BUSITEMA UNIVERSITY

FACULTY OF NATURAL RESOURCE ECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

ASSESSING THE BENEFITS OF CLIMATE SMART AGRICULTURE ON THE LIVELIHOOD OF THE PEOPLE

A CASE STUDY OF NAMASAGALI SUB COUNTY, KAMULI DISTRICT

ΒY

NAMUKOSE HELLEN

BU/UP/2014/372

A RESEARCH REPORT SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCE ECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE AWARD OF A BACHELORS DEGREE IN NATURAL RESOURCE ECONOMICS OF BUSITEMA UNIVERSITY

2017

DECLARATION

I NAMUKOSE HELLEN declares that this research report is my original work and is a result of my independent commitment and has never been submitted either in the same or different kind of institution for any academic qualification.

1

Namukose Hellen

BU/UP/2014/372

Date 13th 06-2017

APPROVAL

This is to certify that this research report by Namukose Hellen has been submitted with my approval as the University supervisor of Busitema University.

•••••••••••••••••••••

Dr. Isabirye Moses

(Supervisor)

×,

Date.....

DEDICATION

To the best mothers in the entire world; Ms Kadondi Rachel and Ms Appophia Juliet, thank you so much for your unending sacrifice towards my education. To all my relatives and brothers who have been there supporting me in all ways, thank you so much. May God truly bless you!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To God, I give thanks for enabling me reach this far in my academics journey. It would not have been easy without His guidance and love through all the tasks I have performed to reach this far.

My sincere gratitude goes to my mothers, brothers, all relatives, guardians and friends for their financial, moral and emotional support throughout my training period. It has not been a simple journey but they have done all they can to see that I make it to this far.

I gladly thank my research Supervisor, Dr. Isabirye Moses so much for giving me all the insight I needed to complete this research. May God bless you!

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Conceptual framework	15
Figure 2: Count of Sex in relation to CSA	46
Figure 3: Count of Sex in relation to Non-CSA	47

. . .

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Types of climate smart agricultural practices in Kamuli District
Table 2: summary data table of the results obtained during data collection
Table 3: Relationship between gender and crop harvests
Table 4: Relationship between gender and earnings from crops grown45
Table 5: Relationship between farming and benefits

LIST OF ACRONYMS

- NAADS National Agricultural Advisory Services
- BMPs Best Management Practices
- ISU Iyowa States University, Uganda program
- CSA Climate Smart Agriculture
- UNDP United Nations Development Program
- FAO Food and Agricultural Organization
- GHG Green House Gas
- MAIF Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries
- SLM Sustainable Land Management
- COMESA Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
- SADC Southern African Development Community
- NAMAs Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions
- NAPAs National Adaptation Programme of Actions
- INDCs Intended Nationally Determined Contributions

ABSTRACT

This study examined the benefits of climate smart agriculture on the livelihood of the people of Namasagali sub county, Kamuli District. The major farming practices in the sub county were identified as both climate smart and non-climate smart farming practices.

Both qualitative and quantitative approaches were used to collect data. This involved use of secondary data, observation, interviews and questionnaires. The data collected from a sample of 35 respondents was analyzed using SPSS 6.0 statistical package and EXCEL spread sheet the results were presented by use of tables, pie charts and bar graphs.

The study revealed that the farmers carried out both climate smart and non-climate smart farming practices like; irrigation, mixed cropping, agro-forestry, mono-cropping, fertilizer application and use of manure. The study also revealed that farming is the major source of livelihoods to the people in the area and that the yields vary depending on the season and the farming practices carried out. The major factors fronted by farmers for the reducing crop yields in Namasali Sub-county were prolonged drought, pests and diseases, theft, land size holdings and declining soil fertility. The study revealed that more crop yields are obtained from climate smart practices say use of farm yard manure, agro-forestry, mixed cropping, irrigation and application of mulches thus enhancing food security, adaptation to climate change and conserving the environment.

It's recommended from this study that farmers adapt climate smart farming practices so as to enhance food security, adaptation and mitigation to climate change and environmental conservation with the help of government and private associations such as NAADS and ISU.

Table of Contents DECLARATION
APPROVALii
DEDIČATION
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS
LIST OF FIGURES
LIST OF TABLES
LIST OF ACRONYMS
ABSTRACT
1.0 CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION
1.1 Background of the study
1,2 Problem statement
1.3 Major objective
1.4 Specific objectives
1.5 Research Questions
1.6 Justification of the study
1.7 Significance of the study
1.8 Conceptual framework
2.0 CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW
2.1 Introduction
2.2 Preventing and mitigating land degradation
2.3 Improving soil structure with organic matter
2.4 CSA Policy Framework in Uganda
2.5 Why CSA?
2.6 Defining CSA concept
2.7 Benefits of climate smart agriculture
3.0 METHODOLOGY

÷

3.1 Introduction
3.2 Research design
3.3 Target and description of the study population25
3.4 Description of the study area
3.5 Map of Namasagali Sub-county showing the study areas
3.6 Sampling size and procedure
3.6. 1 Sample size
3.6.2 Sampling technique and procedure
3.6.3 Data types and data collection methods
3.6.4 Questionnaire
3.6.5 Direct observation
3.5.6 Personal interviews
3.6.7 Data quality control
3.7 Data analysis and processing
3.8 Ethical considerations
4.0 CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS
4.1 Table 2: Characteristics of respondents in the study
4.2 Table 3: Relationship between gender and crop harvests (BAGS)
4.3 Table 4: Relationship between gender and earnings from crops grown (Ug.Shs)
4.4 Percentages of respondents who Practice and those who do not Practice Smart Agriculture. 32
4.5 Number of respondents who practice and those who do not practice non-climate smart agriculture
4.6 Table 5: Relationship between farming and benefits
5.0 CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION
5.1 Socio-economic characteristics of the respondents
5.2 Farming practices carried out
5.3 Impacts of agriculture to the environment

6.0 CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMENDATIONS	38
6.1 Conclusions	38
6.2 Recommendations	
6.3 Area of further research	39
REFERENCES	40
QUESTIONNAIRE	43

1.0 CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

Agriculture has to address simultaneously three intertwined challenges: ensuring food security through increased productivity and income, adapting to climate change and contributing to climate change mitigation (FAO, 2010a; Foresight, 2011a; Beddington et al., 2012a; Beddington et al., 2012b; HLPE, 2012a). Addressing these challenges, exacerbating global pressure on natural resources, especially water, will require radical changes in our food systems. To address these three intertwined challenges, food systems have to become, at the same time, more efficient and resilient, at every scale from the farm to the global level. They have to become more efficient in resource use (use less land, water, and inputs to produce more food sustainably) and become more resilient to changes and shocks. It is precisely to articulate these changes that FAO has forged the concept of climate-smart agriculture (CSA) as a way forward for food security in a changing climate. CSA aims to improve food security, help communities adapt to climate change and contribute to climate change mitigation by adopting appropriate practices, developing enabling policies and institutions and mobilizing needed finances. Various studies have shown the different Climate Smart Agricultural practices and they are beneficial to smallholder farmers on their farms of crops and livestock. UNDP (United Nations Development Program) with Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) started a project "Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management activities in Six Cattle Corridor districts of Uganda Kamuli inclusive. They are currently implementing the Enabling environment to overcome land degradation and desertification in two districts namely; Kamuli and Nakasongora specifically in the cattle corridor sub counties. Through these projects, Climate smart farming practices were encouraged and have demonstrated considerable results compared to the traditional farming practices.

1.2 Problem statement

Climate Smart Farming practices are commonly referred to as Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA) or Sustainable land management practices (SLM). CSA is agriculture that sustainably increases productivity, resilience (Adaptation), reduces /removes greenhouse gases (Mitigation), and enhances achievement of food security and development goals in existence of climate change. Such practices include; mulching, agro-forestry, rain water harvesting, irrigation, zero grazing, integrated fish farming, mushroom growing and use of farmyard manure.

REFERENCES

- 1. ActionAid. September 2014. Clever Name, Losing Game? How Climate Smart Agriculture is sowing confusion in the food movement. http://www.actionaid.org. Aubert, P.-M., M.u Brun and S. Treyer. 15. July 2015.
- 2. A review. In: Agronomy for Sustainable Development. 29 (4): 503-515. WorldFish. 2015. Why Climate-Smart Agriculture. (Presentation given at the Regional Asia-Pacific Workshop on Climate-Smart Agriculture.) http://www.slideshare.net/worldfishcenter/fao-csakeynote218jun2015lee.
- 3. AU-NEPAD, 2010. The AU-NEPAD Agriculture Climate Change Adaptation-Mitigation Framework, CAADP, Pretoria, South Africa.
- Climate-Smart Agriculture for Food Security. In: Nature Climate Change. 4(12): 1068-1072. Neely C.L. and J.M. Dixon. 2006. Farming Systems and its Cousins: Including and Transcending to make a difference.
- 5. Ensuring Transparency and Accountability of the Global Alliance for Climate Smart Agriculture in the Perspective of COP21. (IDDRI Policy Brief N. 3). Paris: France. AUC-NEPAD. 2010.
- 6. Engaging with business for agricultural growth: Opportunities and risks. In: GREAT Insights Magazine, 4(5). August/September 2015. Rural 21, 2015.
- 7. ECOWAS Regional Investment Plan for the implementation of the mobilizing programmes. EU. 2015. Catalyzing Private Investment and Resources for Development - the EU's Role. <u>https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/policies/innovative-financial-instruments-blending en. European</u> <u>Commission. 2013.</u>
- 8. FAO: 2013. Climate-Smart Agriculture Sourcebook on Climate-Smart Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, Rome: FAO. http://www.fao.org/climate-smart-agriculture/72611/en/. FAO. 2011.
- 9. Food and nutrition security in the SDGs where are we heading? http://www.rural21.com/uploads/media/rural2015_01-S10-12.pdf. Schuite, G. J. and D. Forcella. (Enclude BV). 2015.
- 10. Green Inclusive Finance Status, Trends and Opportunities1. (Report requested by NpM, Hivos and FMO). Silici, L. 2014. Agro-ecology: What it is, what it has to offer, and how agro-ecological practices could be more widely adopted. (IED Issue Paper). London: IIED.
- 11. Hoogzaad J., J. Holberg and F. Haupt, 2014. The geographical distribution of climate finance architecture: Amsterdam and Washington DC: Climate Focus. http://www.climatefocus.com/sites/default/files/the_geographical_distribution_of_climate_finance_for _agric_ulture_0.pdf IIED.

- 12. High Level Forum of Climate-Smart Agriculture Stakeholders in West Africa: For the adoption of the ECOWAP/CAADP Intervention Framework for CSA and the launching of the associated West Africa CSA Alliance (WACSAA). www.hubrural.org. Lipper, L., Thornton, P., Campbell, B. M., Baedeker, T., Braimoh, A., Bwalya, M., Caron, P., Cattaneo, A., Garrity, D., Henry, K.,
- 13. Jayne TS, Mather D, Mghenyi E, 2006. Smallholder farming under increasingly difficult circumstances: Policy and public investment priorities for Africa. MSU International Development Working Paper No. 86. Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan. http://www.aec.msu. edu/agecon/fs2/index.htm
- Kristjanson P, Mango N, Krishnä A, Radeny M, Johnson N, 2010. Underständing poverty dynamics in Kenya. Journal International Development 22, 978–996.
- 15. Programme on Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation in the Eastern and Southern (COMESA-EAC-SADC) Region. ECOWAS. 2010.
- 16. Save and Grow, a policy-makers guide to the sustainable intensification of smallholder crop production. Rome: FAO, http://www.fao.org/ag/save-and-grow/. GCF: 2015. Analysis of the Expected Role and Impact of the Green Climate Fund, <u>www.gcfund.org</u>.
- 17. The AUC-NEPAD Agriculture Climate Change Adaptation-Mitigation Framework. www.donorplatform.org Branca, G., T. Tennigkeit, W. Mann and L. Lipper, 2012,
- The Role of Agriculture in the UN Climate Talks. (CCAFS Info Note). Copenhagen, Denmark: CGLAR Research Program on CCAFS, www.ccafs.cgiar.org, COMESA, 2013. COMESA Regional CAADP Compact. COMESA-EAC-SADC, 2011.
- Identifying opportunities for climate-smart agriculture investments in Africa. Rome: FAO, Campbell B, G. Wamukoya, J. Kinyangi, L. Verchot, L. Wollenberg, S.J. Vermeulen, P.A. Minang, H. Neufeldt, A. Vidal, A. Loboguerrero Rodriguez and M. Hedger, 2014.
- 20. Hottle, R., Jackson, L., Jarvis, A., Kossam, F., Mann, W., McCarthy, N., Meybeck, A., Neufeldt, H., Remington, T., Sen, P. T., Sessa, R., Shula, R., Tibu, A., Torquebiau, E. F. 2014.
- 21. Making climate-smart also people-smart. In: GREAT insights Magazine. 4(2). February/March 2015. www.ecdpm.org/bn80 Making agriculture in Africa climate-smart 19 Ridolfi, R. 2015.
- 22. Nelson GC, Rosegrant MW, Palazzo A, Gray I, Ingersoll C, Robertson R, Tokgoz S, Zhu T, Sulser T, Ringler C, Msangi S, You L. 2010. Food Security, Farming, and Climate Change to 2050: Scenarios, Results, Policy Options. IFPRI, Washington, DC.
- 23. Norton-Griffith M, 2008. Revitalizing African agriculture. PERC Reports 26 (3), 32-36.

- 24. Toenniessen, G., A. Adesina, and J. De Vries. 2008. Building an Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa. N.Y.: Acad. Sci. 1136: 233-242.
- 25. Towards a Green Economy: Pathways to Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication. A Synthesis for Policy Makers. www.unep.org/greeneconomy. UNFCCC. 2014. Issues related to Agriculture, Draft Conclusions Proposed by the Chair. Bonn: SBSTA 40th Session. http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2014/sbsta/eng/114.pdf.
- 26. Uganda Ministry of Water and Environment. 2015. Uganda's Intended Nationally Determined Contribution (INDC), October 2015. http://www4.unfccc.int/submissions/indc/. UNEP. 2011.
- Vermeulen S.J., P.K. Aggarwal, A. Ainslie, C. Angelone, B.M. Campbell, A.J. Challinor, J.W. Hansen, J.S.I. Ingram, A. Jarvis, P. Kristjanson, C. Lau, G.C. Nelson, P.K. Thornton, E. Wollenberg. 2012.