BUSITEMA UNIVERSITY NAMASAGALI CAMPUS FACULTY OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

ECONOMIC BENEFITS OF SUGARCANE AND RICE GROWING IN WETLANDS

A CASE STUDY OF NALWEKOMBA WETLAND IN NAMASAGALI SUB-COUNTY, KAMULI DISTRICT

 \mathbf{BY}

AKETCH IRENE OKOTH

BU/UG/2016/105



A RESEARCH REPORT SUBMITED IN PARTIAL FULLFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR AWARD OF BACHELORS DEGREE OF SCIENCES IN NATURAL RESOURCE ECONOMCS

DECLARATION

I the undersigned do hereby declare to the best of my knowledge this research report is my original work. It has never been submitted to any University or Higher institution of learning for a degree award or any academic award.

Signature:	A STORY
0	

Name: AKETCH IRENE OKOTH

Date: 07/07/2019

APPROVAL

This is to acknowledge that the work titled "Economic Benefits of Sugarcane and Rice growing on Lowlands, a case study of Nalwekomba wetland in Namasagali sub county Kamuli District" has been done under my supervision and is now ready for submission to the Faculty of Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences of Busitema University under the Department of Natural Resource Economics.

a.				
Si	an	21	111	P
DI.	211	aı	uı	·

Assoc. Prof, Moses Isabirye

Academic Research Supervisor

Date.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this piece of work to my beloved dad Mr. Okoth Fredrick, Mrs. Akello Beatrice, Mr. Ochieng Ronald (BU), my dear brothers and sisters, Lecturers of BU, Namasagali campus and all my friends at large, may the Almighty God bless you all.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Accomplishing my academic research would not have been possible without the input of many people. It is not possible to mention each of you on this page but accept my sincere appreciation for your invaluable support. Nonetheless, I will mention a few individuals who were critical in the preparation of this report. First and foremost I would like to thank the Almighty God who has provided and enabled me to go through all the challenges during this Research.

Sincere thanks goes to both of my beloved parents Mr. Okoth Fredrick, and Mrs. Akello Beatrice. Mr. Ochieng Ronald for the financial assistance, the parental care given to me and the love they showed to me during my academic journey which gave me hope to complete it successfully, therefore may the Almighty God grant you with what you desire most and bless you abundantly for your unforgettable sacrifice.

Exceptional thanks goes to Professor Isabirye Moses who supervised me towards accomplishment of my research not forgetting the tireless effort of the entire academic staff (both teaching and nonteaching) of Namasagali campus throughout the course. With their indisputable professional, support which has provided a step towards my professional career.

Finally, my thanks go to my friends like Ayubu Muswabu, Okot Jacob, Tashoma Paul, January Ronald, Erumbi Gloria, Munyambabazi John for whatever you have been helping me out in one way or another throughout my research. May the Almighty God bless you all.

Table of Contents

DECLARATIONii
APPROVALiii
DEDICATIONiv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTv
LIST OF ACRONYMS/ABBREVIATIONSx
LIST OF FIGURESxi
LIST OF TABLESxii
ABSTRACTxiii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION1
1.1 Background to the Study1
1.2 Problem statement
1.3 Objectives of the study3
1.3.2 Specific objectives of the study
1.4 Research Questions3
1.5 Conceptual framework3
1.6 Significance of the study4
1.7 Scope of study5
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW
2.1 Sugarcane crop
2.1.1 The biology of sugarcane and sugarcane growing
2.2.2 National importance of sugarcane
2.2.3 Issues surrounding sugarcane cultivation9
2.2.4 Combination of sugarcane with other crops and environment issues
2.2.5 Best practices to enhance sugarcane cultivation
2.3 Rice crop
2.3.1 The biology of rice and rice growing
2.3.2 National importance of rice
2.3.3 Issues surrounding rice cultivation14
2.3.4 Major Constraints affecting both rice and sugarcane growing for Agricultural Productivity16
2.3.4.1 Environmental Constraints

2	2.3.4.2 Irrigation Water Management Constraints	17
2	2.3.4.3 Agronomic Constraints	17
2	2.3.4.4 Technological Constraints	18
	2.3.5 Policy recommendations to enhance crop productivity (rice and sugarcane) growing for Increasing Agricultural Productivity	19
CHAI	PTER THREE: METHODOLOGY	22
3.1	Introduction	22
3.2	Research design	22
3.3	Data Collection methods	23
3.4	Study Population	23
3.5	Study Sample	23
3.6	Sampling Strategy/technique	24
3,7	Data types, sources and collection methods	24
3	3.7.1 Data types and sources	24
3,8	Validity and reliability of data collection instruments;	24
3	3.8.1 Validity and data collection instruments	24
,3	3.8.2 Reliability of data collection instruments	25
3.9	Data Quality Control	25
3.1	0 Logistical and ethical considerations of the study	25
	I Data management and analysis	
3	3.11.1 Data processing	26
3.43	2 Data analysis	26
	3.12.1 Average gross returns and average net returns	
	PTER FOUR	
PRES	SENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DATA INTERPRETATION	27
4.0	Introduction	27
4.1	The characteristics of respondents	27
4.1	.1 Gender of respondents	28
4.1	.2 Age of the respondents	29
	.3 Marital status of respondents	
	.4 Education level of respondents	
	.5 Main occupation of respondents	

	4.1.6 Main crop respondents grow	29
	4.1.7 Acres of land that the respondents they had	30
	4.1.8 Ownership of land	3.0
	4.1.9 Portion of land used for sugarcane growing	30
	4.1.10 Whether respondents grow other crop other than sugarcane	30
	4.1.11 Other crops grown	30
	4.1.12 Portion of land used for growing other crops.	.,30
	4.1.13 How long respondents have been growing sugarcane to other crops	31
	4.14 Whether respondents have benefited from sugarcane	33
	4.15 The benefits	34
	4.16 Recent yields in last 1 year	34
	4.17 Tons/bags got	34
	4.18 The price of ton/bag harvested	34
	4.19 Inputs used in the farm	35
	4.20 How much is paid for services	35
	4.21 Challenges encountered in growing sugarcane/rice	35
	4.22 Most difficult challenges	36
	4.23 Whether respondents have ever been supported by the government or NGOs on your farming	36
	4.24 The support respondents received	36
	4.25 Whether the government or the NGO should support (or continue to support) farmers in your a	
	4.26 The support respondents need in order to improve your farm output	
	4.27 Measures have you done to reduce on the challenges you encounter on your farming activity	37
	4.28 Whether respondents plan to increase on income	37
	4.28.1 How respondents plan to achieve on how to increase on income	37
	4.29 Plan to do savings	37
Ċ	HAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS	38
	5.1 Introduction	38
	5.2 Conclusion of the study	. 38
	5.4 Areas for further research	40
R	eferences	41
į	PRÖVENGER	*-

Appendix 1: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FARMERS	45
---------------------------------------	----

LIST OF ACRONYMS/ABBREVIATIONS

AA African Agriculture

ANR Average Net Return

BU Busitema University

Cm Centimeter

FAO Food and Agricultural Organization

GNR Gross Net Return

IFAD International Fund for Agricultural Development

IFPRI International Food Policy Research Institute

LLL Laser Land Leveling

LP Linear Programming

NAADS National Agricultural Advisory Services

NEMA National Environmental Management Authority

NGOs Non Government Organizations

NPV Net Present Value

NR Net Return

NYFE New York Future Exchange

PC Planning Commission

PVs Present Values

SAIL Sugar and Allied Industries Limited

Sp Species

SPSS Statistical Package for Social Scientists

TGR Total Gross Return

UBS Uganda Bureau of Statistics

WB World Bank

WWFN World Wide Fund for Nature

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: A map of Namasagali Sub-county showing the coverage of Nalwekomba wetland
Figure 2: Map of the study area

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Showing the characteristics of respondents
Table 2: Showing the different economic benefits farmers attain from sugarcane and rice growing,
challenges encountered, measures that will enhance rice and sugarcane growing to maximize output, and
what they are planning to achieve and to do
Table 3: Showing average ton price, average total costs on tons, gross income and gross income per
farmer

ABSTRACT

The study assessed the economic benefits of sugarcane and rice growing in Namasagali Sub County, Kamuli district. The study was cross sectional where both qualitative and quantitative approaches were used to collect data following a multistage sampling technique using questionnaire based interviews.

The research findings indicate that the majority of the respondents are involved in farming in both rice and sugarcane growing respectively because the wetland is government owned and sometimes crop seedlings are free of charge. Findings also indicate that farmers have started growing sugarcane other than other foods because they have seen that is a viable business. Findings also indicate that most of the respondents benefited from sugarcane growing such as building of houses, educating of their children, buying of bicycles, motorcycles and cars among others. Findings indicate that shs. 309,873.66 was the average gross income earned per farmer in the study area and it implies that the enterprises where viable. Furthermore, findings showed that the most difficult challenges were capital whereby it was limited and thus they couldn't fulfill their needs like buying of more land, lack of collateral security to get loans to expand their production among others.

Conclusions were made that 48% of the respondents have never been supported and 32% needed seeds in order to improve your farm output. Recommendations were made that the government should sensitize the farmers on the best farming practices in order to produce maximum output for more sustainability and adequate food security and also should ensure that the services offered by the agricultural associations reach the people in the remote rural areas of Namasagali Sub County by having representatives from such areas.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

About 80% of Uganda's population live in the countryside and derive their livelihood from farming. Agriculture plays a pivotal role in the development of Uganda both economically and socially. The sector contributes about 60% to the country's economic development. As the backbone of Uganda's economy, agriculture has the potential to create lucrative livelihoods and lift thousands of Ugandans out of poverty especially with the adoption of modern techniques and better quality inputs. Extreme poverty in Uganda fell from 53.2% in 2006 to 34.6% in 2013. A significant increase in Agricultural income, in addition to good rainfall, favorable prices and political stability have contributed to this reduction in poverty (reliefweb, 2019)

Uganda's agriculture employs about 73 percent of all workers in the country while only generating less than 15 percent of the economic output of the country. Those engaged in agriculture are primarily rural based having a lower standard of living than those working in other sectors of the economy (IFPRI, 2013)

The introduction of new rain-fed (upland) rice varieties in Uganda, to supplement the swampy paddies (that dominate world production today), offers prospects for doubling rice production in the country (MAAIF, 2009). This underscores the importance of better seed varieties in increasing crop production. It also provides an opportunity to analyze the extent to which farmers are using improved seed in rice production as well as gaps in the supply of improved rice seed; and provides insights on the kind of action or investment required to address such gaps at sub-regional level.

The agricultural system in Busoga is adopting majorly the sugar cane farming system which is practiced in most of the districts. Use of most land for sugarcane farming is emerging as a key driver of the low food crop productivity. Commercial sugarcane farming though popular has had little or no significant positive impact on the livelihoods of farmers (Waswa, 2009).

The rising number of sugar factories in the region has seen more farmers in Busoga hire out their land for sugarcane growing thus threatening food security. This is because it's becoming one of the desired cash crops in developing countries such as Uganda (Mwavu, 2013).

References

Altare C., Rettberg S., Ombogo T., Sincich F. & Genevieve O. (2010) The impact of Sugarcane Plantations on pastoral livelihoods within the Afar region of Ethiopia; Sugarcane and Indigenous People. Ethical—Sugar. Retrieved from http://www.sucre-ethique.org

anthony. (2002, 611). Retrieved from www.sugarktrading.com/cane-sugar

Chinese Rice Study Team of the People's Republic of China. (1982). The feasibility for rice irrigation in Uganda, October 1982. A report written for the Republic of Uganda.

Dalipagic, I. and Elepu, G. (2014). Agricultural value chain analysis in Northern Uganda: maize, rice, groundnuts, sunflower and sesame. Action Against Hunger. ACF- International. FAOStats, (2014), http://data.fao.org/database?entryId=262b79ca-279c-4517-93deee3b7c7cb553

FAO (2010).Uganda Nutrition Profile 2010. Nutrition and Customer Protection Division. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United State Accessed on 26/5/2019 from ftp://ftp.fao.org/ag/agn/nutrition/ncp/uga.pdf

FAO (2010) Food and Agriculture Organisation. Statistics on Production (2010). Retrieved from http://faostat.fao.org/production

FAO, (2012). Uganda Nutrition Profile 2010. Nutrition and Customer Protection Division. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United State https://study.com/academy/lesson/economic-benefits-definition-lesson-quiz.html

Fischer G., Teixeira E., Tothne E., Hizsnyik & van Velthuizen H. (February 2009) Land Use dynamics and Sugarcane production. In P. Zuurbier & J. Vooren (Ed.), Sugarcane, ethanol, contributions to climate change mitigation and the Environment (pp 29 – 62) Wageningen: Wageningen Academic Publishers

FDA (2013) Foreign Agricultural Service/United States Department of Agriculture. Sugar: World Markets and Trade. Office of Global Analysis Retrieved from http://fas.usda.gov/agriculture

Hyuha, T. (2006). Profit Efficiency among rice multipliers in Eastern and Northern Uganda. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Makerere University.

Hyuha, T.S, Bashaasha, B., Nkonya, E. & Kraybill, D. (2007). Analysis of Profit Inefficiency in Rice Production in Eastern and Northern Uganda. African Crop Science Journal, 15(4), pp. 243-253.

IFAD. (2013). IFAD. 1FAD.

J, M. (2019, 6.11). Retrieved from http://www.rice-trade.com accessed on 11th/06/201

KESREF Technical Bulletin No. I. December 2006, ISBN: 9966-7179-1-9

Kilimo Trust. (2012). Development of Inclusive Markets in Agriculture and Trade (DIMAT): The Nature and Markets of Rice Value Chains in Uganda.

Kipsisei G. (2011) Environmental Degradation and Social Conflict in Transmara District, South Rift Valley of Kenya. (Masters Thesis, Institute of Anthropology, Gender and African Studies. University of Nairobi)

Kothari C.R. (2004) Research Methodology; Methods and Techniques. New Age International (P) Ltd

Lankhorst M. & Veldman M. (2011) SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACT OF COMMERCIAL EXPLOITATION OF RWANDAN MARSHES: A Case Study of sugarcane production in rural Kigali. RCN Justice and Demicratie

Lorentzen J. (2009). Global Sugar, regional water and local people: EU sugar regime liberalization, rural livelihoods and the environment in the Incomati River Basin. South African Journal of Science 105, 49-53 doi: S.Afr.j.sci.vol.105 n-1-2

MA (2007) Millennium Ecosystem Assessment; A toolkit for Understanding & Action Protecting Nature's services. Protecting ourselves. Island Press

wikipedia. (2019, 6 11). Retrieved from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/sugarcane accessed on wikipedia. (2019, 6 11). Retrieved from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/sugarcane

World Bank (2006). Enhancing Agricultural innovation: How to go beyond the strengthening of the research systems. Washington, DC: Agriculture and Rural Development. Sattar, T. 2012. A sociological analysis of constraining factors of development in agriculture sector of Pakistan. J. Econ. Sustain. Dev. 3(8): 8-24.

MAAIF (Ministry of Agriculture, Animal, Industry and Fisheries), (2010). Agriculture Sector Development Strategy and Investment Plan: 2010/11 – 2014/15.

MAAIF (Ministry of Agriculture, Animal, Industry and Fisheries), (2012). Proposed plan to operationalise the Non-ATAAS component of the Agriculture Sector Development Strategy and Investment Plan.

Mwavu. (2013). Mwavu.

Nabeeta. (2001). Nabeeta.

Nelson Wesonga (2012). The sweet lure of sugar leaves Busoga farmers exposed to insecurity.

NEMA (2010), National State of the Environment Report, 2012, National Environment

Management Authority, Kampala Uganda

NPA, (2010). National Development Plan (NDP) 2010/11-2014/15. The National Planning Authority (NPA), P O Box 21434, Kampala, wwww.npa.ug.

NPA, (2015). National Planning Authority. Second National Development Plan (NDPH) 2015/16 – 2019/20

reliefweb. (2019, 5 21). Retrieved from reliefweb: https://reliefweb.int/.../uganda/ugandas-agricultural-modernisation-helps-fight-poverty).

Stephen Otege (2013) .The rising number of Sugar factories in the Busoga have threatened food security, accessed on Jan 1, 2011http://www.monitor.co.ug/ Business/Commoditied/Sugarcane-farming-threatens-food-security-in-Busoga-/-/688610/1941614/-/13hnt9gz/-/index.html

Uganda Bureau of Statistics (2010). Uganda Census of Agriculture for 2011/2012, volume iv http://www.infonet-biovision,org/default/ct/123/crops

Uganda sugar policy. (2010), (August)

Waswa. (2009). impacts of sugarcane growing in eastern uganda. Waswa.