Extension advisory service (Uganda)

DESCRIPTION

Through ULAMP by agricultural extensions ,adopted to conserve land degaradation by practicing grass strips.

Aims / objectives: It was initiated by ULAMP through agric extensions, through group working/participation . Training by doing and aimed at land conservation by reducing soil erosion , increasing fodder production , mulches and producing building materials.

Methods: -Demonstrations
-Meetings
-Training /practicing
-Group work/team working

Stages of implementation: Mobilisation-through ULAMP as initiator.
Commencement meeting-by agricultural extension workers as the implementors
Demonstration-Monitors and evaluators(Team work).
Monitoring: Land users as the beneficiaries and at the same time as monitors and evaluators.

Role of stakeholders: Extension staff provided the training and training materials,and participated in monitoring.
Land users provided one demostration site and participated in monitoring
Local leaders participated in monitoring

Other important information: The stakeholders stopped funding on the demonstration site and others just transfered the knowledge and funded themselves with their local implements like hoes , pangas and the species of grass.ie. napier grass.

LOCATION

Location: Mbarara, Uganda, Uganda

Geo-reference of selected sites
- n.a.

Initiation date: 2009

Year of termination: 1994

Type of Approach
- ☐ traditional/ indigenous
- ☐ recent local initiative/ innovative
- ☑ project/ programme based

APPROACH AIMS AND ENABLING ENVIRONMENT

Main aims / objectives of the approach

The Approach focused mainly on SLM with other activities (Grazing,mulching and building materials)

-To reduce soil erosion and conserve land.
-To inrease fodder production
-To increase mulching materials
-To make building materials available
-To give knowledge to farmers on land planning.

The SLM Approach addressed the following problems: The approach wanted to address the problem of soil erosion and fodder production-plus low mulching materials.

Conditions enabling the implementation of the Technology/ ies applied under the Approach

- **Legal framework (land tenure, land and water use rights)**: The existing land ownership, land use rights / water rights greatly helped the approach implementation: The land users were free to use their land in any way they wanted

Conditions hindering the implementation of the Technology/ ies applied under the Approach

- **Availability/ access to financial resources and services**: Lacks money to finance all the activities involved Treatment through the SLM Approach: Still need government help or intervention inform of grants and donations.
- **Knowledge about SLM, access to technical support**: Lacks monitoring staff in order to make changes where necessary. Treatment through the SLM Approach: Having enough agricultural extension staff.

PARTICIPATION AND ROLES OF STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED

Stakeholders involved in the Approach and their roles

What stakeholders / implementing bodies were involved in the Approach?	Specify stakeholders	Describe roles of stakeholders
local land users/ local communities	beneficiaries through groups	as implementers
SLM specialists/ agricultural advisers		At the subcounty to do the training
national government (planners, decision-makers)	ULAMP	

Lead agency

Specialists from the district and the centre came with the approach

Involvement of local land users/ local communities in the different phases of the Approach

	none	passive	external support	interactive	self-mobilization	
initiation/ motivation			✓			Local leaders for mobilisation
planning				✓		group leaders for guiding specialists
implementation				✓		attending meetings
monitoring/ evaluation				✓		Together with specialists
Research	✓					

Flow chart

Decision-making on the selection of SLM Technology

Decisions were taken by

- land users alone (self-initiative)
- ✓ mainly land users, supported by SLM specialists
- all relevant actors, as part of a participatory approach
- mainly SLM specialists, following consultation with land users
- SLM specialists alone
- politicians/ leaders

Decisions were made based on

- evaluation of well-documented SLM knowledge (evidence-based decision-making)
- research findings
- personal experience and opinions (undocumented)

TECHNICAL SUPPORT, CAPACITY BUILDING, AND KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

The following activities or services have been part of the approach

- ✓ Capacity building/ training
- ✓ Advisory service
- ✓ Institution strengthening (organizational development)
- ✓ Monitoring and evaluation
- Research

Capacity building/ training

Training was provided to the following stakeholders

- ✓ land users
- ✓ field staff/ advisers

Form of training

- ✓ on-the-job
- farmer-to-farmer
- demonstration areas
- public meetings
- courses

Subjects covered

Group formation,Group dynamics, soil and water management .

Advisory service

Advisory service was provided

- on land users' fields
- ✓ at permanent centres
- ✓ Meetings

Name of method used for advisory service: Meeting; Key elements: Land management, Fertility mangement, Layout of conservation structures

Advisory service is quite adequate to ensure the continuation of land conservation activities; They came like once in a month

Institution strengthening

Institutions have been strengthened / established

- [ ] no
- [x] yes, a little
- [ ] yes, moderately
- [ ] yes, greatly

at the following level

- [x] local
- [ ] regional
- [ ] national

Describe institution, roles and responsibilities, members, etc.

Type of support

- [ ] financial
- [x] capacity building/ training
- [ ] equipment

Further details

Land users were supported in mobilisation of meetings and on job training.

Monitoring and evaluation

socio-cultural aspects were regular monitored by project staff through observations; indicators: attendance lists management of Approach aspects were regular monitored by project staff through observations; indicators: number of activities done There were few changes in the Approach as a result of monitoring and evaluation: There was inrease in the number of people attending meetings. There were few changes in the Technology as a result of monitoring and evaluation: soil erosion has reduced and top cover plus the crops planted haved improved

FINANCING AND EXTERNAL MATERIAL SUPPORT

Annual budget in USD for the SLM component

- [ ] < 2,000
- [ ] 2,000-10,000
- [ ] 10,000-100,000
- [ ] 100,000-1,000,000
- [x] > 1,000,000

Precise annual budget: n.a.

Approach costs were met by the following donors: government (in providing training materials or demonstration materials.): 70.0%; local government (district, county, municipality, village etc) (payment of technical staff): 30.0%

The following services or incentives have been provided to land users

- [ ] Financial/ material support provided to land users
- [x] Subsidies for specific inputs
- [ ] Credit
- [ ] Other incentives or instruments

	partly financed	fully financed
Training materials	☐	☑

Labour by land users was

- [x] voluntary
- [ ] food-for-work
- [ ] paid in cash
- [ ] rewarded with other material support

IMPACT ANALYSIS AND CONCLUDING STATEMENTS

Impacts of the Approach

	No	Yes, little	Yes, moderately	Yes, greatly
Did the Approach help land users to implement and maintain SLM Technologies? Continous production of fodder has given manure ,and improved soil fertility of the soil.	☐	☑	☐	☐
Did the Approach empower socially and economically disadvantaged groups? No improvement on feeding habits/regime	☑	☐	☐	☐
Did the Approach improve issues of land tenure/ user rights that hindered implementation of SLM Technologies?	☑	☐	☐	☐
Did other land users / projects adopt the Approach? About 20% have adopted the technology and improved livelihoods	☐	☑	☐	☐

Main motivation of land users to implement SLM

- [x] increased production
- [ ] increased profit(ability), improved cost-benefit-ratio
- [ ] reduced land degradation
- [ ] reduced risk of disasters
- [ ] reduced workload
- [ ] payments/ subsidies
- [ ] rules and regulations (fines)/ enforcement
- [x] prestige, social pressure/ social cohesion
- [x] affiliation to movement/ project/ group/ networks
- [ ] environmental consciousness
- [ ] customs and beliefs, morals
- [ ] enhanced SLM knowledge and skills
- [ ] aesthetic improvement
- [ ] conflict mitigation

Sustainability of Approach activities

Can the land users sustain what hat been implemented through the Approach (without external support)?

- [x] no
- [ ] yes
- [ ] uncertain

CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNT

Strengths: land user's view

- -It helped in technology implementation
  -helped in mobilisation of meetings

Strengths: compiler's or other key resource person's view

- It helped in technology implementation (How to sustain/ enhance this strength: Regular monitoring of the approach)

Weaknesses/ disadvantages/ risks: land user's viewhow to overcome

Weaknesses/ disadvantages/ risks: compiler's or other key resource person's viewhow to overcome

- They are less available to every individual increasing the number of extension advisory staff

REFERENCES

Compiler
Wilson Bamwerinde

Editors

Reviewer
Fabian Ottiger

Date of documentation: April 18, 2013

Last update: Junie 26, 2017

Resource persons
Wilson Bamwerinde (bamwerinde@gmail.com) - SLM specialist
John Mubangizi - SLM specialist

Full description in the WOCAT database
https://qcat.wocat.net/af/wocat/approaches/view/approaches_2471/

Linked SLM data
Technologies: Grass strips https://qcat.wocat.net/af/wocat/technologies/view/technologies_1151/
Technologies: Grass strips https://qcat.wocat.net/af/wocat/technologies/view/technologies_1151/

Documentation was faciliated by

Institution

- n.a.

Project

- The Transboundary Agro-ecosystem Management Project for the Kagera River Basin (GEF-FAO / Kagera TAMP)