

Difficulties of Smallholders to enter and maintain GlobalGAP-Certification

Findings from Interviews with Smallholders in two different Districts
of Uganda

By Cliff Odemun and Rudolf Buntzel

The Study was made possible by the Support from Bread for the World

Kampala/Nkozi, May 2014

ACRONYMS

| | |
|-------|-----------------------------------------------|
| KATDA | Kasambya Tukole Development Association |
| NGO | Non-Governmental Organisation |
| NAADS | National Agricultural Advisory Service |
| NARO | National Agricultural Research Organisation |
| FAUEX | Federation of Association of Uganda Exporters |
| UBOS | Uganda Bureau of standards |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Case of Inquiry

GlobalGAP is one of the most important food standards in the world today. It is a Business-to-Business Standard (B2B) and in practical terms the entrance ticket for selling to the mainstream food markets in OECD-countries. GlobalGAP started way back in 1997 as EurepGAP by a group of Retailers belonging to the European Retailer Produce Working Group. This was started due to the growing consumer concern regarding product safety, environmental impact and health, safety and welfare of workers and animals, but also because the supermarket chains wanted to shift the burden of liability in case of food scandals to the supply chains. It was originally designed for the marketing of farm produce from European farmers. But after some time it was extended without any alteration all over the world. Renamed as GlobalGAP, it also became a yardstick for those African farmers, who want to enter the world food market. Their situation, ecology, size and capacities however are so different to those of the farmers in developed countries that they face difficulties to comply with this standard.

A previous case study about fruit and vegetable growers in Uganda found out that the number of vegetable and fruit exporting smallholders dropped considerably in 2006 by 40 %, from 2,145 to 1,260, and the volume of exports by 16 % to 4,700 tonnes in just one year. As one of the two main reasons the researchers identified “the emergence of increasingly stringent food standards in export markets (i.e. in particular EurepGAP).”¹ Interviewing exporting companies and state officials we were told that there are hardly any certified fruit and vegetable producing small scale growers left in Uganda today.

We wanted to speak with affected farmers: Those who have been certified by GlobalGAP but have pulled/dropped out of the scheme, and those who try hard to gain certification today. The leading question is: Why is it so hard for African small farmers to comply with international food standards, taking fruit and vegetables as example and focusing on GlobalGAP?

Methodology

The study employed a cross-sectional design borrowing from both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods. Survey instruments (Questionnaires) were administered to farmers of three different categories namely:

- Those farmers that tried the process of certification but failed on the way.
- Those farmers that were certified but later dropped out of the certification.
- Farmers that were certified and are still certified to date.

The study was conducted in the following phases:

Phase 1: Review/Questioner development.

This was done by Rudolf Buntzel in consultation with the contractor, Cliff Odemun, to suit the purpose of the study in terms of meeting the study objectives.

Phase 2: Identification of the target group / respondents:

Consultations were held with a number of stake holders that interact with these farmers directly or indirectly to be able to generate the list of the respondents to be interviewed in the study. This, among others, include export companies and the Ugandan Standard Bureau.

Key informant interviews were carried out with the director and representatives of the following companies in order to select the legible respondents to be interviewed:

Persons consulted in the generation of the study sample:.

| Name and type of the Organisation | Contact person/ title and Address of Organisation |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Federation of Association of Uganda Exporters (an umbrella organisation uniting | Mr. John Kavuma the president of the Federation of Association of the Uganda |

¹ Kleih, Ulrich/Ssango, Fred/Kyazze, Florence/Graffharm, Andrew/MacGregor, James, Impact of EurepGAP on small-scale Fruit and Vegetable Growers in Uganda, Pulication of IIED, London Nov. 2007, page 2

| | |
|-----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| the Uganda exporters) | Exporters. www.ugandaexporterfed.org +256752696825 |
| ICE MARK (An exporting company) | Mr Benson 0312262700 |
| Uganda Bureau of Standards (UBS) | Mr David Ebuku |
| Empower Real Uganda (exporting company) | Mr Lucky Guma Moses Executive Director www.empowerreal.org +256772582658 |
| Sulma foods (an exporting company) | Mrs Silvia Natukunda Agri –business Facilitator Sulma Foods. |

Study population:

A total of 20 farmers were interviewed from the different categories in the two study areas of Gomba/Butambala District and Nakaseke/Luwero District.

The researchers used a random sample to select farmers to participate in the study.

Method of data collection:

Open ended questionnaires were administered to the affected farmer see (Annex 1) by the researchers and a trained research assistant.

To gain an insight into the perceptions of farmers towards GlobalGAP certification, data was analyzed with regard to education level, category of farmers, size of farm, number of farm laborers, the cash crops grown, standard programs involved in, benefits of group certification, challenges of standard programs and recommendations.

Key findings

Reasons why farmers dropped out of the GlobalGap:

60% of the farmers who reported to have dropped out of the standard program cited reasons such as:

- High financial costs involved in the establishment of the farm in order for it to meet the benchmark standards required in the quality assurance program.
- Breach of contract by the export company who sometimes stop buying their products on the agreed price as stated in the contract.
- Export companies that start well buying from the farmers, but along the way disappeared. This without explanation to the farmers leaving them stranded with a crop like Hot Pepper. The export crops have got very low marketing possibilities in the domestic markets. For example the farmers under GlobalGAP in Gomba/Butambala District report to have been victims of the company Jackson Uganda Limited that used to buy and export their Hot Pepper. The company just

stopped working with them after doing business with them for about 6 years without any explanation.

- Breach of contract by the farmers in terms of failing to meet the standards and other requirements like to supply the contracted quantity or to meet the quality requirements. Sometimes they sold part of their produce elsewhere.
- Most of the farmers in Uganda don't specialise in growing only one particular crop. They want to diversify for security purpose. Hence one farmer dealing with about five different cash crops, and different enterprises for each one of them. This diversity makes it difficult to monitor and meet farfetched different standards for each one of them.
- Poor infrastructure like roads networks and buildings (storage facilities) that makes transportation and cost of marketing high. It also affects the quality of the commodities.

All the farmers who dropped out report to have been part of the GlobalGAP certification and they had been part of the program for 6 to 8 years under one particular exporting company that supported them with the certification. 30% reported that they dropped out three years back while others (30%) dropped out about 5 years back. The rest (40%) don't know their stand as to whether they have dropped out or not. They believe they are just not active at the moment.

Preliminary Conclusion

The farmers expressed a lot of reservations about the standard program, because most of its requirements don't suit the local context. There is need for wide consultation among all key stakeholders when designing standard programs. They complained about price fluctuations as a result of the export companies not sticking to the contracted price. Many stringent conditions can't be realised by most peasant farmers due to the accompanying financial implications. There is an identified need for government to improve conditions on the local markets in order to make domestic marketing more competitive to export markets.

PRIMARY FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

Education Level of the farmers:

The study found out that farmers who are in the process of certification, meaning those that have receive the GlobalGAP-training and are practising the Global-GAP requirements but have not yet got certified, were better educated than the already certified and still in the program and those that dropped out of the certification. From the farmers in the process of certification, 60% attended secondary level, 30% completed advanced secondary education and 10% having attended primary level. In comparison their colleagues already operating under global certification 50% have completed primary level, followed by 40% secondary and only 10% attended advanced level.

All the study groups had attended at least some level of education and could read and write in English or their first language (local language) as shown in tables 1 and 2 below.

Table 1

Educational level of Respondents under the global G.A.P certification

| Level of education | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------------------|------------------|-------------------|
|---------------------------|------------------|-------------------|

| | | |
|------------------|-----------|------------|
| Primary | 5 | 50 |
| Secondary | 4 | 40 |
| Advanced | 1 | 10 |
| Total | 10 | 100 |

Table 2

Education level of Respondents in the process of certification

| Level of education | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Primary | 1 | 10 |
| Secondary | 6 | 60 |
| Advanced | 3 | 30 |
| Total | 10 | 100 |

Farm Characteristics

All the respondents were small holder farmers and cultivated land ranging between 1 to 10 acres see (Table 3)

Table 3

Land usage in Acre operated by the farmer

| Percentage of farmers under that category | Range in Acres |
|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 55 % | Between 1 – 4 Acres of land |
| 20 % | Between 8-10 Acres of land |
| 15 % | Between 5 – 7 Acres of land |
| 10 % | Above 10 Acres |

Hire/Permanent labourers

The farmers only use hired labourers during the peak season. 85% of respondents reporting to employ between 1-4 temporal labourers and 5% hired between 5-7 part time/temporal labourers. Only 35% used between 1-4 permanent labourers while 10% used 5-7 permanent labourers. 55 % of them depend on family labour only to provide support on the farms.

Market involvement

The cash crops grown include: hot pepper, maize, beans, coffee, bananas, vegetables, sweet potatoes, fruit, okra, tomatoes, ground nuts, sugarcane and avocados.

The proceeds are sold both in the quality standard market and the domestic market. But the majority of the harvest goes to the domestic market, because of the too stringent conditions in the quality assurance market, which they can hardly meet. 30 % of the farmers reported only to be selling in the domestic market, while 70% try both markets. The most common crops in the quality assurance market are beans, coffee, tomatoes, hot pepper, maize and bananas.

Besides the trade in the food markets, farmers have got also other sources of income. The majority of them (50%) are involved also in non-food and non-agricultural businesses, like retail shops, tailoring, boda boda (motorbike taxi) riding, motor cycle mechanic. 45% rear

animals, 20% earn salary from employment while 10% don't have any other source of income apart from farming.

The study also reveals that export companies buy either directly or use agents to buy products from farmers. The respondents operating under GlobalGAP only sell hot pepper to Jacksons Uganda Limited while the farmers in the process of certification sell maize, coffee, beans and tomatoes to other quality assurance markets like KIMUKA (IBEERO), BRAC Uganda and South Sudan.

Most of the farmers don't know the final destination of their crops in overseas markets. Europe, Asia, and Africa were mentioned but they could not be very specific as to which countries in particular.

Standard program/ those farmers that dropped out of the program

All the respondents revealed that the buyers of their products especially in the quality markets required participation in some kind of quality/hygienic standard program. Those operating under GlobalGAP with those in the process of certification mentioned several requirements they called "strings attached". They have to fulfil them in order to be part of the scheme. The requirements of the scheme look farfetched to many of them, because the financial implications that come with them are not affordable to them. This among others include: constructing a pit latrine, extra store for chemicals on the farm, digging a deep hole for dumping left over pesticides and used cans on the farm, putting a hand washing facility on the farm, putting a shelter shade for placing hot pepper during harvest, placing unique numbers on the products for traceability, harvesting two weeks after spraying and not before, harvesting only ready products, selling only to export companies, fencing off their farms.

Those under other standard programs like KIMUKA and BRAC-Uganda were required to other burdensome practices, like to sort the produce and transport it to company premises in Kampala, dry produce on drying equipment like tarpaulins, to pick only ripe coffee and so on. All these standard measures of the quality and hygienic programs come with financial implications, with more work and require a lot more time on the farm. The farmers claim that they can't afford them on their own, as affirmed by 80% of the farmer interviewed. Especially the farmers owning more than one farm in different locations and away from his homestead are complaining. This is a common case scenario in the survey areas. They say they have to fail to implement the requirements on all their different farming sites because: it is expensive in terms of cost and time to establish the different necessities as required on all the different parcels. The small size of the different plots and that they are so much scattered is an economic disadvantage by itself. But to establish such facilities like toilets in each one of the sites is just unimaginable.

The respondents further mentioned that it is absurd to buy protective gears for all labourers on the farm. That would be very expensive. Also the required drying equipment for the produce is not affordable. In most cases they improvise, for instance by sharing equipment with group members. This is also a common practice with regard to the sprayers to apply pesticides. Borrowing such equipment cuts on costs.

However not everybody only complained. 15% of the farmers said the program wasn't too demanding and appreciated the different requirements that come with it. They understand

that the standard program does not only protect the final consumer or the export company but also the farmer himself.

Participation in the Quality Assurance program and reasons for drop-out.

All the respondents interviewed reported to have participated in some kind of quality assurance program directly or indirectly. Some of the mentioned quality assurance programs they have been part of include GlobalGAP, organic certification, KIMUKA and BRAC-Uganda.

Consequences for Dropping-out of the Quality Standard

A number of consequences were reported as a result of dropping out of the standard among which were;-

- Their incomes reduced, because the quality markets offer better prices and ready market for their products, which is no longer possible.
- The exporting company used to provide quality seeds and pesticides on credit and they would pay after the sell.
- They no longer benefit from the training and scouting or regular monitoring and supervision of their farms which was being offered by the export company at zero cost.
- Majority of the farmers revealed that they had stopped growing hot pepper which was the product sold to the export company. Those who still grow hot pepper and sell it to the domestic market receive very low prices.

Single measures of the standard programs that cause **major problems** to the farmers and how they coped with them:

The farmers tried their best to cope with the requirements of the standards. Most of the requirements don't really make much sense to the Uganda smallholder farmer, according to their assessment. They are challenging in one way or the other. Most of the farmers operate small farms ranging from 1-2 acres. But the necessary investment would be the same as for a farm of 10 or 20 acres. The farmers interviewed revealed that they only manage the standards with the permanent assistance and advice through the export company. Precondition is that the farm auditors are flexible enough in their interpretation of the requirements. For instance that they accept that the farmers use local materials like wood, mud, grass and banana leaves to construct pit latrines and harvest shades on their farms. Instead of using tarpaulins for drying in the sun they resorted to using polythene and mats. Also not owning the equipment oneself, but borrowing from the neighbour, needs to be recognized. This is the only way how small farmers managed to cope with the investment requirement.

Farm management requirement

A more formal way of how to run their enterprises turned out to be a big challenge to many of the farmers. GlobalGAP interferes quite a bit with farm management. Most of the farmers have never been trained in agricultural economics. They possess no or very minimal

managerial skills. They manage their farms with informal knowledge, sometimes just intuition. But now they have to keep books and make calculations.. For people only semi-literate to start documenting farm activities is a big task. 10% could afford to hire people with higher education to do the paper work.

New techniques in production

GlobalGAP asks for a set of measures which they consider to be “good agricultural practices” (GAP). It is the most demanding part of the standard, because it implies a departure from many traditional ways of how to run the farm. The knowledge to put the GAP into practice was acquired during trainings provided by the export company and other agencies like government and NGOs. Farmers also got high quality seeds and pesticides from the export company on credit and paid after sell. Others accessed credit from the farmers 'saving and credit scheme in order to buy high quality agricultural inputs. Even if that was not proper according to the standard, most of the farmers growing hot pepper replanted the first seeds provided by the export company in the next season. Without the training and the input assistance by the export company the farmers admitted that it would not have been possible for them to join the GlobalGAP.

Group certification

The study confirmed the importance of the training programs by the exporting company. Communication was also quickly passed to the group and through networking. Since certification presupposes the formation of a group and only the group of the farmers receive certification, much of the new knowledge and changes in the procedures were communicated within the group. Group certification not only turned out to be practical for cutting certification and transaction costs, but turned also out to be a necessary tool for empowerment.

Handling produce

The majority of respondents cope with handling produce by strictly following the guidelines as per the standard setters. Farmers growing hot pepper constructed harvest shelter shades on the farms where they placed the produce during harvest while those growing maize and coffee put the harvest into the sun for drying. Washing facilities, sorting and transport are very troublesome to the farmers. The farmers introduced jerry cans to put mobile hand washing facilities on the farms, instead of the wanted basin. This deemed to be necessary to handle the produce after washing hands and to clean crates for placing the produce. Sorting the harvest and pre-grading it before transporting it either to the collection centres or to company premises has to be done on the farm under strict hygienic conditions. The farmers find transportation of produce to the company premises very expensive. The farmers that export directly to one of the neighbour countries, like South Sudan or East Congo, pool resources and hire a vehicle to transport their produce there. That is quite a lucrative outlet.

New documentation requirement

To be able to cater for the semi-illiterate farmers who can write only in the local language and not so properly, the use of small exercise books were adopted with prefixed tables that only need to be filled out with the own records. Every farmer has to capture his personal records of all farm activities, starting from seed bed preparation, fertilization, planting, weeding, spraying, harvest and selling. It has to be done in the language they best

understand. Then these individual records are transferred to the group files by the group secretary. This person is more capable to deal with figures and letters. He or she should be capable to give explanations about the records in English.

Use of only high quality inputs

To use only the best possible quality inputs, like certified seed, has been made possible with the support of the export companies that provide quality seeds and authorized pesticides to their farmers on credit payable after harvest and sell. Other farmers get credit from the farmers saving and credit scheme to buy quality inputs. Some farmers make their own composite fertilizers from organic farm wastes and manure.

Testing soil and water

The study found out that the majority (85%) of farmers lacked the expertise to test soil and water and had never implemented those conditions by GlobalGAP. The export company collected samples from the farms of some farmers and tested them at Makerere University. Most of the farmers didn't understand the importance of this requirement and complied just for formality purposes.

Labour safety

70% of the farmers found it very hard to implement the requirements concerning workers' safety, because the hired labour is only casual and seasonal. Most of the farmers revealed that they had not managed to buy the gears for all labourers. Only a few farmers bought gumboots for themselves, which are needed when spraying. All the requirements to mark the points of danger on the farm, to keep a first aid kit and to train the employees monthly about safety measures look a bit theoretical to the farmers.

Environment requirement

The most troublesome provisions are those related to the safety storage and disposal of the jerry cans of the pesticides. Farmers complained about the trouble to get rid of waste material from spraying. They dig deep holes on the periphery of the farms to dump left over pesticides and used cans. Only a few of the farmers could afford to construct stores for the safe keeping of the farm chemicals, which is a requirement.

Rejects

The majority of the respondents (80%) said that a high percentage of their products were accepted by the export companies; they seemed to be satisfied in that regard. However, a small percentage of their deliveries (20%) was rejected by their buyers, mainly as a result of damage during transportation or they were heavier than the stipulated weight. Less rejects are due to false grading on the farm. Surplus deliveries, extending the contractual request, might be treated differently from the reject, if demand for it is there. The company can buy the surplus at slightly lower prices than the contract price if the farmer is willing to sell. He would not refuse, because there is hardly any other outlet and to take the surplus back to the farm involves extra costs. The farmers try hard to sell the rejects on the local markets, where they normally receive only very low prices. For some rejects the farmers have a use

on the farm, like e.g. from hot pepper he can prepare a biological pesticide or use rejects for composting. But the impact of selling the rejects on the local markets and thus reducing the price for others is meagre, because for most of the export vegetable crops there is hardly a serious domestic market.

Farmers that dropped out of the standard program

Most of the farmers that dropped out claim that they would have coped to continue with the quality assurance program, if they would have had the chance. They expressed their willingness to re-join the schedule again, if the conditions under which they dropped out were rectified. Most important for them is that the export company resumes business with them again and buying again at a pre-fixed price as agreed in the contract. They regretted that their previous export company has left them without any reason.

Other kinds of certifications known to the farmers

The majority of the farmers (70%) were aware of other kinds of certification other than GlobalGAP, such as organic farming, fair trade. Asking them for a definition, most farmers explained well what organic farming is about. But they didn't know much about fair trade or any other kind of certification program.

Benefits for participating in the quality standards

All the respondents said that they have benefited from participating in the quality standard program. Products fetched very good prices there, and farmers gained knowledge in what is quality and what are "good agricultural practices" about. The aspect of forming a group for group certification gained popularity and cooperating with fellow farmers was also mentioned by some farmers.

Recommendations to make it easier for the small holder farmers

Farmers proposed several changes in the standard program in order to make their participation easier. They proposed wide consultation among key stakeholders during design of standard requirements, subsidization to purchase high quality agricultural inputs, state enforcement of the contract compliance by the companies, provision of soft loans payable after selling and regular trainings as well as monitoring of farms by the official extension service.

Monitoring for compliancy to the standards

The majority of the respondents (80%) were visited by an inspector from the export company to monitor compliance with the program. The visits ranged between 1 to 3 times a year.

Flexibility to interpretation of the rules

The farmers appreciated that the inspectors were quite flexible with interpretation of the rules, because they accepted the farmers to use local materials, to put in place some of the requirements in the local way, like pit latrines, and to accept other innovative ways by the farmers to reduce costs. The inspectors rather advised the farmers how to improve on areas of weakness instead of meeting them as police.

Cost of inspection

The farmers didn't incur any cost for the inspection. This cost was met by the export companies that sent them to the farms.

Buyers' efforts to help the farmer pass the certification

The study noted that export companies made efforts to assist farmers to pass certification although one group of farmers interviewed was still in the process of certification. The companies offered trainings about the standard program, regularly monitored farmers to ensure compliance with the program and provided farmers with high quality seeds and pesticides on credit payable after sell. They also supplied groups with necessary equipment like weighing scales, provided a permanent store for seeds, packing equipment and group safety gear for spraying, spray pump and other assistance.

Whether the terms of the contract were fair

The group of farmers operating under GlobalGAP certification signed a contract with Jacksons Uganda Limited, the export company. Of these, only 27% reported that the contract was fair, because farmers were consulted and that the export company used to pay them on time. 67% denied that and claim that the contract wasn't fair. According to them both parties breached the contract in such a way that the company failed to stick to the standard price agreed on. The farmers faced price fluctuations and uncertainties. The farmers also failed to deliver quality products at times due to bad weather, old seed and pests. It made the farmers pull out and the company too. Some farmers never understood some elements of the contract. The farmers contracted by KIMUKA said the term of transporting the products to the company premises wasn't fair as transport was expensive for them.

Group certification

The farmers were certified as part of a group certification. One group interviewed was called "Kasambya Tukole" (Development Association - KATDA). It was still in the process of getting prepared for certification. The group operating under GlobalGAP certification is called "Awaggwa eku" (Growers Cooperative Society), while the group under KIMUKA is called "Butemula Producer Organisation".

The farmers certified under GlobalGAP initially consisted of 100 + members, they were mobilized by the Sub-County Chief to attend trainings offered by Jacksons Uganda Limited. The export company asked them to form a group to be registered at both the Sub-County and at the District. The majority of the farmers dropped out of the program and membership now consists of about 30 people only. The other farmers' groups visited is still processing its certification. They said the export company addressed them because they already existed as a group. The company trained them in GlobalGAP requirement to reach the level of certification. The company asked them to register as a new group.

Assessment of what they do together as a group

Most of the farmers of this groups are involved in several common ventures, such as: growing crops, collective marketing, saving and credit scheme, rearing animals, planting trees to preserve the environment and some outside the inner group also in social support services. To operate as an establish group has enabled the farmers to produce high quality

products, because they can access credit, buy agricultural inputs, and ultimately improve their livelihoods through the good prices their products fetch. The group is not closed, others may join as new members when agreeing to work up to the level of knowledge of the older members.

Gender Aspect of the group

Women are full members of the group although they only make up a small proportion so far. In Awaggwa eku, one of the groups visited, women make up 20% of the membership, and 35% of the total group population in KATDA. The women are highly respected, since they tend to be good business minded. In some groups women made it up into the Board.

Women have similar roles as men except for spraying which is strictly men's work. They are involved in preparation of land, planting, weeding, harvesting, and selling just as men. There is no conscious division of labour.

Assistance rendered to farmers

Government

There has been no specific program targeting small holder farmers exporting to the European market or any other part of the world. All governmental programs for agriculture are streamlined and not specific to target particular farmers. This study found out that the government extension agents from NAADs and NARO programs visit farmers to advise them on the good farming practises.

Export companies

Other than the export company under contract with the interviewed farmers' groups, there has been no evidence of other companies coming in to help farmers in meeting the standards requirements. What other export companies mostly do is to headhunt the already established farmer groups of their rival companies. They offer slightly better prices attempting some farmers to breach their old contract and go over to the competitor. Often these new companies are not reliable partners to the farmers, because they might not stay for long with the deal. Such practices are destructive, since there are free riders who capture the fruit of the intensive training investment without being willing to invest anything in human capital themselves.

NGO

Most of the NGOs like Brac, Farm Africa, ADRA Uganda, PELUM and VEDCO, work with the farmers most especially in organic farming. Study sighted out a number of trainings on good farming practise, like mulching, planting in lines, terracing and making compost.

Nearby estates

Sharing of ideas as farmers in the groups was evidenced as they perform group scouting and visit each others farms to advise accordingly.

Comparison between the informal market and formal market

The majority of farmers (70%) said there are tricky terms and conditions in the quality markets. Since this market offers better prices for their products it is still more attractive.

30% argued that although prices are low at the domestic markets, terms are friendlier and anything can be sold. The middlemen buy everything you have, and they pay cash in the hand.

Recommendations how the government can improve informal market
Farmers made a number of recommendations to the government on how to improve local markets such as: regulating prices in the markets; reducing taxes on agricultural inputs; improving feeder roads; offer soft loans to farmers; introduce quality standards on the market and licencing buyers.

CONCLUSIONS

How the farmers perceive of GlobalGAP.
All farmers interviewed had heard of GlobalGAP and appreciated it theoretically. When coming to practical terms they felt that GlobalGAP is farfetched for Uganda. According to them GlobalGAP can only be achieved if the poor farmers can be supported by the different potential stakeholders, like government, the exporting company, foreign companies or NGOs. According to one of the farmer in Gomba district: “GlobalGAP is like a nice dream while sleeping. But when you wake up, it’s too hard to achieve it. They confirm that it has got good standard measures for quality assurance and gives good prices for farmers, but it is hard to realise them. This refers to the Ugandan situation: high rural poverty level, land fragmentation, small scale farms, and lack of capital, capacity building and political support. The farmers are offered good prices in the standard market and the program ensures quality standards for products which protect the farmers, consumers and the environment. Although the program is beneficial to them, it has very tough requirements that need to be revised to suit the local farmer’s conditions.

Annex. 1 Study Tool

Questionnaire to Farmers about their participation in a Standard or Quality Assurance Program

I. General

- 1.) Name of the Farmer:.....Sex:.....
- 2.) Location:.....
- 3.) Level of education (*Literate/illiterate*):.....
- 4.) Category: Smallholder.....Emerging Commercial Farmer.....Estate.....

II. Farm and Market Involvement

- 5.) Size of the farm:.....
- 6.) Number of farm laborers (*part time and seasonal*).....
- 7.) Which cash crops is the farmer growing?.....
- 8.) How much farm land is under cash crops? (*Acres and percentage*)
 - a.) today.....
 - b.) at a time of certification in the past:.....

9.) Sources of major income other than from the farm of the family.....

III. Market Involvement

10.) Which cash crops do you sell to different markets?

a.) to the informal market (domestic)?.....

b.) to modern markets under some kind of Quality Assurance Program?.....

11.) Who is the direct buyer of your products for the quality market (*middleman, special agent, processing or export company, supermarket/restaurant/cantina, others*).....

Name of the buying company:.....

12.) Which markets are the final destination of your quality products ? (*Domestic wholesale, domestic Supermarket, regional market, international market - Europe, USA, Japan*).....

13.) Does your buyer require participation in some kind of set-up "Quality and/or Hygienic Standard Program" from you? (*Which kind of program? With regular "certification"?*).....

14.) **if yes:** Have the requirements of the Program demanded much from you?

IV. Standard Program

15.) Have you ever before taken part in any Quality Assurance Program / Certification? (Which one?).....

16.) Have you ever dropped out of a quality/certification program?.....

17.) **If yes:** Why did you not continue the Program on your farm?.....

18.) When was that?.....

19.) How many years have you participated in such a Standard Program?.....

20.) What were the consequences of your drop out?.....

21.) Which details of the requirements of the Standard Program you participated in caused major problems to you? (*Please, in some detail if mentioned*)

- How did you cope with the investment requirements?.....
- How did you cope with necessary changes in your farm management?.....
How did you cope with the new technics in production?.....
- How did you cope with getting the new necessary information?
- How did you cope with new requirement for handling your produce (*like washing, grading, packing, transport, storage?*).....
- How did you cope with the new documentation requirements?.....
- How did you cope with the requirements to use only high quality inputs? (*seed, pesticides, fertilizer*).....
- How did you cope with requirement to test your water and soil?
- How did you cope with the new hygienic requirements?.....
- How did you cope with the labor safety requirements?
- How did you cope with environmental requirements?.....
- How did you cope with other new challenges(*Which?*).....

22.) **Rejects:** Is a high percentage of your produce being rejected by the quality assessment? Are the rejects a problem? What do you do with the rejects (*produce that does not qualify for quality*)?.....

For those farmers, who dropped out of a Standard Program?

23.) Can you imagine that you could have coped with the problems in the long run?..

24.) Would you enter such a Program again?.....

25.) Have you heard of GlobalGAP? What do you think of it?.....

26.) Have you heard of any other kind of certification program? (*Which?*).....

27.) Did you get better prices your quality products? (*How much better?*).....

28.) Did you benefit (*more income then cost*) by participating in a Quality Program?.....

29.) How should the Standard Program change in order to make the participation of small farmers easier?.....

30.) Did an auditor/ inspector/certifier ever visit your farm to monitor your compliance with the Program?.....

31.) Have they been fair to you? Have they been flexible to interpret the rules?.....

32.) Did you pay for their inspection?.(Or anybody else? How much did you pay?.....

33.) Did your buyer make much effort that you (and your group) succeed to pass the certification?.....

34.) Did you enter into a contract (or any other kind of agreement) with your buyer in the Standard Program?.....

35.) Was the contract/agreement fair?.....

V. Group Certification

36.) Have you been member of a group of farmers under that Standard Program that you were part of?.....

37.) Have you been certified as part of a Group Certification?.....

38.) Did you organize yourself to come up with a group?.....

39.) What did / are you doing together as the group?.....

40.) Are women full members of your group?.....

41.) What is the specific role of the women in the Standard Program of your group?.....

42.) Was the group helpful for you and for the process of being part of the Standard Program?.....

Vi. General Assessment

43.) Do you think that Standard Programs make sense (also for the domestic marketing)?.....

44.) Which concrete requirements of your Standard Program don't make sense to you? (*Why?*).....

45.) With reference to the Standard Program: Did you receive good information, advice and assistance from any third party (*like governmental extension, export company, NGO, nearby estate*)?.....

39.) If you compare the terms under which you sell your products on the informal market and on the high quality market: Which one is more attractive?.....

40.) How could government improve the conditions on the informal markets?.....

Kampala/Nkozi, May 3rd, 2014