



THE REPUBLIC OF UGANDA

Extension Services and Agricultural Sector Performance: What are the Emerging Trends?

Overview

Agricultural extension services refer to the application of scientific research and new knowledge to agricultural practices through farmer education (Wikipedia). Extension services in Uganda aim at enhancing agricultural production and productivity, value addition, food security, household incomes and exports.

Agricultural sector performance in this brief is measured by the extent to which resources were made available for extension services, the availability of these services and sector outcomes.

The policy brief analyses emerging trends in financing and provision of extension services in Uganda and their effects on sector performance.

The analysis focuses on the period FY 2012/13 to mid-year FY 2014/15 and uses data from the Budget Monitoring and Accountability Unit (BMAU), Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic (MFPED) and Ministry of Agricultural, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF).

Key Issues

- The amount of funds spent on extension has significantly reduced from Ug shs 212.41 (62% of sector expenditure) in FY 2012/13 to Ug shs 44.65 (28% of sector expenditure) in FY 2014/15 mid-year.
- Farmers' access to general extension services at LG level have deteriorated after phasing out of NAADS.
- Extension services have not significantly improved sector outcomes except for the food crops, coffee and cotton sub-sectors.

Background

Public extension service delivery

Since 2001, the National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS) has been the prime programme for delivering extension services in Uganda. However, starting FY 2013/14, the extension service is undergoing restructuring involving laying off of NAADS Local Government (LG) staff and implementation of the single spine extension system.

Extension services are also offered by LGs MAAIF statutory agencies: Uganda Cotton

Development Organisation (UCDO), Uganda Coffee Development Authority (UCDA) and Dairy Development Authority (DDA)

Financing of extension services

Analysis is based on outputs and expenditure items that contribute directly to extension service delivery. The trends are shown in Table 1. The total amount spent on extension services reduced greatly from Ug shs 212.41 billion (62.30% of total sector expenditure) in FY 2012/13 to Ug shs 44.65 billion (28.90% of sector expenditures) in FY 2014/15 mid-year. Since FY 2012/13, the average release (101%) and absorption (98%) of funds for extension service was excellent. The NAADS accounted for 86% of sector expenditures.

Table 1: Financing of extension services - FY 2012/13 to FY 2014/15 (Ug shs billion)

Institution	FY 2012/13			FY 2013/14			FY 2014/15 (mid-year)		
	Approved	Release	Spent	Approved	Release	Spent	Approved	Release	Spent
DDA	1.43	1.43	1.39	1.53	1.33	1.30	1.67	0.79	0.54
KCCA	1.35	1.11	0.75	1.35	1.30	1.30	1.22	0.30	0.30
LG NAADS/ General Extension	150.50	145.86	145.86	150.7	148.56	149.56	62.54	30.09	30.09
MAAIF	22.61	21.32	18.36	28.91	25.83	25.83	10.43	7.39	6.70
NAADS Secretariat	52.91	42.71	42.45	47.12	74.07	71.73	6.27	3.62	2.67
UCDA	2.75	2.75	2.72	7.75	7.75	7.75	7.91	3.96	3.91
UCDO	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.69	0.69	0.69	1.06	0.61	0.44
Total Extension (GoU)	232.43	216.06	212.41	238.05	259.53	258.16	91.10	46.76	44.65
Total amount spent on extension services (FY 2012/13-FY 2014/15 mid-year)									515.22
Total GoU and donor sector budget	433.92	374.46	340.90	382.79	345.14	342.76	479.049	240.738	154.652
%Extension of total sector budget	53.60	57.70	62.30	62.20	75.19	75.30	19.00	19.40	28.90

Source: MFPED, 2014; MFPED, 2013; IFMS; Various Budget Monitoring Reports

Notes: i) Data was not available on amount spent of the Local Government Grants for extension. It was assumed that all funds released where 100% spent ii) Warrant is assumed to be equal to the release.

Availability of extension services

Nationally, the proportion of households/communities accessing NAADS in FY 2012/13 was low at 22%¹. There is no update national statistics on this variable. Field assessments by BMAU reveal a remarkable difference in availability of extension services before (FY 2013/14 and prior years) and after (FY 2014/15) restructuring NAADS as illustrated by the sample programmes below.

FY 2012/13 and FY 2013/14

By 31st June 2014, the extension services received by farmers were mainly under the NAADS programme, complemented by interventions under MAAIF agencies.

NAADS

In FY 2012/13, 650,000 Food Security Farmers (FSFs) and 26,000 Market Oriented Farmers (MOFs) received improved technologies and advisory services.

In FY 2013/14, advisory services and inputs were extended to 436,231 FSFs and 27,223 MOFs.

The BMAU findings revealed that extension services under NAADS resulted in slight improvements in agricultural production. Key constraints to sector performance were: low outreach of LG extension staff due to their limited numbers; poor quality high cost inputs; wastage of inputs, limited monitoring and supervision, and corruption. More than half of funds spent at LG level for the NAADS programme were used for staff contracts, allowances, coordination costs and operational expenses².

UCDA

In FY 2013/14, the UCDA provided 28,464,451 coffee seedlings, assorted inputs and extension services to farmers and war veterans. Farmers reported good access to the coffee extension workers.

1 Uganda National Household Survey, 2012/13

2 Annual Budget Monitoring Report FY 2013/14

UCDO

In FY 2012/13, the UCDO provided 1,381MT seeds, 12,650 bags of fertilizer, 380,000 units of pesticides, 632MT fertilizers and 300 field extension workers to farmers. The targeted extension services were noted to be inadequate reaching about 70% of the cotton farmers in some areas. The inadequacy of extension services led to wastage of seeds, poor agronomic practices and low production.

FY 2014/15 (by February 2015)

The public extension services received by farmers are mainly offered by MAAIF and its statutory agencies and LGs as illustrated in the examples below.

MAAIF Crop Disease and Pest Control Project:

The MAAIF trained and equipped 58 plant clinic doctors in Uganda to extend crop based advisory services at LG level. Only five (Mbale, Kisoro, Mukono, Masaka and Mitooma) out of the nine districts that were visited operationalised the plant clinics in their respective LGs. Iganga, Jinja, Rukungiri and Kabale districts failed to offer extension services due to understaffing and lack of operational funds.

MAAIF Crop Protection Department: The MAAIF trained 60 district staff from 50 districts and equipped them with soil testing kits. They were expected to offer soil testing and advisory services to farmers. Of the seven sampled districts, four districts (Kisoro, Rukungiri, Mitooma, Mbale) offered the services to farmers in their respective LGs. Due to inadequate operational funds and understaffing in the LGs, the districts of Kabale, Iganga and Jinja failed to extend advisory services to farmers.

NARO Agricultural Technology and Agribusiness Advisory Services (ATAAS)

The LGs offer extension services to facilitate the dissemination of technologies under the

ATAAS project/National Agricultural Research Organization (NARO). The ATAAS programme underperformed (68% of the semi-annual targets were fully or partly achieved) largely due to the absence of an effective extension system in local governments to transmit the technologies and follow up the on-farm trials. There was evidence of wastage of technologies at farm level.



NARO cassava cuttings that were abandoned in Aduvu village Arua district

UCDO

The level of achievement of targets for provision of cotton extension services, production inputs and cotton planting seeds was excellent (75%). A total of 333 extension workers were trained and deployed. Farmers acknowledged receipt of the extension services.

Overall sector outcomes

Uganda lacks comprehensive up to date agricultural statistics as the Uganda Agriculture Census was last conducted in FY 2008/09 and the Uganda National Household Survey (UNHS) in 2012/13. Real GDP Growth and exports are used to measure sector performance.

Agricultural GDP growth, although improving, remains much lower compared to the industry and services sectors (Table 2) implying

negligible impact of extension services. Most growth was registered in the food crops sub-sector which has been the main beneficiary of NAADS interventions. Between FY 2012/2013 and FY 2013/14, coffee registered the highest growth in terms of volumes and export value from 3,030 bags (US\$ 395.40 million) to 3,780 bags (US\$415.74 million). This suggests positive impact of UCDA extension services.

Table 2: Real GDP growth by economic activity by sector at market prices

Sector	2012/13	2013/14 (projection)
Agriculture	1.3	1.5
Cash crops	3.5	3.3
Food crops	0.2	1.9
Livestock	3.4	3.3
Forestry	2.0	2.2
Fishing	2.5	-5.1
Industry	6.8	5.6
Services	6.5	5.6
Total GDP	6.0	4.7

Source: MFPED, 2014b

Beans, hides and skins registered positive trends in value of exports while cotton, fish and maize had negative trends during the same period³.

Conclusion

Financing for extension delivery in Uganda has significantly reduced. The approved budget has reduced by 61% from Ug shs 232.43 in FY 2012/13 to Ug shs 91.10 in FY 2014/15. Access to general extension services at LG level has deteriorated due to inadequate staffing and operational funds at district and sub-county level. The extension services have had some positive impact in the food crops, coffee and cotton sub-sectors

Recommendations

- MAAIF and LGs should fast track implementation of the single spine extension system and recruit extension workers at district and sub-county level.
- The MFPED and MAAIF should ensure that the restructured extension system is adequately resourced.
- The MAAIF should collaborate with the UBOS to update the Uganda Agricultural Census.
- The MAAIF should strengthen evidence based field monitoring and supervision of sector interventions.

References:

- *Annual Budget Monitoring Reports FY 2013/14 and FY 2014/15 Semi-annual.*
- *MFPED, 2014: Annual Budget Performance Report, October 2014.*
- *MFPED, 2014b: Background to the budget 2014/15*
- *MFPED, 2013: Annual Budget Performance report, September 2013*
- *UBOS, 2013: Uganda National Household Survey UNHS 2012/13*

**Ministry of Finance, Planning and
Economic Development**
P.O Box 8147
Kampala
www.finance.go.ug

³ MFPED, 2014b