited better education. All of these benefits involve cash expenditure therefore indicating increased availability of cash incomes as a result of the project.

However, Table 36a shows that, as expected, the benefits for non-beneficiaries (both neighbours and parish) are limited to availability of better quality seed and better seed varieties. The proportion for non-beneficiary neighbours is greater than those in the parish. This clearly indicates that the varieties are diffusing and are being appreciated for their attributes and the quality offered by the beneficiaries is good. The response to increased availability of groundnuts seems to suggest increased production of groundnuts probably as a result of the performance of the new varieties. Some non beneficiaries, both neighbours and from parish, benefited from availability of information on groundnut production. They may have attended the trainings that were organised. by the FPRA, PDCs and production committees, as indicated above.

Negative Impact Of The Project.

Responses to the question about negative impact were very few. Only 5% of all respondents answered. However more of them came from beneficiaries. Responses included:

- ✓ Frequent meetings hence limited time for other activities.
- ✓ High production with no market.(8/16 responses in Kumi)
- ✓ Local varieties have lost market (Kumi 2 neighbours and 1 from parish!)
- ✓ Limited land (groundnuts competing with other crops?).
- ✓ Failed to provide seed to all groups in time/ not all farmers received.(2 beneficiaries and 4 neighbours).
- ✓ Increased economic differences between parishes.(1 from parish).

- ✓ AT does not supply farm equipment (1 beneficiary).
- ✓ No credit schemes(! beneficiary)
- ✓ “When pigs destroyed my groundnuts, I accused the owner to LC courts and now we are not friends” (1 beneficiary)

These responses do not suggest any serious negative impact but rather imply that the project is desired by those outside and the varieties are actually superior i.e. high yielding.

Some of the following challenges were identified during the course of implementation of the project and agree with the other survey findings.

1. *Drought affected yields in some cases resulting in reduction of seed amounts repaid and slowing the coverage.*
2. *Other pests and diseases were observed especially the leaf miner. Chemical control requiring cash investment by resource poor farmers posed a challenge.*
3. *Mismanagement of the multiplication and distribution process by some FPRAs and local leaders leading to distribution of seed to people outside of group influence resulting in non repayment and missing records was observed in some cases.*
4. *Some farmers failed to plant seed at the time received. As a result, they missed out a season, due to various other problems, thus slowing the coverage and spread of seed.*
5. *Some farmers ate or sold off the seed before planting, especially the really poor group members.*
6. *Poor handling of seed by a few individuals, resulting in low viability and thus low production by next beneficiary.*
7. *Sustaining commitment of non-group members of the PDC since the service is voluntary is an ongoing challenge.*
8. *Enforcing byelaws incase of default, especially since most group members come from same village, may not be taken seriously. There are many social pressures involved.*
9. *Sustaining participatory activities such as joint review meetings and monitoring is difficult unless the project has new benefits to offer in exchange for group time.*
10. *Poor seed quality supplied by Serere, especially the mixing of Serenut 3 with local varieties.*

Challenges encountered were discussed in a participatory manner, and addressed during review meetings and field monitoring and informed decisions taken regarding appropriate solutions.

Major Challenges In Groundnut Production

When asked about the challenges of groundnut production, both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries mentioned the following: -

Table 37 Major Challenges in Groundnut Production	Beneficiaries		Non-beneficiaries	
	Count	%	Count	%
Drought	153	48%	102	42%
Costly and labor Intensive	61	19%	44	18%
Pest & Diseases	54	17%	63	26%
Price Fluctuations & no market	11	3%	7	3%
lack of capital & agric chemicals	12	4%	13	5%
Limited land & poor soils	18	6%	7	3%
Costly & low access to improved varieties	2	1%	3	1%
floods, untimely planting & domestic animals	5	2%	3	1%
no knowledge/ skill in gnut production	0	0%	3	1%
Total	316	100%	245	100%

Clearly both categories considered drought a major problem (reported by 48% of beneficiaries and 42% of non-beneficiaries). This explains the high proportion of respondents that mentioned tolerance to drought as an important attribute in their preference ranking of varieties. Non beneficiary assessment was 26% compared to 17% for beneficiaries. This might be due to lower access to rosette resistant varieties for non-beneficiaries compared to beneficiaries. It also explains why resistance to rosette disease was a key factor/concern in choice of varieties for both groups, since it is linked to the issue of lack of capital and agro-chemicals.

Groundnuts being labor intensive & costly to produce is rated equally by both categories of respondents. This is likely to be aggravated by the low labor availability at household level of 4 adult equivalent only. Low levels of income make this situation worse especially since the project is targeting the poor in the community and explains why most labor is paid for in kind using part of the harvest.

The challenges of limited land and poor soils were indicated by more beneficiaries (6%) than non-beneficiaries (3%). However, this is linked to the high proportion of beneficiaries, who have realized the value of growing groundnuts but own little land. Table 7 above indicates that land is limited and this may have resulted in over cropping of land without any soil fertility remedy leading to loss of soil fertility. The low adoption of soil fertility measures is also a key factor.

The high number of responses given by beneficiaries might indicate more involvement in groundnut production, as compared to the small proportion of the non-beneficiary respondents who generally mentioned other issues.

Marketing Issues.

As production of the varieties has increased, marketing issues were considered. The survey indicates that:

- (a) Point of sale for groundnuts.

Table 38a. Point Of Sale For Groundnuts

	Beneficiaries		Non Beneficiaries	
	Count	%	Count	%
1. Farm Gate	77	32%	69	29%
2. Market in Subcounty	53	22%	66	28%
3. Other Subcounty	3	1%	17	7%
4. District HQ	3	1%	7	3%
5. Outside District	65	27%	0	0%
6. Didn't sell	39	16%	81	34%
	240	100%	240	100%

n=240 beneficiaries, multiple answers allowed

Table 38. indicates that sales were made at farm gate, at market in sub county, other sub county, district head quarters and outside the district. Beneficiaries sold more at the farm gate (32%) compared to non-beneficiaries (29%).

Non-beneficiaries sold mainly at the market in the sub county. Most beneficiaries sold mainly at farm gate and market in sub-county and outside the district. This was probably because they were selling seed and not food as was the case for non-beneficiaries. A high proportion did not sell at all, probably because they had produced little or were still waiting for the right time to sell.

(b)Price of Groundnuts

Table 38b Average Price of Groundnuts

	Non Beneficiaries			
	Beneficiaries	Neighbours	Parish	Overall
Bag	37,286	29,370	30,733	30,088
Basin	6,362	5,300	4,575	4,817
Kg	1,581	1,260	1,367	1,329

Table 38b.shows that sales were made by the bag, basin, and the kilogram. and the beneficiaries sold at higher prices compared to the non beneficiaries. This is possibly because they sold what they produced as seed since they were selling the new varieties which others did not have. However prices for non- beneficiary neighbours were slightly lower for the bag and kilo compared to those in the parish.

(c)Mode of sale.

Table 38c How Did You Sell It

	Beneficiaries		Non Beneficiaries	
	Count	%	Count	%
As a group	17	7%	3	1%
As Individual	123	51%	155	65%
No response	100	42%	82	34%
	240	100%	240	100%

Most sales were done individually by both categories. However, slightly more effort was made to sell in group by beneficiaries. This probably relates to the issue raised in market access indicating that market is not readily available for new varieties.

Value Addition

Table 38d Number Who Add Value To Groundnut

	Beneficiaries		Non Beneficiaries	
	Count	%	Count	%
Yes	65	27%	57	24%
No	126	53%	102	43%
No Response	49	20%	81	34%
	240	100%	240	100%

Most farmers did not add value to groundnuts and the level is almost the same for beneficiaries and non beneficiaries at 27% and 24% respectively.

Table 38e How Add Value to your crops?

Means of Value Addition	Beneficiaries		Non Beneficiaries	
	Count	%	Count	%
1. Shelling	58	24%	56	23%
2. Making peanut butter	3	1%	1	0%
3. Making Flour	6	3%	2	1%
No response	173	72%	181	75%
	240	100%	240	100%

The major form of value addition is just shelling done by the same proportion of both beneficiaries and non beneficiaries at 24% and 23% respectively.

Market Access Problems.

Both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries generally indicated they had no marketing problems i.e. 57% and 52% respectively. A high proportion did not answer the question. Only 23% and 17% of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries respectively indicated having market problems.

Table 38f Market Access Problems

Beneficiaries			Non Beneficiaries		
Market Access Problems	Count	%	Market Access Problems	Count	%
No Problem/ Market readily available	56	23%	No Problem/ Market readily available	104	43%
lack of proper storage	1	0%	competition for market among farmers	1	0%
lack of ready market	35	15%	frequent price fluctuation	7	3%
low demand for new varieties in open market	10	4%	High demand for improved varieties	3	1%
low prices/price fluctuation	2	1%	Low demand	17	7%
no organized marketing society in place	2	1%	low prices during harvest	5	2%
Taxation	1	0%	Taxation	2	1%
Transport problems	12	5%	Transport problems	7	3%
No Answer	121	50%	No Answer	94	39%
Total	240	100%	Total	240	100%

Marketing problems raised by beneficiaries include : lack of market (15%), transport problem (5%), low demand for new varieties in the open market (4%). This is probably the reason for selling outside the district and at farm gate as only interested buyers seek out the varieties. And might explain the lower sales in the sub county markets by beneficiaries.

Other issues listed by both but with few responses include taxation, low prices, price fluctuations. A beneficiaries mentioned lack of organized marketing as an issue.

A PRA exercise was conducted in the 16 sub counties in the project area and revealed that marketing was considered to be a problem especially with the increasing quantities of groundnuts resulting from the increased production from the new varieties. Apparently all issues indicated by the survey were also mentioned in the PRA discussions. However one key issue that ranked high through out was lack of organised institutions to facilitate flow and use of market information along the market chain. Thus farmers felt they were not getting the right price for their groundnuts. The outcome of the exercise was setting up of sub county based marketing teams to facilitate marketing based on informed decisions from use of market information

3.6. Conclusion

This project was aimed at addressing the problem of low groundnut production. caused by groundnut rosette disease through provision of rosette resistant varieties to the poor households for multiplication

It is evident from the survey finding that the intended project purpose has significantly been achieved. In summary the following have been confirmed by the impact assessment:

- ✓ *3 new varieties namely Serenut 2, 3 and 4 which are resistant to groundnut rosette disease have been introduced to farmers over the 3 years of the project.*
- ✓ *The varieties have been evaluated by the beneficiaries and have been accepted for being rosette resistant, tolerant to drought, high yielding good tasting among other attributes*
- ✓ *Quantities of the varieties have increased substantially and large quantities are being sold enabling other non participating farmers to benefit thus disseminating the new varieties.*
- ✓ *More than 9000 people have accessed the seed through the formal project arrangements, sales and gifts by individuals .*
- ✓ *Women are benefiting by accessing the seed and from the resultant production. benefits are evenly spread between men and women.*
- ✓ *Redistribution of the varieties is continually increasing under the guidance of local leadership. but at low repayment rate*
- ✓ *Seed to plant more than 2500 ha of the varieties has been produced over time*
- ✓ *Use of home saved is the most reliable way groundnuts farmers ensure seed availability.*
- ✓ *Training of FPRAs, local leaders and farmers was done. More than 2000 farmers got trained and the local leaders have the capacity to do it*
- ✓ *Ideas from the training were highly adopted and helped in increasing production ensuring seed quality.*
- ✓ *Local leaders i.e. PDCs and PCs have been involved in the whole process*
- ✓ *Agricultural activities are constrained by weather and socio economic factors thus the desired multiplication rates could not be met*
- ✓ *The project has no critical negative impact*

4. Appendices

Sampling Instructions

A: Beneficiaries to be interviewed

Sub-county	Parish	Group	No. of farmers interviewed
Nyero	Kalapata	1. Amee	10
		2. Ominai	10
		3. KAIFA	10
Kidongole	Kidongole	1. Airogo	10
		2. Kotolut	10
		3. Kanyamutamu	10
Kasodo	Apapa	1. Kakwenyutu	10
		2. Apapa multipurpose	10
		3. Kasnyoutu	10
Lyama	Nansanga	1. Mulimi Tagwa	10
		2. Tukola Batala	10
		3. Kyweterekera	10
Kachonga	Nabiganda	1. Babusa Hujeha	10
		2. Mbanajo	10
		3. Nanghrisas	10
Nagongera	Nagongera	1. Awanya	10
		2. Chalumba	10
		3. Genirok	10
Butiru	Bunabwana	1. Bumufuni	10
		2. Bubuyela Women	10
		3. Busirali	10
Bukhalu	Bunalwere	1. Malukhu	10
		2. Bukhalu Modern	10
		3. Bwayilira	10

B: Non-beneficiaries Neighbours.

For each group identify and interview only 5 neighbours, the total should be 15 neighbours.

C: Non-Beneficiaries from non-participating parishes

Sub-county	Parish	Village	No. of farmers
Nyero Ariet	Ariet	Ariet	15
Kidongolge	Kaena	Kacul	15
Lyajma	Tadeeri	Naluli	15
Kachonga	Namable	Nasingi A	15
Nagongera	Katejula	Poliecha	15
Butiru	Bukhofu	Bwanyama	15
Bukhalu	Buyaga	Bungasanyi	15

Procedures

1. For each group get village list of all the members/household heads write numbers on small pieces of paper corresponding with the numbers of group members/households heads.
2. Fold the pieces of paper
3. Mix them thoroughly
4. Randomly pick the required numbers of papers equivalent to the sample size (10 for beneficiaries and 15 for non-beneficiaries in non participating sub-county)
5. The people to be interviewed are those whose numbers on the list are same as numbers picked randomly.
6. For non-beneficiaries, neighbours please use same procedure.
 - start by sampling 5 beneficiaries from each group whose neighbours will be sampled
 - ask the beneficiaries to list their neighbours and random sample those to be interviewed.

Appendix 2. Staple Food Consumption Patterns for Beneficiaries and Non-Beneficiaries

BENEFICIARY

2002		Beans (without Gnuts)	Chicken (without Gnuts)	Cowpeas (without Gnuts)	Fish (without Gnuts)	Gnuts in combination with greens, legumes or meat	Green grams (without Gnuts)	Greens (without Gnuts)	Groundnuts alone (binyewa)	Meat (without Gnuts)
District	n=									
Kumi	60	2.02	2.53	2.16	2.42	2.23	2.91	2.10	2.50	2.50
Pallisa	60	2.18	3.00	2.90	1.93	1.78	3.72	1.85	2.02	2.67
Tororo	60	1.66	2.54	3.07	1.76	2.12	3.53	1.48	1.85	1.90
Mbale	30	1.03	3.14	3.83	2.57	1.69	3.62	1.00	1.45	2.38
Sironko	30	2.17	3.07	3.80	2.23	2.23	3.93	1.83	2.43	3.03
Average Rank	240	1.87	2.79	2.98	2.13	2.02	3.48	1.71	2.08	2.44
Overall Rank		2	7	8	5	3	9	1	4	6

BENEFICIARY

2004		Beans (without Gnuts)	Chicken (without Gnuts)	Cowpeas (without Gnuts)	Fish (without Gnuts)	Gnuts in combination with greens, legumes or meat	Green grams (without Gnuts)	Greens (without Gnuts)	Groundnuts alone (binyewa)	Meat (without Gnuts)
District	n=									
Kumi	60	2.22	2.41	2.21	2.27	2.10	2.86	2.07	2.20	2.32
Pallisa	60	2.22	2.95	3.08	1.97	1.75	3.60	2.12	2.07	2.57
Tororo	60	1.64	2.56	3.11	1.72	2.00	3.56	1.49	1.73	1.93
Mbale	30	1.00	3.10	3.80	2.48	1.33	3.60	1.10	1.10	2.23
Sironko	30	2.30	3.07	3.83	2.17	1.80	3.86	2.37	2.00	2.87
Average Rank	240	1.93	2.75	3.05	2.07	1.85	3.44	1.85	1.89	2.34
Overall Rank		3	6	7	4	1	8	1	2	5

Note 1= daily, 2=often (1-2 per week), 3= rarely (once a month), 4=never

Q18. Staple Food

NON BENEFICIARY

2002		Beans (without Gnuts)	Chicken (without Gnuts)	Cowpeas (without Gnuts)	Fish (without Gnuts)	Gnuts in combination with greens, legumes or meat	Green grams (without Gnuts)	Greens (without Gnuts)	Groundnuts alone (binyewa)	Meat (without Gnuts)
District	n=									
Kumi	60	1.76	2.37	1.80	2.53	2.18	2.50	1.75	2.69	2.32
Pallisa	60	2.19	2.89	2.79	1.98	1.74	3.85	1.87	1.80	2.56
Tororo	60	1.61	2.75	3.21	1.86	2.32	3.71	1.38	2.19	2.29
Mbale	30	1.00	3.50	3.93	2.23	2.34	3.93	1.00	1.83	2.31
Sironko	30	1.70	3.33	3.90	2.50	2.62	3.70	1.37	2.80	3.13
Average Rank	240	1.73	2.86	2.93	2.18	2.18	3.47	1.55	2.25	2.47
Overall Rank		2	6	7	3	3	8	1	4	5

NON BENEFICIARY

2004		Beans (without Gnuts)	Chicken (without Gnuts)	Cowpeas (without Gnuts)	Fish (without Gnuts)	Gnuts in combination with greens, legumes or meat	Green grams (without Gnuts)	Greens (without Gnuts)	Groundnuts alone (binyewa)	Meat (without Gnuts)
District	n=									
Kumi	60	1.73	2.27	1.77	2.46	2.14	2.43	1.83	2.59	2.27
Pallisa	60	2.19	3.08	2.98	1.96	1.78	3.85	1.87	1.93	2.59
Tororo	60	1.73	2.58	3.23	1.86	2.31	3.69	1.41	2.23	2.22
Mbale	30	1.03	3.33	3.90	2.33	2.17	3.93	1.00	1.43	2.30
Sironko	30	1.87	3.23	3.83	2.23	2.03	3.63	1.80	2.10	2.93
Average Rank	240	1.77	2.80	2.96	2.14	2.08	3.44	1.63	2.13	2.42
Overall Rank		2	7	8	5	3	9	1	4	6

Note 1= daily, 2=often (1-2 per week), 3= rarely (once a month), 4=never

GROUNDNUT IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Enumerator Instructions: Do not read the list of possible answers to farmers. Just ask the question and let them give you their reply. Then circle the relevant code number or numbers. If they give an answer that is not included, write it down under “other”.

A. HOUSEHOLD AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

Enumerator

1. Name of beneficiary farmer
2. Sex of Beneficiary 1=M 2=F 3. ID No.
4. Well being Rank 1=Wealthy 2=average 3=poor 4=very poor
5. District 1=Kumi, 2=Pallisa, 3=Tororo, 4=Mbale, 5= Sironko
6. Sub-county 11=Kidongole, 12=Malera, 13=Nyero 14=Ngora; 21=Lyama, 22=Kadama, 23=Kasodo, 24=Butebo, 31=Nabuyoga, 32=Nagongera, 33=Mazimasa, and 34=Kachonga; 41=Busiu 42=Butiru 51=Bukhalu, 52=Butandiga
7. Name of Household head_____ 8. Sex of household head 1=M 2=F
9. Age of house hold head (years) _____
10. Formal education of beneficiary (highest level attained)
1= illiterate/no formal schooling 2.= primary 3.= secondary (A or O level)
4= Tertiary anything beyond S4 / higher TTC
- 11.Marital status of Beneficiary
1. Single 2. Married 3. Widowed 4. Divorced/Separated
12. Household composition (**Please indicate the number of each category of household members - note each person should be counted only once.**)

Age group	Total number in age group	Participating in farm activities all the time		Not directly participating in farm activities	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
Above 60 yrs					
18 -60 years					
12 - 17 years					
11 or less					

13. Are you a member of ATU group? 1=Yes 2=NO

13b. If yes, Name of the group.....

14. Please list your main sources of household income in order of importance. (i.e. farming, trade, employment etc)

Rank	Main source of income in 2001	Main source of income 2004
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		

15. How has the income coming from crop production changed since 2001? (tick one only).

Increased? _____ Decreased? _____ Stayed the same. _____

16. What total area of land did you cultivate in year 2001 season A? acres;
and 2004 season A.....acres

17. List five crops in terms of area cultivated before the project and now.

List Main Crops in the order of area planted	Year 2001 (before the project)	Year 2004 (season A)
Largest		
Smallest		

18. Rank the main cash crops in order of contribution to household income. (1 is the most and 8 is the least as applicable)

	Cash crop	Rank in 2001 (before the project)	Rank in 2004 (season A).
1	Cassava		
2	Groundnuts		
3	Legumes (Green Grams / cow peas / beans)		
4	Sweet potato		
5	Maize		
6	Sorghum		
7	Millet		
8	Cotton		
9	Rice		
10			
11			

19. Think about the main foods that you consume as sauce, how frequent did the following sauces feature in your diet before 2001 and in 2004? Indicate

1= high (almost every day), 2=medium (1-2 per week) 3=low for (rarely 1/month) 4=never

	Main Sauces	How frequent in 2001	How frequent in 2004
	Meat (without g.nuts)		
	Chicken (without g.nuts)		
	Fish (without g.nuts)		
	Cowpeas (without g.nuts)		
	Beans (without g.nuts)		
	Green grams (without g.nuts)		
	Greens (without g.nuts)		
	Groundnuts alone (binyewa)		
	Gnuts in combination with greens, legumes or meat		

20. How has your standard of living changed since 2001? 1=increased 2=decreased 3=stayed the same.

21. What has brought about the change? _____

22. When did you start being a groundnut Multiplier? ...Season.....Year.....

B) Access to Rosette Resistant Groundnut Varieties. 23. Please indicate the variety grown and source of seed in the table below

Variety	2001		2002		2003		2004	
	Yes/No	Source of seed	Yes/No	Source of seed	Yes/No	Source of seed	Yes/No	Source of seed
1. Red Beauty								
2. Igola 1								
3. Serenut 1								
4. Serenut 2								
5. Serenut 3								
6. Serenut 4								
7. Others [specify]								
8								
9								

Codes for source of seed 1. ATU 2. ATU Group Member 3. Bought from a stockist 4. Bought from non-ATU farmer 5. Own home saved seed 6. Bought from multiplication farmers 7. Bought from the open market

24. If you do not grow Groundnuts, WHY NOT? _____

25. For each variety grown above indicate on the table below why you like or dislike it, and give ranks (1= best liked and 9 is least liked.) start by filling columns for likes and dislikes, then rank after.

Variety	What do you like about the variety (likes)	What don't you like about the variety (dislikes)	Rank the varieties according to preference	Reason for the ranking
1. Red Beauty				
2. Igola 1				
3. Serenut 1				
4. Serenut 2				
5. Serenut 3				
6. Serenut 4				
Other specify				
7.				

Code for likes 1. High yielding. 2. Rosette Resistant 3. Tolerate drought 4. Good taste 5. Matures early
6. Marketable 7. Good price 8. Others specify **Code for dislikes** 1. Low yield 2. Not rosette resistant 3. Not tolerant to drought 4. Poor taste 5. Late maturing 6. Low market 7. Low price 8. Too labour intensive, 9. Too much weeding, 10. Others specify

26). Use of Improved/Recommended groundnut production practices (do rating before asking reason for modification or why practice is not followed)

Practice/Principle Recommended	Notes on recommended practice	Rating	Modification (what is being done differently)	Why? (Reason for modification or for not following)
1. Site selection	Free draining soil not after legume			
2. Land preparation	Weed free, fine seed bed			
3. Timely planting	At the onset of rains, after a heavy rain			
4. Spacing	45x10cm for bunch types e.g. Serenut 3 & 4, 45x15cm for Serenut 2			
5. Improved variety	E.g. Serenut 1, 2, 3, 4, Igola1 & Red beauty			
6. Weed control	Keep garden weed free; at or after flowering do hand weeding			
7. Pest control	Spray against pests. Leaf miner			
8. Fertilizer use	Use SSP at planting 50kg/acre or use manure or rhizobia			
9. Timely harvest	Dark markings on inside of shell I.e. at maturity			
10. Proper drying	Cracks on biting or rattle on shaking or during drying don't keep indoors for more than a day without drying			
11. Proper storage	Cool, dry place, aerated containers, off the ground			

CODE FOR RATING: 1= Fully Follow, 2= Not fully followed (modified in some way), 3. Not followed at all.

27) **How did you learn about Groundnut seed growing & production** (possible answers)

1. From extension worker _____ 2. Production committee _____
 3. Parish Development committee (PDC) _____ 4. Other farmers _____ 5. Brochures _____
 6. Others specify (List responses mentioned by farmers.) _____

28) Did you attend any training on groundnut production? 1= Yes, 2= No

29) If yes, organized by who: 1.=FPRA 2.=Production Committee
 3. PDC 4. NAADS 5.=HASP 6.=Other

30. If not, why not? _____

31) What new ideas have you learnt from the trainings?

32) Have you shared the information about improved groundnut production practices/principles with anyone?
 1=Yes, 2=No

33 If yes, how? _____

34) What have you benefited by following the recommended practices of groundnuts production mentioned above?

35) Seed Multiplication and Distribution

Variety	Qty of seed received for multiplication (basins)			Amount harvested in bags			Qty of seed replanted (basins in shell)			Amounts harvested from replanted seed (bags)		
	2002	2003	2004	2002	2003	2004	2002	2003	2004	2002	2003	2004
1. Serenut 2												
2. Serenut 3												
3. Serenut 4												

36) For any year you did not replant, what happened?

37) For seed you bought. Specify the following:

- Variety bought _____
 Quantity bought _____ (bags/basin/kg) *circle unit used*
 Year bought _____
 Price paid _____ (per bag/ basin/kg) *circle unit used*

38) For each variety grown, indicate the numbers of people you gave or sold seed to (circle the units used as bags or basins)

Variety	a) Qty repaid to group in bags/basins			b) No. of group members given seed from you			c) No. of people who bought seed from you			d) Total qty sold in bags/basins			e) Price per bag/basin sold			f) No. of other people given seed			Qty of seed given out in basins/bag		
	2002	2003	2004	2002	2003	2004	2002	2003	2004	2002	2003	2004	2002	2003	2004	2002	2003	2004	2002	2003	2004
Serenut 2																					
Serenut 3																					
Serenut 4																					

39. What major challenges have you faced with groundnut production? _____

INCOME

40. Which family member makes decision about the use of the money from Groundnut sales?

- 1) male head of household 2) female head of household 3) both man and woman 4) other, specify _____

41) Where did you go to sell the G.nuts? 1. Farm Gate 2. Market in Subcounty 3. Other Subcounty 4. District HQ 5. Outside District 6. Didn't sell.

42). At what price did you sell it _____(per bag/ basin/ kg) circle unit used

43). How did you sell it? 1=as a group 2=or as an individual

44). Did you experience any problems with access to Market? 1= Yes 2=No

45). Explain _____

46. Do you undertake any activities to add value to your groundnuts before selling? 1. Yes 2. No.

47). If so, what? 1. Shelling 2. Making peanut butter 3. Making Flour

OTHERS

48) If farmer did not payback full amount expected or repaid partly, ask why?(look at table 35 & 38 to cross check, if paid in full skip question and go to no. 51)

49) What action did group take?

50) What does the group byelaw say about such a case?

51. Do you think your standard of living has changed because of participation in the groundnut multiplication project? 1= Yes; 2 = No

52. If Yes, can you tell us how you have benefited? (*Ask the farmer then code – do not read list. Circle all that are mentioned.*)

- (1) Increased household income;
- (2) better feeding for the family;
- (3) Gained high social status
- (4) Better health care for family members;
- (5) better education for children;
- (6) bought physical assets
- (7) Others specify).....

53. Can you please list for us the physical assets (if any) you bought using the money obtained from groundnut multiplication?

.....

.....

54. If you did not benefit from the groundnut multiplication project, can you please tell us why?

.....

.....

55. Have there been any negative or unintended results of the Project? (can be social, family or community relations, economic, environmental etc.) 1= Yes; 2 = No

56. If Yes, what were they? (List the changes)

**GROUNDNUT IMPACT ASSESSMENT
FOR NON-BENEFICIARIES**

Enumerator Instructions: Do not read the list of possible answers to farmers. Just ask the question and let them give you their reply. Then circle the relevant code number or numbers. If they give an answer that is not included, write it down under "other".

A. HOUSEHOLD AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

Enumerator.....

1. Name of Respondent farmer
2. Sex of Respondent 1=M 2=F 3. ID No.
4. Well being Rank 1=Wealthy 2=average 3=poor 4=very poor
5. District 1=Kumi, 2=Pallisa, 3=Tororo, 4=Mbale, 5= Sironko
6. Sub-county 11=Kidongole, 12=Malera, 13=Nyero 14=Ngora; 21=Lyama, 22=Kadama, 23=Kasodo, 24=Butebo, 31=Nabuyoga, 32=Nagongera, 33=Mazimasa, and 34=Kachonga; 41=Busiu 42=Butiru 51=Bukhalu, 52=Butandiga
7. Name of Household head _____ 8. Sex of household head 1=M 2=F
9. Age of household head (years) _____
10. Formal education of Respondent (highest level attained)
1= illiterate/no formal schooling 2.= primary 3.= secondary (A or O level)
4= Tertiary anything beyond S4 / higher TTC
11. Marital status of Respondent
1. Single 2. Married 3. Widowed 4. Divorced/Separated

12. Household composition (**Please indicate the number of each category of household members - note each person should be counted only once.**)

Age group	Total number in age group	Participating in farm activities all the time		Not directly participating in farm activities	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
Above 60 yrs					
18 -60 years					
12 - 17 years					
11 or less					

13. Are you a member of a farming group? 1=Yes 2=NO

14. Please list your main sources of household income in order of importance. (i.e. farming, trade, employment etc)

Rank	Main source of income in 2001	Main source of income 2004
1		
2		
3		

4		
5		

15. How has the income coming from crop production changed since 2001? (tick one only).
Increased? _____ Decreased? _____ Stayed the same. _____

16. What total area of land did you cultivate in year 2001 season A? acres;
and 2004 season A.....acres

17. List five crops in terms of area cultivated before the project and now.

List Main Crops in the order of area planted	Year 2001	Year 2004 (season A)
Largest		
Smallest		

18. Rank the main cash crops in order of contribution to household income. (1 is the most and 8 is the least.)

	Cash crop	Rank in 2001	Rank in 2004 (season A).
1	Cassava		
2	Gnuts		
3	Legumes (Green Grams / cow peas / beans)		
4	Sweet potato		
5	Maize		
6	Sorghum		
7	Millet		
8	Cotton		
9	Rice		
10			
11			

19. Think about the main foods that you consume as sauce, how frequent did the following sauces feature in your diet before 2001 and in 2004? Indicate

1= high (almost every day), 2=medium (1-2 per week) 3=low for (rarely 1/month) 4=never

	Main Sauces	How frequent in 2001	How frequent in 2004
	Meat (without gnuts)		
	Chicken (without gnuts)		
	Fish (without gnuts)		
	Cowpeas (without gnuts)		
	Beans (without gnuts)		
	Green grams (without gnuts)		
	Greens (without gnuts)		
	Groundnuts alone (binyewa)		
	Gnuts in combination with greens, legumes or meat		

20. How has your standard of living changed since 2001? 1=increased 2=decreased 3=stayed the same.

21. What has brought about the change? _____

22. When was the last time you grew g-nuts? ...Season.....Year..... Never _____

If never – skip to question 25.

B) Access to Rossette Resistant Groundnut Varieties. 23. Do you grow gnuts? 1. Yes 2. No

24. If yes please indicate the variety grown and source in the table below

Variety	2001		2002		2003		2004	
	Yes/No	Source of seed	Yes/No	Source of seed	Yes/No	Source of seed	Yes/No	Source of seed
1. Red Beauty								
2. Igola 1								
3. Serenut 1								
4. Serenut 2								
5. Serenut 3								
6. Serenut 4								
7. Others [specify]								
8								

Codes for source of seed 1. ATU 2. ATU Group Member 3. Bought from a stockist 4. Bought from non ATU farmer 5. Own home saved seed 6. Bought from multiplication farmers 7. Bought from the open market

25. If you do not grow Groundnuts, WHY NOT? _____

26. For each variety grown above indicate on the table below why you like or dislike it, and give ranks (1= best liked and 9 is least liked.) fill columns for likes and dislikes, then do the ranking.

Variety	What do you like about the variety (likes)	What don't you like about the variety (dislikes)	Rank the varieties according to preference	Reason for the ranking
1. Red Beauty				
2. Igola 1				
3. Serenut 1				
4. Serenut 2				
5. Serenut 3				
6. Serenut 4				
Other specify 7.				

Code for likes 1. High yielding. 2. Rossette Resistant 3. Tolerate drought 4. Good taste 5. Matures early 6. Marketable 7. Good price 8. Others specify **Code for dislikes** 1. Low yield 2. Not rosette resistant 3. Not tolerant to drought 4. Poor taste 5. Late maturing 6. Low market 7. Low price 8. Too labour intensive, 9. Too much weeding, 10. Others specify

27). Use of Improved/Recommended groundnut production practices. (do rating before asking reason for modification or why practice is not followed)

Practice/Principle Recommended	Notes on recommended practice	Rating	Modification (what is being done differently)	Why? (reason for modification or for not following at all)
1. Site selection	Free draining soil not after legume			
2. Land preparation	Weed free, fine seed bed			
3. Timely planting	At the onset of rains, after a heavy rain			
4. Spacing	45x10cm for bunch types e.g. Serenut 3 & 4, 45x15cm for Serenut 2			
5. Improved variety	E.g. Serenut 1, 2, 3, 4, Igola1 & Red beauty			
6. Weed control	Keep garden weed free; at or after flowering do hand weeding			
7. Pest control	Spray against pests. Leaf miner			
8. Fertilizer use	Use SSP at planting 50kg/acre or use manure or rhizobia			
9. Timely harvest	Dark markings on inside of shell I.e. at maturity			
10. Proper drying	Cracks on biting or rattle on shaking or during drying don't keep indoors for more than a day without drying			
11. Proper storage	Cool, dry place, aerated containers, off the ground			

CODE FOR RATING: 1= Fully Follow, 2= Not fully followed (modified in some way), 3. Not followed at all.

28) **How did you learn about Groundnut seed growing & production** (*possible answers*)

1. From extension worker _____ 2. Production committee _____
3. Parish Development committee (PDC) _____ 4. Other farmers _____ 5. Brochures _____
6. Others specify (*List responses mentioned by farmers.*) _____

29) Did you attend any training on groundnut production? 1= Yes, 2= No

30) If yes, organized by who: 1.=FPRA 2.=Production Committee
3. PDC 4. NAADS 5.=HASP 6.=Other

31. If not, why not? _____

32) What new ideas have you learnt from the trainings?

33) Have you shared the information about improved groundnut production practices/principles with anyone? 1=Yes, 2=No

34 If yes, how?

35) What have you benefited by following the recommended practices on groundnuts production mentioned above?

36) For seed you bought. Specify the following:

Variety bought _____
Quantity bought _____ (basins/bags/kg) *circle unit used*
Year bought _____
Price paid _____ (basins/bags/kg) *circle unit used*

37. What major challenges have you faced with groundnut production? _____

INCOME

38. Which family member makes decision about the use of the money from Groundnut sales?

- 1) male head of household 2) female head of household
3) both man and woman 4) other, specify _____

39) Where do you go to sell the G.nuts? 1. Farm Gate 2. Market in Subcounty 3. Other Subcounty 4 District HQ 5. Outside District

40). At what price did you last sell it _____ (per bag/basin/kg)
circle unit used.

41). How did you sell it? 1=as a group 2=or as an individual

42). Did you experience any problems with access to Market? 1= Yes 2=No

43). Explain _____

44. Do you undertake any activities to add value to your groundnuts before selling? 1. Yes 2. No.

45). If so, what? 1. Shelling 2. Making peanut butter 3. Making Flour

OTHERS

46. Have you heard about the AT Uganda Groundnut Multiplication Project? 1=Yes 2=No

47. How have you heard about it? _____

48. What did it do

49. Has the groundnut project had any impact on you? 1=yes 2=No

50. If Yes, can you tell us how has it affected you? (**Ask the farmer then code – do not read list. Circle all that are mentioned.**)

- A. More groundnuts in the market B. More varieties/ better quality groundnuts available
C. Better groundnut seed available D. information/skills on improved groundnut production
E. Other (specify) _____

51. Have there been any negative or unintended results of the Project? (can be social, family or community relations, economic, environmental etc.) 1= Yes; 2 = No

52. If Yes, what were they? (List the changes) _____

Appendix 12

SEED QUALITY AND STORAGE TRAINING 19TH JULY 2002 PSPC MBALE

WHAT IS SEED?

Seed is something meant for planting. It can be in the form of true seed (e.g. groundnuts), cuttings (e.g. cassava), vegetative material (e.g. banana) etc.

QUALITY

Is a combination of factors leading to the final **quality** of seed. These include: moisture content, seed shape, colour, viability, freedom from diseases etc.

In my case, I will say that quality begins at harvesting.

HARVESTING

Timing

It is very important to harvest groundnuts at the correct time. If harvested too early, the seeds will shrink when drying which lowers the yield, oil content and **quality** of the seed. Delays in harvesting will result in poor quality seed due to mould infections and subsequent aflatoxin contamination of the seeds/pods. Late harvesting also reduces yield because higher proportions of pods are left in the ground due to the pegs being weak and the pods breaking off. If harvested late, some non-dormant varieties will begin to sprout in the field resulting in yield losses.

Indicators for harvesting time

Leaf fall is not a good indicator of when to harvest. It is recommended that a few plants (3-5) should be pulled up and the pods removed and shelled the insides of the shells should be examined. If the majority of pods (70% upwards) have dark markings inside the shell and the seeds are plump and the correct colour for that variety, then the groundnuts are mature and ready for harvest. If the crop is severely defoliated as result of disease (only one or two leaves per branch) or if sprouting had begun, the crop should be harvested regardless of maturity. The estimated period of maturity for each variety can be used as a rough guide.

Hand lifting

Harvesting by hand only is more suitable for the erect groundnut varieties in sand, loam soils, which are well drained. When the soil is wet and heavy or very dry, it is much more difficult to pull up the whole plant without losing pods.

Hand lifting with hoe or hoe fork

By using a hoe during harvesting it is possible to lift plants out of heavy or dry soil with a reduced pods loss. Spreading varieties can also be more easily lifted. Care should be taken not to damage the pods with the hoe as damage makes the pods susceptible to fungal attack, thus reducing the quality. A hoe fork lessens the likelihood of such damage.

Cleaning

It is important to shake the plant after lifting to remove excess soil from the pods, particularly when the soil is wet or heavy. Soil stuck to pods will lengthen drying times and produce better conditions for the development of unwanted fungal growth.

DRYING

The Importance of drying

The correct drying or curing of the harvested groundnuts is very important as poor curing can help induce fungal growth (producing aflatoxin contamination) and reduce seed **quality** for consumption, marketing and germination for the following season's planting. For good storage and germination, the moisture content of the pods should be reduced to 7-8%. This may be difficult to determine locally, but it means that the pods should be well dried. There are different ways of drying the pods, some of which are better than others. It is particularly important to note that if the pods are exposed to the sun for too long the seed **quality** can deteriorate considerably and germination can be affected.

Drying in windrows

If the harvested groundnut plants are left to dry on the soil surface where they have been lifted, the pods are likely to be in contact with the soil, which can contain moisture and be at a higher temperature. This method can easily affect the **quality** of the seed, particularly if there is rain during the drying period. If field drying is used, it is better to use windrows, where plants are laid in rows to catch the wind and dry more quickly. The drying of pods in windrows (3-5 days) should produce the required level of moisture before the pods are picked or stripped. Excessive exposure to the sun can affect the **quality** of the seed.

Drying on mats

The plants can be picked/plucked from the windrows and then laid out in a thin layer in the sun on dry ground, matting or other dry surfaces for a further 2-5 days, which would normally dry the pods to the required moisture content for storing. Pods should be covered or taken indoors during the wet weather. They can also be picked immediately after lifting and then dried in the sun as above for 6-8 days. Once again excessive exposure to the sun can affect the quality of the seed.

Drying so that the pods are shaded

Ideally pods should be dried with plenty of air circulation and in the shade. Two principal methods are used elsewhere in Africa, both of which can produce good **quality** seed with reduced levels of fungal infection. After 2-3 days of wilting in the field in windrows, the plant should be dried using one of the following methods.

- (a) **Cock.** Plants are laid, with foliage, directly on the ground in a circle 1-2 meters in diameter, the pods placed towards the inner part of the circle. Layers of plants are built up, gradually reducing the diameter of the circle, as the cock gets higher, until there is a small opening left at the

top of the cock. Foliage (e.g. banana leaves) can be used to cover the top of the cock. The cock should be built on raised ground so that the lower parts do not get waterlogged if it rains during drying. Polythene should not be used for the base of the cock as this reduces drainage in the case of rain and also should not be used as cover as a build up of condensation can occur.

- (b) **A-frame.** The wilted plants are gathered and stacked on an A-frame with the pods facing inwards and a way from the soil. A-frames are easy to construct using three thick poles as a base with thin poles attached to either side of the two main poles of the A-frames shelves on to which the wilted plants can be placed. The lowest shelf should be about 30cm above the ground. Excellent air circulation occurs and, if constructed properly, the drying foliage of the plants protects the pods from rainfall and thus improving the **quality** of the nuts.

In both cases the groundnuts should normally be left drying for 3 – 4 weeks before the pods are packed. After picking do not dry further by putting the pods into the sun as this could result in over-drying or a reduction in seed **quality**.

Plucking

The hand removal of pods from the plants (plucking) can be labour intensive. A simple frame of wood, built at a height convenient for plucking, covered with a stretched piece of chicken netting, can speed up the process considerably and reduce drudgery. The dried/wilted plants are held by the leaves and the roots/pods drawn across the stretched chicken wire. The pods get caught in the wire and are pulled off, dropping below the frame.

STORAGE **Requirements**

It is best to store groundnuts in their shell. Good drying of the pods to 7-8% moisture content will help to ensure that the seeds remain in good conditions during storage. Never bag groundnuts for storage if the pods are still damp. Before storing, poor, damaged, shriveled, rotten, or fungus-infected pods should be removed. Whatever the storage container, it is important to ensure that the store is dry and that there is good ventilation so that the pod/seeds do not increase in moisture content, which would encourage fungal growth. Ideally the store should be cool, as this prolongs life of the pods

In bags

Bags should be made of a material, which allows the air to circulate, therefore, gunny bags are recommended. Do not use polythene or polypropylene bags as these restrict airflow and fungal growth could occur. For the same reason, do not cover bags with plastic or tarpaulin (canvas), which may also restrict ventilation and increase condensation. Bags should be stored away from the ground on wooden slats to avoid damage from dampness. If bags are stacked a gap should be left between stacks to allow ventilation. Do not stack bags more than ten bags high.

Other methods

If bags cannot be used, storage in clay pots, woven baskets, or storing loose may be used. In all cases it is important to ensure good ventilation by keeping the storage vessel off the ground and ensuring that the storage place used is dry. When storing the pods loose, a platform made of local material (e.g. bamboo) should be made to keep the pods off the ground.

Pests

When pests damage the pods/seeds, they create the conditions for the build-up of fungal infection. Insect storage pests can be controlled using Actellic Super applied as a dust to the pods before bagging.

Shelling

Shelling should be done as and when groundnut seeds are required for consumption, marketing or for planting as the storage life of the seed outside the shell is short and the **quality** can reduce rapidly. With both hand and mechanical shelling, the seeds should be checked and any discoloured, mouldy or shriveled seeds should be thrown away.

By hand

Hand shelling is labour intensive but is effective for small quantities of groundnut. It is particularly good for the selection of seed for planting the following season, as there is less damage to the seeds, thus avoiding fungal infections. The practice of putting pods into sacks and beating them to break them up is not recommended as this can produce a high level of damaged seeds, thus reducing the **quality**.

AFLATOXIN

Aflatoxin is a toxic substance produced by mould fungi (*Aspergillus flavus*), which can grow on poorly managed agricultural crops, particularly groundnuts. Aflatoxin contamination may happen during pre-harvest and post-harvest handling of the crop. Pre-harvest contamination is severe during periods of drought at the pod filling stage. Post-harvest contamination results mostly from poor drying and curing procedures. If eaten in sufficient quantities, aflatoxin can cause sickness, hepatitis and/or liver cancer. It is, therefore, extremely important to ensure good management of groundnut crops and any suspect seed should be destroyed rather than used for human or animal consumption. If groundnuts are to be sold for export no aflatoxin contamination must present. Although the practices for minimizing mould are mentioned in the different sections above, they are summarized here.

- a) Harvest the crop as soon as it is mature, any delay will encourage the development of fungus.
- b) Avoid damaging pods during cropping.
- c) Remove soil from the pods before leaving to dry.
- d) Ensure that the correct drying procedures are used and that damaged shriveled or mouldy seed.
- e) Avoid pod damage by insects as this can leave the pods/seeds susceptible to fungal infection.

- f) Pre-harvest contamination is severe during drought and extra care should be taken to clean the seed, especially the smaller seed.

All these lead to production of **quality** seed.

QUALITY AND MARKETING

The quality of groundnut is determined very much at the farm level. Good growing, harvesting, drying and storage on-farm (as set out above) will ensure that the pods/seeds are marketable. A buyer will in particular, be looking for (ideas shown in brackets): Varietal purity (at least 95%), low moisture content (7-8%), high shelling percentage (above 55%), low level of damaged pods/kernels (less than 17%) and no aflatoxin contamination.

Appendix 13- Farmer- Led Multiplication of Rosette Resistant Groundnut Varieties for Eastern Uganda

AT Uganda's Experience In Seed Multiplication.

Tino Grace.

AT Uganda Ltd, P.O Box 8830,

Kampala, Uganda.

Abstract

Access to improved and appropriate technologies crucial for increased crop productivity has remained a major production constraint especially for the resource poor farmers. Farmer led verification and multiplication of improved crop varieties is one sure way to provide poor farmers with access to improved varieties, practices, knowledge and information required for increased crop productivity.

The project on farmer led multiplication of rosette resistant groundnut varieties focuses on involving the target group in most activities to ensure their participation and ownership of the process for long-term sustainability and benefit.

The approach emphasizes the participation of key stakeholders in planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of activities. The groups participate in preparation of seed distribution plans and set regulations to ensure seed is not lost thus breaking the distribution chain. Local leadership structures are put in place at group level (production committees) and at parish level (Parish Development Committee) with defined roles to ensure planned activities are completed. Distribution and repayment of the loaned seed is done in public to ensure accountability. Seed is given to individuals in groups as loan seed "to be repaid with seed interest" so that it multiplies until all target households access it. Groups provide peer pressure to ensure seed is repaid. Parish Development committees and Production committees trained on seed production and reinforced with simple production guides, then train other beneficiaries. Adoption is promoted through end of season evaluations, joint review meetings and field monitoring with key stakeholders for progressive problem identification and solving.

Training and direct participation has enabled farmer led multiplication and distribution process to succeed dramatically with minimal external supervision. In two years 2,210 beneficiaries from 160 groups received seed and training. In 2004 seed will be extended to new groups.

Key words

Groundnuts, rosette disease, farmer led, multiplication.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 General Background

The farmer led multiplication for rosette resistant groundnut varieties for eastern Uganda is a three year project funded by the Department For International Development (DFID) through Natural Resources International (NRI) Ltd and implemented by AT Uganda Ltd. the project was a result of call for proposals for promotional projects to promote or apply (disseminate) research outputs of NRI crop protection programme. The project operates in the five districts of eastern Uganda namely Kumi, Pallisa, Tororo, Mbale, and Sironko. The project began on the 1st February 2002 and will end on 31st march 2005.

The project area falls in the montane (Mbale and Sironko) and Teso farming systems characterized by crop-livestock mixture. The dominant annual food crops include beans, groundnuts, finger millet, cassava, sorghum and maize. However, Mbale and Sironko differ from the rest of the region in that in addition to the food crops above bananas are grown for food income. Cotton is a common industrial crop in the Teso system, Sironko and lowlands of Mbale, while Arabica coffee is the main commercial crop grown in the medium and high altitude areas of Mbale where it is intercropped with bananas.

1.2 Project Summary /Background

The baseline survey for another project in the same project area identified the need to address Groundnut rosette disease as a major constraint to groundnut production, a major crop grown for food and income; thus the basis for focus on groundnuts as a crop.

Considering that groundnut seed rate is high and the risk of crop failure from rosette disease is high, lack of seed is a major reason why poor households do not grow groundnuts, even though groundnut production is very profitable. Eastern Uganda used to produce large quantities, however, decline in production is explained by the lack of cash to buy chemicals to control rosette. Therefore rosette control through disease and vector resistance is more economical, sustainable and appropriate especially for resource poor farmers.

In view of this situation this project promotes farmer led multiplication of rosette resistant groundnut varieties for poor households under the supervision of local authorities. It will increase groundnut production and ensure poor people have access to new varieties through delivery of the following outputs:

1. Extension staff (FPRAs), local authorities and farmers trained in groundnut production, multiplication and storage;
2. Foundation seed for new rosette resistant varieties obtained and multiplied by farmer group member;
3. Multipliers return double the amount of planting material received for redistribution and further multiplication;

4. The process of collection, redistribution and monitoring of multiplied seed effectively handed over to local leadership for management.

It is dissemination and not a research project. Lessons from previous projects indicate that farmer led multiplication of improved varieties is one way to ensure that the poor but able farmers access and utilize improved varieties, practices, knowledge required for increased productivity.

2.0 Methodology/ Approach

2.1 Materials studied.

Information contained in this paper is generated from AT Uganda Ltd documents especially data and information collected during implementation of earlier projects. Documents reviewed include baseline studies, project memorandum, progress reports, end of season evaluation reports, reports of joint review meetings, and impact reports for AT Uganda LIFE project (livelihoods initiatives for eastern Uganda project).

2.2 Area Description

The project operates in the five districts listed above and covers in total sixteen sub-counties. The sub-counties include: Nabuyoga, Nagongera, Mazimasa, and Kachonga in Tororo District; Lyama, Kadama, Kasodo, and Butebo in Pallisa District; Kidongole, Malera, Nyero and Ngora in Kumi District; Bukhalu and Butandiga in Sironko District; And Busiu and Butiru in Mbale District.

In each sub-county the project operates in two parishes and works with ten farmer groups, with a total membership of 4317 farmers in the 160 groups. These groups earlier participated in seed multiplication under LIFE project.

2.3 Project Approach / Methodology

The model for multiplication of seed used is a replication with modifications of the project approach already practiced with other crops in LIFE Project, an earlier project implemented by AT Uganda Ltd with same stakeholders.

The approach emphasizes participation of key stakeholders in this case beneficiary farmer groups, Production Committees (PCs) and Parish Development Committees (PDCs), and FPRA and Sub-county local government authorities in planning, implementing, monitoring and evaluating project activities.

The process involves:

- a) Training of FPRAs as trainers on groundnut production.
- b) Setting up local leadership structures at group level i.e. PCs to handle seed multiplication issues and another structure at parish level i.e. PDCs to coordinate and monitor the groups. Each group is represented on the PDC, which also has local government representatives from the village and parish levels, especially local councillors (LCs) and the parish chief.

- c) Participatory identification and assignment of roles to the local leadership i.e. PCs and PDCs to ensure seed given out is safe guarded and repaid for further multiplication, (the roles include among others training other beneficiaries on groundnut production i.e. farmer led extension, monitoring management of crops in the field, facilitating identification of beneficiaries, distribution and recovery of seed for redistribution and record keeping.
- d) Delivery of seed by project to individuals in groups based on distribution plans i.e. plan of how multiplication should take place and the order in which new materials should filter through the group members to ensure that all have access within the shortest time possible, drawn by the groups assisted by the PCs and PDCs considering the able poor and women as priority to receive seed first.
- e) Acknowledgement of receipt of seed and multiplication terms especially on quantities to be repaid by all beneficiaries and witnessed by PDCs for accountability and transparency for easy follow up at group/ public meetings.
- f) Local leaders keep a register of all seed recipients.
- g) Beneficiaries are responsible for custody, storage of seed since distribution is done soon after harvest and provide land and labour to produce the crop.

3.0 Results

For effective, sustainable dissemination of improved varieties to poor households interventions in training, multiplication, distribution and handover of management to the community were undertaken. The following results have so far been achieved:

No.	Activity	2002	2003	2004	Comments
1.	No. of beneficiary sub-counties	16	17	17	The project area did not change except one sub county of Kadama, which was divided in the second year making nine beneficiary groups to fall in another sub county of Kirika.
	Kumi	4	4	4	
	Pallisa	4	5	5	
	Tororo	4	4	4	
	Mbale	2	2	2	
	Sironko	2	2	2	
2.	No. of FPRA trained in groundnut seed production.	16	31	0	Additional locally identified farmers were also trained as field assistants to support the FPRA. The collaborating researcher conducted all trainings.
3.	No. of Project staff trained in groundnut seed production.	4	4	0	These are staff involved in supervising project activities in the field.
4.	No. of PCs formed and trained in groundnut seed production.	160	0	0	A committee was formed in each group comprising of at least three members to support seed production activities at group level. Up to 480 farmers were trained as trainers.

No.	Activity	2002	2003	2004	Comments
5.	No. of PDCs formed and trained in groundnut seed production.	32	0	0	Each benefiting parish has a committee with at least 10 members. Each benefiting group is represented on the PDC and the rest of the members are LCs and the parish chief, up to 78 leaders excluding PCs were trained. This committee coordinates the parish activities and helps enforce multiplication by laws.
6.	No. of individual beneficiaries trained in groundnut seed production.	800	2210	4210	These figures are running totals. All individuals receiving seed for multiplication have to train before getting the seed. Refresher trainings were also conducted for all each season to promote adoption, and were done by the PCs supervised by FPRAs.
7.	No. of simple groundnut seed production guides produced and distributed to farmers trained.	0	4000	0	All beneficiaries trained got copies.
8.	No. of groundnut production manuals given to FPRAs and other trainers.	50	0	0	The NRI CPP supplied the manuals. Copies were also given to non-participating Agricultural staff.
9.	No. of trainings conducted no seed production.	32	176	176	In the first year trainings were at sub county level. However, in the second year it decentralized to group level to increase group participation and attendance. Refresher training of the trainers i.e. PCs and PDCs preceded trainings at group level.
10.	No. of varieties given out for multiplication.	2	3	3	These include Serenut 2 and 3 in the first year and Serenut 4 was added in the second and third years.
11.	No. of bags of seed in shell bought and given to farmers.	269	286	194	Twice the amount given out was returned after harvest for further redistribution to other farmers.
	Serenut 2	264	50+	0	+ Groups bought additional 89 bags using matching grant funds.
	Serenut 3	8	*156	95	*Seed supplied was mixed so most was flushed out.
	Serenut 4	0	36	99	
12.	Hectares multiplied using purchased seed.	82.50	35.50	69.00	41 hectares lost as result of wrong seed. However, up to 187.5 hectares were multiplied. Farmers planted additional 27 hectares using seed bought using matching grant funds.
	Serenut 2	80.00	15.00	0.00	
	Serenut 3	2.50	6.00	29.00	
	Serenut 4	0.00	14.50	40.00	

No.	Activity	2002	2003	2004	Comments
13.	Hectares multiplied using seed returned by beneficiaries and distributed to other farmers within groups. Serenut 2 Serenut 3 Serenut 4	0.00 0.00 0.00	160 *0.00 0.00	377 341 10.00 26.00	A total of 537 hectares planted. It is expected to be more as some records were missing. * Records missing.
14.	Metric tons of extra seed available and sold by beneficiaries. Serenut 2 Serenut 3 Serenut 4	0.00 0 0 N/A	39.25 36.00 1.15 2.10	N/A	All these were sold within the project area for seed. The serenut 2 sold can plant 455 hectares. There was also informal distribution to non-participating members of the community, which could not be quantified.
15.	No. of joint review meetings held.	0	32	32	Two meetings were held each growing season per sub county, and attended by all groups to assess progress of project activities with the aim of identifying and solving problems in a participatory manner.
16.	No. of joint field monitoring visits made.	16	16	16	By a team comprising of PDCs, PCs and project staff (sometimes). Each group was visited at least once a season, to assess adoption of practices, crop performance and to instil the culture of collective responsibility.
17.	No. of end of season evaluations conducted with beneficiaries.	16.00	16.00	N/A	One per season per sub county. To promote appreciation and adoption of practices.
18.	Other trainings offered to facilitate the process. Record keeping. Collective marketing of produce. Processing of peanut butter.				All 160 groups received the trainings. For PDCs and PCs. All groups and marketing committees set up, to help sell extra seed produced profitably. 45 groups, 2 individuals and 8 FPRAs acquired manual groundnut grinders in the second year to diversify marketing opportunities for groundnuts.
19.	Other achievements. Some sub counties and programmes have adopted the same multiplication method for groundnuts and other crops. Some beneficiaries are also using the same method to lend out seed to friends, neighbours, and relatives.				This indicates appreciation of the approach. It is mainly used in Ngora, Mazimasa and Kachonga sub counties.

4.0 Challenges

Just like in any under taking, challenges encountered and included:

1.Drought affected yields in some cases resulting in the reduction of seed amounts repaid and slowing the coverage.

2.Other pest and diseases especially the leaf miner requiring chemical control by resource poor farmers posed a challenge.

3.Some mismanagement of the multiplication and distribution process by FPRAs and local leaders leading to distribution of seed to people outside influence resulting in a few cases of none repayment and missing records.

4.Some farmers missing out a season due to other problems slowing the coverage and spread of seed.

5.Some farmers eating up or selling seed before planting especially the real poor who also happen to be group members.

6.Poor handling of seed by some individuals, resulting in low viability and thus low production by next beneficiaries.

7.Sustaining commitment of non-group members of the PDC since the service is voluntary.

8.Enforcing by laws incase of default especially since most group members come from the village not taken seriously, to protect own social image.

9.Sustaining participatory activities such as joint review meetings and monitoring.

10.Poor seed quality especially mixing of varieties with local once.

Most of the challenges encountered were discussed addressed in a participator manner during review meetings and field monitoring informed decisions made.

5.0 Discussion of results/ findings

5.1 Training

Training is important to ensure that beneficiaries have access to the necessary knowledge and skills for increased productivity and seed quality in sustainable manner. It calls for building of the local capacity to train, and thus the training of PDCs and PCs as trainers and providing them with simple seed production guides. This equipped them with the necessary knowledge and skills to pass on to others. The high number trained was achieved, as training was a pre requisite to accessing seed. This coupled with the emphasis for quality seed encouraged most farmers to attend the trainings including some

non -group members. Refresher trainings at planting helped in ensuring high adoption of correct spacing for attainment of the right plant population.

End of season evaluations also offered opportunity for more learning and adoption of practices, as farmers were able to hear and learn from the experiences of their fellow farmers, apart from being able to assess and appreciate the varieties and practices promoted.

Having the farmers themselves take charge of these activities helped them participate learn from the process.

5.2 Multiplication

Increase of seed quantities for distribution to all targeted beneficiaries in a short period, required whoever received seed to return more than the amount initially received. The multiplication factor of two was definitely easy to meet and encouraged repayment by most farmers and thus expansion of seed quantities evidenced by the increased acreage from repaid seed and also quantities sold for seed.

Clear repayment terms and procedures developed in a participatory manner and enforced, and group peer pressure arising from community ownership of the seed also did instil the repayment culture in beneficiaries and gave control to the community.

Joint monitoring of crops in the field helped remind beneficiaries of their obligation and helped in timely identification of problems which depending on the nature were either solved immediately or discussed later with all members at the joint review meetings resulting in participatory problem solving. This also helped other groups take precautionary corrective action as they learnt from each other and helped groups refine their by laws based on challenges encountered and lessons learnt from others. However, there were cases of failure to pay back the full amounts, missing out a season, also a few cases of total loss due to extreme weather, and mixing of varieties at point of purchase also affected multiplication as such mixed seed had to be flushed out of the multiplication process. All these combined reduced the amounts of seed multiplied and thus expected acreage.

5.3 Distribution

As beneficiaries paid back seed there were quantities of seed to pass on to other members. With the process of distribution of seed to the beneficiaries already streamlined using distribution plans, the high return rate ensured that good quantities were available to serve many farmers. The process was helped by the use of by laws, PC and PDC participation and group peer pressure as every member looked to the group as the only opportunity and source to access seed. Thus by the end of the first season of the second year nearly all members had accessed seed, with groups having small membership already passing on extra seed to non group members.

5.4 Handover

Putting in place of PDCs and PCs helped set up structures that will eventually continue managing the multiplication process. Training in the areas of

responsibility and seeing them implement with some supervision and lesson learning helped build their capacity to a great extent. The challenge remains to how to keep them motivated to carry on without further supervision. The process has generally already been handed over, however, the project is still providing the necessary support till the end of the project.

5.5 Challenges

Most of the challenges were addressed as they arose and got inbuilt in the planned activities and got dealt with specifically.

Streamlining distribution procedures, discussing them and carrying it out in public ensured the right beneficiaries got seed.

Seed quality issues were addressed through continuous training and also through imposing penalties for distributing poor quality seed.

Repayment of seed was fostered through censoring of beneficiaries to ensure only those with potential to repay get, field monitoring and revision of to cater for new challenges as they arose and enforcement of by laws.

To keep PDCs operational and PDC members' motivated provision was made for them to get seed as other beneficiaries, which seemed to work. However, having the groups represented on the committee helped because as direct beneficiaries they have sustained interest and have become the driving force of the committee.

6.0 Conclusion

For effective sustainable dissemination of improved varieties and practices to poor households, interventions should foster and address the critical factors of community ownership and control of processes. This can be achieved through participation of the key stakeholders through processes and structures identified by them, for collective responsibility. The process should be kept as simple as possible; participation of key stakeholders ensures capacity building, local ownership, control and better understanding of the project and thus commitment to its sustainability.

Project Logframe: R8435 (ZA0666) Commercial Incentives For Sustainable Groundnut Multiplication

Narrative Summary	Objectively verifiable indicators	Means of verification	Important assumptions
4.1. Goal			
Livelihoods of poor people improved through sustainably enhanced production and productivity of RNR	To be completed by CPP Programme Manager	To be completed by CPP	To be completed by CPP Programme Manager
4.2. Purpose			
Promotion of strategies to reduce the impact of pests and stabilize yields in semi arid cereal-based cropping systems, for benefit of poor people.	To be completed by CPP Programme Manager	To be completed by CPP	To be completed by CPP Programme Manager
4.3. Outputs			
1. Hand-Over Management of multiplication and redistribution in 16 new subcounties handed over to the local community leaders, who have been trained.	1.1 At least 16 local leadership structures (1 per subcounty) created and fully responsible for multiplication and redistribution of planting material. 1.2 At least <i>240 community and group leaders</i> from <i>80 new groups</i> trained in seed production and multiplication, group development, and collective marketing.	1 PDC work plans 2 Community distribution plans and records 3 Training reports.	Local leaders will have the incentive to keep working.
2. Multiplication Foundation seed of new rosette resistant groundnut varieties procured and multiplied by farmer groups and farmers trained in seed production, multiplication, distribution management, and collective marketing	2.1. At least 70 <i>hectares</i> of new improved rosette resistant varieties of groundnut (Serenut 2, 3 and 4) multiplied in <i>16 new sub counties</i> 2.2 At least 80 additional groups trained in seed production, and group development	1. Multiplication agreements 2. PDC register records. 3. Delivery notes 4. Training reports.	Seed will be available in sufficient quantities. Extension staff will be accepted by farmers in the new parishes.
3. Market linkages: One or more Groundnut marketing Associations with Subcounty level branches established either at the regional or district level	3.1 Marketing Association launched and registered with the District by EOP 3.2 Supply Prospectus drawn up and "sold" to at least one end buyer by end of project. 3.3 At least 16 marketing centres formed, each with a centralized storage facility for ease of quality control and bulking.	1. Constitution 2. Association registration 3. Progress reports	Business partners can be found who are interested in buying groundnuts.

Activities	Inputs	Means of verification	Important assumptions										
<p>1.1 Hold mobilization meetings in new sub counties. 1.2 Mobilize new groups of beneficiaries. 1.3 Establish Parish leadership structures. 1.4 PDC's and 80 group PC's to be trained as trainers on seed production. 1.5 16 PDC's and 80 group PC's to be trained as record keepers. 1.6 Local leaders train the farmer groups under supervision of the Extension staff. 1.7 Parishes monitor field performance of seed. 1.8 Parishes hold first end of season evaluation meetings. 1.9 Community leaders witness first repayment and redistribution.</p>	<p>Total budget of £52,200</p> <p>Including the following to AT Uganda:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Staff Costs</td> <td>£14,208</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overheads</td> <td>£5,532</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Capital Equipment</td> <td>£0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Travel and Subsistence</td> <td>£10,470</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Miscellaneous</td> <td>£22,290</td> </tr> </table>	Staff Costs	£14,208	Overheads	£5,532	Capital Equipment	£0	Travel and Subsistence	£10,470	Miscellaneous	£22,290	<p>Register of new participating communities and groups PDC records Training reports</p> <p>Training reports and PDC Records</p> <p>Evaluation reports Redistribution records</p>	<p>Local leaders will be motivated to work without monetary pay.</p>
Staff Costs	£14,208												
Overheads	£5,532												
Capital Equipment	£0												
Travel and Subsistence	£10,470												
Miscellaneous	£22,290												
<p>2.1 Groups prepare distribution plans. 2.2 Groups prepare seed multiplication regulations (bylaws). 2.3 Review and reprint seed production guides for distribution to all new farmers 2.4 Buy additional seed from original groups and research station. 2.5 Deliver seed to PDC's for distribution to groups. 2.6 Repayment of sufficient seed to plant 140 hectares collected from recipients and ready for redistribution the next season.</p>	<p>Farmers donate land and labour.</p>	<p>Distribution plans Bylaws Production guides</p> <p>Delivery notes Delivery notes Redistribution records</p>	<p>1.1 Original groups will wait to sell seed to project.</p>										
<p>3.1 Extension staff train new groups on group development and collective marketing. 3.2 Groups facilitated to come together to form a groundnut marketing Association with sub-county level branches 3.3 Simple storage facilities identified and established (one store per Sub-county) on a cost sharing basis for purposes of market bulking by end of project. 3.4 Groundnut marketing association linked to groundnut buyers and processors. Supply prospectus developed, circulated to potential buyers/investors and commercial market relationship negotiated 3.5 Groups hold end of season evaluation meeting</p>	<p>Technical assistance in marketing association formation Suitable Rental property identified that can be modified for the purpose. Local building materials supplied by community Technical assistance from ILO to develop and promote Supply Prospectus</p>	<p>Training reports</p> <p>Association constitution and registration Tenancy agreements Stores inspection report</p> <p>Prospectus Contract</p> <p>Evaluation report</p>	<p>Farmers sufficiently committed to invest time and resources in association management</p>										