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Objectives of the study

The main objectives of the study was to identify how limited access to land and limited access to quality seeds have contributed to food insecurity among the small scale farmer households in Lango sub region. The study targeted specifically; youths, Women and disable persons in the region.

Specific objectives

1- To identify the level at which limited access to land and limited access to quality seeds has contributed to food insecurity among the small farmer households in Lango sub-region, specifically looking at the Youths, women and disabled persons.

2- To assess the roles of women, youth and disable persons in promoting food security at the household level.

3- To assess the challenges small farmer households face in acquiring land and quality seeds, leading to food insecurity in Lango sub region. These information are intended to help the researchers come up with suggestions that may help policy makers arrive at ways of helping women, youth and disable persons in accessing land and quality seeds which will in turn enable them produce more food and become food secure.
**Targeted persons/Respondents in the research:**

The respondents targeted were 358 Farmers in 89 farmer groups located in five sub counties of Adekokwok, Agali, Amach, Barr and Ngetta in Lira district. In each farmer group, the study targeted; one PwD, one youth, one woman, one woman headed household, and one youth headed household per group. The latter two were selected based on their availability in each of the groups.

**Stratagem used**

A planning meeting was conducted to develop the evaluation tools as well as to agree on the evaluation schedules. The steering committee played an oversight role in the entire process and ensured that it is not compromised in any way. The exercise was conducted in the board room of FAPAD to ensure that a free and fare environment was created for sound discussions.

**Duration**

The exercise was conducted for five working days (quantitative survey) and another ten days for qualitative survey. The actual evaluation, data cleaning, analysis and reporting took another ten days. In all, the study took almost thirty days.

**Approach and methodology**

The study employed both quantitative and qualitative methods. The quantitative method was used to collect data from farmers comprised in farmer groups; which also included Youths, Women and disable persons who are engaged in small scale farming in Lango sub-region. The qualitative approach was used to provide insights of the small scale farmer groups and other stakeholders in regards to their awareness to access to land and quality seeds, leading to food security.
Methods

The following methods were used in undertaking the study:

i) Key Informant Interviews: Interviews were held with key stakeholders in different sub-counties and at district levels, and included; Agro input dealers, technical persons at district and sub-county levels, Regulatory Agencies such as; UNBS, Municipal Authorities, Ngetta Zardi and Police. The list of the key informant respondents interviewed is attached in Annex 1.

ii) Focus group Discussions (FGDs): Four FGDs were organized with farmers groups in different sub-counties (Amach and Ngetta), targeting women groups, Youth groups, Disable groups and a group of women, youth and disable combined together. Each FGD was attended to by at least 5 people who were selected by the research team with the help of FAPAD. The list of FGDs participants is attached in Annex 2.

iii) Opinion Leaders: Interviews were held with two opinion leaders from different sub-counties of Adekokwok and Barr. The opinion leaders were selected by the research team to get their views on access to quality seeds and land. The list of the opinion leaders are attached in Annex 3.

iv) Document Review: This included comprehensive literature and statistical review to capture information on legal policy and institutional frameworks on the implementation of quality seeds and access to land. The study made use of policy documents and other publications from Lira District Ordinance, Ngetta ZARDI, UNBS and SEATINI. The lists of documents reviewed are listed in the references.

v) Quantitative Survey: In addition to the above, a survey which targeted farmers groups was conducted in the five sub-counties in Lira district. Small farmer groups in the sub-counties of; Ngetta, Amach, Adekokwok, Barr and Agali were selected because their direct involvement in farming. The list of the main farmer groups interviewed are attached in Annex 4.
Scope and Coverage

The study was conducted at district level in five sub-counties of Lira District, which include; Ngetta, Amach, Adekokwok, Barr and Agali. The selection of Lira district was purposive, based on the following:

a- The number of farmer groups organized in the sub-counties (District)
b- Lira is among the districts where farming is practiced in small groups
c- Record of past active engagements with FAPAD

Survey Organization

Survey instruments: A structured key informant interview questionnaire, survey questionnaire and focus group discussion guide were used to collect the relevant data. The draft tools were pre-tested before the actual data collection exercise. After that the chronology and appropriateness of the questions on the first version of the tools was revised in order to collect the rightful information from the respondents.

Sample Size: The study conducted interviews from 358 respondents (farmers) in 89 Farmers group in five sub-counties of Lira District.

Data was collected during the months of October to November 2016. A research team composed of eight people gathered data by use of face to face interview (qualitative data) and structured questionnaires (quantitative). The qualitative data was analyzed using the content analysis procedure where verbal data was categorized for purposes of classification and summarization. Qualitative data is presented as text analyses and explanations of the responses. Data from document reviews is also presented as referenced texts. For any cases where tables and graphs from any of the document reviews are presented in the report, the source is duly acknowledged.
PRESENTATION OF RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

SECTION A: BACKGROUND INFORMATION OF THE RESPONDENTS
A total of three hundred and fifty eight farmers were interviewed with the participation percentages of 53.49% males and 46.09% females for the highest to the lowest respectively as in the chart below.

Figure 1.1: The participation by gender

![Pie chart showing gender participation]

Source: Survey data

The above figure shows that more men (193) participated in the survey than women (165). It is also an indication that more men are engaged in farming (as farmer groups) than women. The numbers of both men and women as indicated above include all youths who are male and female, disable persons who are male and female and adult male and female.
Figure 1.2: The distribution of the respondents by sub counties

![Bar chart showing the distribution of respondents by sub counties](image)

Source: Survey data

The figure above clearly shows that Amach had more numbers of respondents, followed by Agali, then Ngetta, Adekokwok and finally Barr. It is not only about number, but it also indicates how organized farmers groups are in each sub-county. There could be very many farmers in Barr, for example, but because they were not very organized, only a few could be met and interviewed.

Table 1.1: Distribution of Respondents by family headed category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of respondents</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Headed Household</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>43.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Headed Household</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>32.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Headed Household</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peron with disability Headed Household</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Headed Household</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>358</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The respondents from these farmer groups were sectioned into five categories and the percentage distribution of the respondents were; Male headed household 43.859%, Female headed household 32.12%, Youth headed household 12.29%, PwD headed households 10.06% and Child headed households 1.96%. The table and chart above show the distribution of respondents by family headed category.

It is clearly seen that male headed household dominates the category, followed by female headed, then youth, PWDs and finally child headed. This also indicates that men still dominates control of family and may imply that landownership is mainly in the hands of male adults. The youth, PWDs and child headed households comprise of both male and female. In these categories, the challenges of land ownership and access to quality seeds may be huge, giving rise to food insecurity which leads to inability to feed the members of the families.
From the above chart, 60.9% of the respondents (218) were 33 years and above, 18.44% (66) 28-32 years, 13.44% (48) 23-27 years, 5.59% (20) 18-22 years and 1.68% (6) 13-17 years. This shows that most data was obtained from mature respondents, at least from 27 to 33 and above. This means that most information obtained would give acceptable results after analysis as required. Nevertheless, the information given by those whose ages range from 13 to 23 years were equally important as the issue of food insecurity does not differ between adults and children. In this case, information given by children (13-23 ages) could be of more relevant because they are the ones affected most. All age groups indicated above include youth, male and female adults, and PWDs.
Levels of education varied amongst the respondents with those who stopped in primary taking 60.89% (218), secondary 25.98% (93), no level of education 8.94% (32), tertiary institution 3.91% (14), and a degree 0.28% (1). The figure shows very clearly that most farmers are educated only to primary level, followed by secondary level, then those who have not been to school at all, tertiary and finally degree level. It is also a clear indication that people who have attained higher education do not participate much in farming. They could be formally employed, or are doing farming using other resources (money-employ people to dig and pay them).

In comparison with the previous figure of age, this could mean that, though maturity may indicate quality information, level of education may indicate some ignorance in certain responses on the issue of access of land and quality seeds.
Marital status of the 358 respondents was investigated where 94% were married while 6% were not married. 97% (348) of the respondents had children while 3% (10) were without children.

With the number of children that the farmers have, it confirms the responses through qualitative survey that land has become small to produce food which is enough to feed the growing number of children in families. One disable person said that the population has overgrown and cannot be supported by the few land available. Another disable added that “The number of children we have cannot be supported by the plots we have”. One opinion leader- Mr. Okwe Fred said “The population is also very high, which has made land to be limited for farming, especially youth. The land is fragmented that does not allow farming in a big volume”.

Of the children available in the farming households, 36.74% were farmers, 8.91% were traders, 6.1% were civil servants and 7.26% were farmers, students constituted 32.12% while 8.24% were young children. With most of the children born getting engaged in farming, it means that land is becoming small and smaller for food production, meaning that the issue of food insecurity will continue to be a matter of concern among the community.

The 358 respondents were asked about the number of years they lived in their locations and their responses were, 85.75% over 12 years, 7.82% 9-12 years, 3.63% 6-8 years and 2.79% 1-5 years respectively as in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>24.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 and above</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>23.46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Survey data*
Table 1.3: Number of years lived in the area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years lived in the area</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 12 years</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>85.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Survey data*

The table above shows that over 85% (307) have lived in the area for over 12 years. This confirms what most participants stated that most of lands they use are traditional land that they inherit. Others could be there as a result of buying the land and settling on. The longer they lived in the area also confirms that more children are born there, giving rise to more people who will need land in future, hence putting more pressure on land for cultivation.
SECTION B: LAND ACCESS AND OWNERSHIP

Ninety four point six nine percent (94.69%) of the land used for farming is owned by the households while 5.31% of land used for farming is not owned by the farming households. Of the 94.69% owning land, 1.25% is owned by CHH, 12.09% by YHH, 10.03% by PWD, 31.6% by FHH and 39.72% by MHH.

Asked how they acquired the land they owned, 81.56% inherited the land, 21.23% purchased the land while 18.99% were given land. The details of how land was acquired by the various categories are summarized in the table below;

Table 1.4: How land is acquired

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land acquisition</th>
<th>Total frequency</th>
<th>Chh</th>
<th>Yhh</th>
<th>Fhh</th>
<th>Pwdhh</th>
<th>Mhh</th>
<th>Total percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inherited</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0.68%</td>
<td>10.03%</td>
<td>26.03%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>37.32%</td>
<td>81.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
<td>21.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>5.79%</td>
<td>18.99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For those who do not own land, their terms on how to use the land were assessed in which 4.47% use cash pay hire, 0.56% use communal rights and 0.28% use free will offer.

Asked whether land is readily available, 90% of the 358 respondents answered yes and only 10% said land is not readily available. Of the 90% that said land is readily available, 13.3% were youth, 9.3% were PWDs, and 31.8% were women while 35.6% were men. The 10% that said land is not readily available comprise of 2.1% youth, 1.8% PWDs, 3.1% women and 3% were men. These are clear indications that land is available, but how to access it is the biggest problem. With more men saying that land is readily available, it shows that men are in control of more land that the women, youth or disable persons. The youth who are more energetic to till land have problem accessing it. Much as the youth seem to attract attention in terms of sympathy and are given land to cultivate, it is in small quantity and the land is repossessed after some time.

The available land owned by the farming households interviewed is put into various use by the farming community as 75.42% till whole, 43.92% till part, 1.4% hire part and 1.4% others (keeping animals = 0.56%, given to neighbors = 0.28% and fallow = 0.56%).
15.2% of the youth interviewed till whole their land, 31% of women interviewed till whole their land, 11% of the PWDs interviewed till whole their land and 18.22% of the interviewed men also till whole their available land. The high percentage (75.42%) of the interviewed households cultivating all their lands is linked to shortage of available land for production.

There were however complains about land acquisition problem in some farming households where the following challenges were highlighted in the order of their seriousness as in the table below;

Table 1.5: Challenges of acquiring land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High cost</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender bias</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability stereotype</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data

According to the survey, only 20.4% of the respondents had challenges in land acquisition with greatest challenge being high cost followed by age, gender bias and disability stereotypes respectively.

34.92% of the respondents admitted to have presented these challenges before local leaders and political actors while 65.08% did not make any presentation to any authority.

Of the 34.92% that presented their challenges to authorities, only 3.63% were satisfied with responses offered by those authorities while 31.28% were not satisfied with the responses received from the authorities. These included:

Thirteen youth of the 51 complained mainly about high cost of land, only three PWDs out of 36 complained about disability stereotype and high cost in that order while only twenty women out of 114 complained about high cost, gender bias and age. 79.6% did not have land acquisition related challenges.
19/20 youth that presented
22/25 PWDs; and
ALL the other 34 that presented were not satisfied with the responses provided by the authorities.

The 358 respondents were asked if they have the capacity to demand for appropriate action from government authorities, only 38.27% had the capacity to demand for appropriate action. While 61.73% did not have the capacity to demand anything from government authorities.

Among those who reported not having capacity were:
- 45% of youth,
- 44% of PWDs and
- 70% of women

The study established that the municipal authority does not have direct authority to monitor access to land. When asked to suggest ways of increasing access to land, the authority had no positive response. This leaves farmers at a disadvantage when it comes to whom to guide and help in case of challenge to access land.

However, opinion leaders felt that cultural leaders can play big roles when it comes to the issue of accessing land and distribution. They feel that land must be distributed equitably. Women are not allowed to own land and yet they are more concern about food availability at household
levels that men. It is also felt that local Government must enact laws to expedite issues of land within their jurisdiction. At the same time courts of law have many cases of land pending, leaving plenty of land unutilized, especially when there is court injunction. These issues raised tend to suggest that food insecurity is prevalent in Lango sub-region as a result of lack of will to put in place and implement effective law.

Youth are reported to raise a lot of concern on access to land for cultivation. “They want land for farming, but unfortunately only a few are available”. Remarked Ayo George; a local resident of Adekokwok Sub-county. The only land accessible by youth for farming is the one to be inherited. The Youth therefore are seen to complain that their parents do not have enough land. On the other hand, women say their husbands sell land out leaving them with nothing to cultivate on. Traditionally, clan leaders are the mentioned to be the main actors on enabling easier access to land. The control of most land in the rural areas is still in the hands of traditional leaders. Clan leaders do come in when there is land wrangles and the end result is to disadvantage women, youth or disable persons. Therefore it is assumed that they are the ones who can prevail on the accessibility land. On the other hand, the local government is expected to enact laws that would allow for easy access to land in its jurisdiction. They believe that if these are done, access of land by women, youth and disable persons would not be a big challenge. Courts of law on the other hand are believed to have many cases on land pending not heard. A respondent hinted that this is allowing plenty of land to remain unutilized (especially where there is court injunction).

The law enforcement agency was clear that at the rate of 10% (on average) of land related cases reported in a year, it means that issues on access to land are prominent. Of these cases, the biggest number is reported by women. Therefore women seem to be most affected by the issues of access to land. Furthermore, PWDs have been mentioned and recorded many times as the people most affected by challenges of access to land. By way of sensitization, taking legal actions and eventually prosecution is a positive indication that some law is in place to make sure that access to land and quality seeds are harmonized to eradicate food insecurity. These are not sufficient enough solutions. But proposals such as affirmative action, mass mobilization through
mass media and community dialogues, and law enforcement could explain the way the community is negatively being affected by limited access to land.

Political actors agreed that there are problems of accessing land in Lango sub-region, Lira district. People are either hiring land or have no land for farming. Women are more affected, followed by Youth and finally disable persons. Women are believed to be most hard working, and therefore need to own land. Youths are being wasted because they are redundant most of the time. They are also believed to have no land to practice farming, and yet they have more energy compared to women and disabled. The disable persons are said to have ability to do farming but have no land. Because of the above it becomes very difficult to become food secure.

The land for farming is mainly acquired through customary tenure. Most people use the customary or traditional land available. There are others who hire at a lower rate from people who own or the owners do donate to them to use for a specific period of time. This shows that such pieces of land are not large enough to provide for production of large quantities of food. Hiring land will depend on how much money one has, which would limit farming in large scale to avert food insecurity. Leave alone the issue of money, sometimes they hire such land very far from where they live, making it difficult to harvest in time as the crops may either be destroyed or stolen. All these make it difficult to achieve a food secure community.

The women participants were open to explain that their rights of utilizing land are limited, especially in traditional land. One participant explained that “when you are married and you later divorced and return to your parents, no land is given to you”. However, it was noted that if it is purchased land, no rights are violated. But we were also told that it depends on the understanding of one’s husband. Some husbands even refuse women to use purchased lands. The disable person’s participants at the FGD said that only those who are not married have their rights limited for use of land. For those who are married, the survey learnt that they have no problems. The youths seem to have the same problem like others in terms of their rights when it comes to land utilization. One youth participant said “Our rights are not invited in utilizing land in any way”. But a participant from the combined group had this to say “Our rights are not limited in utilizing land in any way, except may be if you want to give the land as security for loan, this is
when you need to have a consultative meeting with your wife and children and even your father and mother who gave you the land. These are already clear indications that the rights of women, youth and disable persons are violated when it comes to land utilization. It could be because land is not enough, therefore need for restriction on it. They have all spoken very clearly about it, but the issue raised by the participant from the combined group need be understood well by the small farmers, especially women and youth.

The issue of limited access to land has had serious negative impact on the community. One youth from Ngetta said “Limited access to land has led to lack of food to feed children”. Another participant youth added that limited access to land has contributed by making poverty to be accepted as the order of the day. A woman participant stated that limited access to land has made them to continue cultivating the same piece of land throughout the year, with the hope that the fertility of the land will be regained. But in the long run, the yields of crops keep on dropping. Another woman picked it up by saying “Many times we are forced to hire gardens which are far from home and when it comes to harvest periods, it becomes difficult and the crops get rotten”. On the other hand, a disable person participant from Amach, Ayac Parish said that the number of children they have cannot be supported by current pieces of land they have. “This therefore has resulted to continuous poverty in the community”. He said. From the combined group- Agali-Okile, a participant said “The mindsets of people have changed towards farming. It is no longer seen as a viable activity”. Other participants raised the same points as in other groups.

In terms of response or actions taken to have the above issues resolved, the survey learnt that the clan leaders have taken some steps to try and address the concerns. It was also established that at sub-county level, the local leaders have also taken some steps to help resolve land problems. Though the courts of law have also taken steps to help the vulnerable farmers, what is not clear however is the extent to which such efforts or steps taken have had impacts on the farmers! On the other hand, a few participants (disable persons and youth) have clearly stated that no action has been taken to try to help them. This therefore leaves the two vulnerable groups with problems unresolved as far as their rights to use land are concern.

On the view of what needs to be done that has not yet been done, awareness and sensitization to the community about ownership of land were repeatedly mentioned by the vulnerable farmers. Though other participants, (mainly woman) added their voices by saying that the government
should come up with some good law or policy to protect them against land rights or ownership. The concern of women confirms the statement by the two opinion leaders that women are the major users of land and contribute positively to food security. The women are putting direct and genuine requests to leaders to come to their rescue as far as access to land is concerned.

It was not made clear how they would wish to be sensitized. But the message is clear and it is up to the concern offices to come up strategies to that effect. The youth participants had no response to this. It is therefore difficult to ascertain whether they are comfortable or not. This may need more consultations. It could also indicate their level of ignorance about their rights on land ownership and use.

Though the women participants agreed that the government gives support to them by solving the land issue, it is not clear how the land issue was solved and how they have benefited from it. It is important to know how such land issues are resolved, whether temporary resolution or permanent. These are unclear reactions/responses made by the FGDs to propose several ways through which they can be helped to access land and quality seeds. Women continue to propose that the government should continue helping them when they have land problem so that the issues of food insecurity is resolved.

However, efforts have been made to ensure that food security initiatives or easy access and ownership of land for production are attained. Land ownership and quality seeds have been recognized as the core ingredients of food security. This is confirmed by one opinion leader and it is a clear indication of the concern about access to land and food security.
SECTION C: SEEDS AND SEED QUALITY

The 358 respondents were asked about where they acquired their seeds from and the responses revealed that 74.86% acquired from open markets as compared to 32.68% that acquired from registered suppliers. 2.51% of farmers got seeds from NGOs and 0.56% from government programme (Operation Wealth Creation). In the others category, (3.07%) of farmers acquired from donations, purchase, and previous harvest and borrowed and paid back after each harvest.

Majority of youth acquire seeds from open market, followed by registered input dealers and own saved seeds while only two reported obtaining seeds from peer farmers. One youth openly said “Seeds can be bought from the local market”. Another youth said “You can also buy from Agro input dealers or from NGOs and Government or exchange with something like chicken, goats any other things”. According to the youths, even the government and NGOs sell seeds to them and not given free

Most of the PWDs interviewed acquire seed from open market, own saved seeds and registered input dealers respectively. One disable person said “We store our own seeds to be planted in the next season”. Another one added that “We also get from friends or can also get from seed dealers, and sometimes the seeds are also distributed by organisations, e.g. in 2013 FAPAD gave us seeds”.

The majority of women interviewed acquired most seeds from open market, others said from registered input dealers, peer farmers and own saved seed respectively. One woman said “We also acquire seeds from our mother in-law, friends, neighbours or buy from the local markets in the villages”. Another woman added “Very few people buy from stockists of Agro input dealers because they are very expensive and in small quantity”.

This issues of how to access quality seeds as expressed by the different participants above show that they all do not have stable places of accessing quality seeds. They actually do not know where to acquire quality seeds. This is a danger to food security as most farmers will be getting poor quality seeds, leading to low yields or production of crops for feeding the community. In short, the seeds they acquire are actually not recommended quality seeds.
**Understanding of Quality Seeds**

Farming households were asked about their understanding of quality seeds. About 55% of the youth respondents interviewed did not understand what quality seed is while the remaining percentage understood it in terms of appearance and labels. One youth participant said “Quality seeds can be seen by its yield in the garden and appearance” Another one responded that “It can be seen by its germination because other seeds do not germinate, and you can also see from its production at the gardens”.

The majority of the PWDs interviewed understand quality seed by high price, high germinability, known supply source and good harvest respectively without any knowledge of quality seeds. But one said “Quality seeds are seen from its appearance”. Another one added that the packed seeds with writing on are quality seeds, and that you can also see quality seeds from the garden before harvest.

For women majority understand quality seed by high price, known supply source, good packaging, high germinability and good harvest respectively with 18 of the interviewed having no knowledge of what quality seed is all about. One woman was quick to say “If it is not rotten, then it is a quality seed”. They also said that quality seeds can also be seen from the garden at home. Another woman said “The packed seed from the agro input dealers is hard to tell whether it is quality seed or not.

It is agreed by two opinion leaders that poor quality seeds are everywhere. The seeds given free to farmers are believed to be of poor quality. That makes it to be common in every community. However, as means to try and get off such problems, Uganda National Agric Input Dealers Association (UNADA) reported as having been training people on how to detect poor quality seeds. But another challenge that this training comes with is that it is only conducted in town and is of no help to a rural farmer, and it seems no one has power to enforce laws against poor quality seeds.
Important to note is the fact that up to 9.22% of the households does not know what quality seeds are, meaning that they are mainly planting grains instead of seeds. This normally affects their productivity and household income, leading to food insecurity and low standard of living. It is clear indications that small scale farmers; comprising of women, youths and disable persons are not aware of where to access quality seeds from.

The respondents were asked if they have any forum/platform to raise the problem of poor quality seeds supplied to them and their responses were;

Majority of youth said through community meetings and local council meetings while only ten of them did not know where to report.

For the PWDs, majority also reported through community meetings and local council meetings with only five without knowledge of where to report.

For women, majority reported community meetings, followed by those who do not know where to report with only eleven cases of local council meetings.

Important to note is that up to 27.65% of the overall respondents did not know where to raise the problems of poor quality seeds supplied to them. It therefore means that many of these small scale farmers are either not aware of their rights or are ignorant of the laws. The 27.65% indicated above is not a small number, and their having knowledge of what to do when they buy poor quality seeds would make a big difference to improve on food security.

One opinion leader said “I am not aware of any action taken by my sub-county”. He added that “Nobody complains since the seeds are given free”. This still leaves responsible offices with plenty of work to be done on access of quality seeds. Apparently there isn't sufficient information regarding quality seeds and food security. However, there are limited instances where for instance, a case was reported in Ngetta Zonal Research Institute. This shows how ignorant small farmers are about their rights on access of quality seeds.
When asked if they would be willing to join other forum to articulate farmers concerns, 5.59% said they are willing. This shows that the farmers’ inability to join any forum to share ideas and learn more from others remains a factor contributing to food insecurity in the region. They actually do not understand the importance of joining such fora, a thing that needs to be encouraged.

**What Political Actors Say**

The different political actors interviewed agreed that there are problems of accessing quality seeds in Lango sub-region, Lira district. People are either borrowing seeds from friends or using seeds that are stored locally for planting. Women are more affected, followed by Youth and finally disable persons. Women are believed to be more hard working, and therefore need to access for quality seeds. Youths are being wasted and yet they are believed to have more energy compared to women and disabled. The disable persons are said to have ability to do farming, but unfortunately, they have no access to quality seeds. The above reasons make it very difficult to attain food security.

Some political actors agree that there are some by-laws put in place at local levels to ensure that there is food security in the community. At LC3 and LC2 levels, they indicated that the by-laws to prevent animals from destroying crops are in place and the community tries to implement it. The punishment according to them is to pay back what is destroyed. Such punishment is believed to prevent further mismanagement of animals leading to food destruction when still in the gardens. On the other hand, at LC1 level, there is indication that the by-law does not exist, yet they are the ones expected to implement such by-laws. The first point to report such cases is the LC1 office. The LC1 offices may need more sensitization on such by-laws.

However, the implementation is expected to be done at village chief level and on assumption that the constitution of the land is well known to all. At LC2 and LC3 levels of political leadership, they understand the constitution and always try to explain to the community wherever they have meetings with them. But unfortunately at LC1 level, they are not aware of any by-law, worse
with the constitution of the country, therefore complicating the issue even more to the community.

There is no specific time that the issue of food security is addressed by the political actors. It looks as if they only take the advantage of any meeting, including funeral gatherings and talk about it, but not in a properly arranged meeting. The fact that some responded by saying ‘rarely’ and others use the constitution or when there is any meeting is a clear indication that there is no specific period set to address the constituents on food security. On the issue of budget allocation, the actors relay on the budget proposed and prepared at the production department of the district. At LC2 level, there seems to be some budget at parish level, but whether it is harmonized with the one from production department of the district is not clear. This however seems not to give much impact on the improvement of food security to the community.

The challenge on access to quality seeds is open. Most small farmers relay on donated seeds—whether of quality or not is not determined. But because some are given by NGOs and government through wealth creation programmes, it is assumed that such are quality seeds. The silver hope expressed by farmers is the idea of keeping the harvested crops and use it as seeds for next farming seasons. Even in this option, it is clear that there is no quality determination. The buying of seeds from seed dealers is appropriate, but still the small farmers have no idea if such seeds are of high quality or who is the right seed dealer. All these still leave many questions to be answered on the access of quality seeds and land. They indicate that small farmers are not sure of what kind of seeds they buy or are given to plan. They are also not sure about access to land for farming. Therefore the community still remains unguided, therefore food insecure.

Women seem to be the focal center for food insecurity information. They are reported to register more information on food security than Youth or disable persons. The level of registration of information on food security is high. This means that the issue of food insecurity is real and needs addressing. Some of the cases on food security are registered with; the government-through production department, NGOs, WFP. But what needs to be determined is whether such reports are acted on or not.
A number of suggestions put forward by the political actors are valid, but the will to implement them is what has to be worked on. It is true that suggestions such as; educating the children, growing of both commercial and food crops separately, sensitization of men on the importance of women owning land, giving women rights to access land with little difficulty, farmers accepting government changes on farming, and many others are very valid, but the success will depend most on access to land and quality seeds. The farmers themselves must accept to change their mindset. Because of such unfinished issues, the issues on access to land and quality seeds, will remain a barrier to attain food security in Lango.

_Municipal Authority_

The authority does not have any direct law on quality seeds and access to land, but only relay on the directive from ministry of Agriculture through the district production office. However, indirectly they have by-law on garbage collection which can be used later as manure. This is good but cannot sustain farming in rural areas. It is only for back yard gardening in urban areas. This is already a sign of frustration or lack of will to get rid of food insecurity. But by the introduction of training programmes which covers areas of seeds and farming inputs provision, is an indication of some positive move. The unexplained issue is, who receives the training and at what intervals. There is a need to be specific on who are the beneficiaries of the training, and its impacts on the community. The fact that the municipal does not have direct authority to monitor access to quality seed supplies becomes a great concern. The authority is only allowed by department of agriculture to inspect seed dealers’ spaces, seed sales and dealers implementers. After that they only report/keeps records without any legal actions. The only thing the authority makes sure it is done is for the dealers to acquire licenses at a determined fee, of which the punishment for default is to close the premises. The authority also does not have a mandate to address concerns on counterfeit seeds. It is waiting for the ordinances being prepared by district and other by-laws by ministry of Agriculture and the seed act by central Government. This means that the authority has almost no power over the issue of quality seeds sold by seed dealers in its jurisdiction.

The training of business community and inspection of their business premises and reporting to officers at the district is not enough effort to ensure access to quality seeds. The authority needs power/mandate to make sure farmers are protected through access of quality seeds. Mere closing
of the business is not punitive enough to eradicate food insecurity through access to quality seeds. It was also realized that the authority has no forum that convenes seed dealers together through which issues of poor seed supplies can be addressed, but only guided by the central government. This means that by the time the government comes up with guidelines, the level at which small farmers will have suffered in terms of poor quality seed access may not be measurable. The authority therefore is not doing/being allowed to do much in terms improving access to quality seeds. On the issue of access to land, the authority does not have any single mandate over it. However, there are indications that the authority may be granted some mandate to act under law. The sooner the better as it is a critical issue.

On the suggestions given by the authority as ways of reducing poor quality seeds or increased access to better quality seeds for farmers, it is seen as a positive move but how such can be implemented still remains as big worries. There must be willingness and capacity of the people/officers entrusted with responsibility to act professionally and ethically.

However, the integrated seed sector does not ensure that farmers get quality seeds for food security. Since only 15% of the total farmers get seed from seed dealers, this means that 85% of the farmers are food insecure (Ngetta ZADRI seed Expert). This is another indication that the population that is still food insecure is very high.

**Regulatory Body (UNBS)**

The only regulatory body in Lira (Lango Sub-Region) that should deal with issues of access to quality seeds and monitor its performances is the Uganda National Bureau of Standards (UNBS). It has its regional office in Lira Town. But unfortunately, the office does not deal with issues of quality seeds. It only handles issues of scales. It claims it has only been assigned to handle scales as a tool to determine quantity. This means that farmers in Lango sub-region do not get any help from the office on issues to deal with access to quality seeds.

**Law enforcement authority**

The study confirmed that cases of counterfeit seeds are reported and are always investigated, and the person is prosecuted under counterfeit laws. The application of the counterfeit laws is enough evidence of the government concern for quality seed access. The involvement of business
community, UNBS, political leaders and farmers themselves is a positive move towards making sure that farmers are safe with the kind of seeds they buy. It is also clear that when informed, they visit the premises of the seed dealers. These are positive efforts to try to ensure there is food security.

**Seed dealers**

Seed dealers seem to sell all types of seeds that the small farmer groups need. For example, at one input dealer, located along Olwol Road-Lira said she deals in variety of cereals and Vegetable seeds e.g. Maize, Beans, Sorghum, Rice, Soya-beans, Okra, Water melon, Tomatoes, Onions, Cabbages, Eggplants, Scuma wiki, Amaranths and Green paper. This shows that getting seeds may not be a big problem, but there's concern with their quality. To determine good quality seeds, each dealer had her own explanations. One stated that since they get their seeds from certified seed companies like Victoria seeds and East Africa seed company, it's an **assured case** that the seeds are of good quality. That the knowledge they posses on seed production enable them carry out seed test especially those of questionable quality before selling. Another seed dealer said that they determine quality seeds by Purity, Expiry date, packing date, packing materials and tags given by the ministry of agriculture.

A respondent from *Victoria seeds- Lira* stated that they determine quality of seeds by the certification offered by ministry of agriculture who certify the seeds.

Other seed dealers stated that they are certain of their seeds being of good quality because they buy seeds from registered seed companies. All seed dealers indicated good knowledge of quality seeds.

*The ministry of agriculture also does the field inspection and certification of vegetable seeds which are brought from outside the country, since they are not made from Uganda here. Respondent from Victoria Seeds*
All seed dealers seem to source the seeds they sell from reputable companies that manufacture seeds. For example, East Africa Seed Company, Victoria seeds, Masindi seed company Ltd, Sinlow company and other sources from outside Uganda. The study realized that the local companies deal with at least one of the national or international seed dealers. This sounds healthy for the small farmer groups. However very few farmers procure seeds from registered seed dealers due to the charges levied on their products. Majority of the seeds farmers purchase are obtained from peer farmers other than registered dealers. For instance, Best yield seed company sells their seeds to both small and large scale farmers. Victoria seeds company sell their seeds to all categories of farmers, including some agro input dealers. If all small farmer groups buy seeds from the registered dealers, assuming such companies have branches all over Lango sub-region, then the issues on quality seeds would not arise. The gaps that allow adulterated inputs is then explained by illegal seed dealers who pollute the seed market with poor seed supplies.

The seed dealers interviewed are concerned about the farmers’ complaints. They reported taking action and following up with their suppliers, but later taking steps to compensate the farmers. This explains that the issue of quality seeds may arise from the supply origins. Each of the dealers openly talked about compensation when the complains are confirmed correct. It only means that when law is in place and there are people to implement it, the issue on quality seeds can be managed. The local leaders are also expected to be close to both the dealers and the small farmers. The understanding of good quality seeds must be spread to all concerned.

The most common nature of complains are failure of seeds to germinate. This is either because of expired seeds or mixed seeds. These are all facts about determining quality. When complains are raised, it means that small farmers are aware of their rights. This must be encouraged because it's a factor that leads to access to quality seeds, hence food security. However, all dealers have restrictions to the business. The study realized that for each complain, a receipt must be produced. It is a
good practice of doing business and dealing with customers’ complains. It also gives the farmers confident to deal with the seed dealers. The other additional important thing discovered is that even the receipt numbers are kept and verified during complains and claims. All these show that the seed dealers are willing to promote access to quality seeds by small farmer groups.

The dealers do recognize poor quality seeds, but using different approaches. Most of them use color as identity of good quality. Others use trademarks and packaging and labeling. Bonny from *Friend of Farmers* said sometimes it is very difficult to recognize seeds using color, because people have become sophisticated. But as experts, they agree that it is easy to manage. This level of recognition is a proof that the dealers are working to protect the interest of small farmer groups. This would lead to good production that will see food security attained. The dealers are already trying to work together to curb the problem of poor quality seeds. They are working as a team and making sure that they all buy seeds from seed producers. All these are initiatives that could bring about changes to accessing quality seeds. If small farmers are aware of these, the many problems pertaining access to quality seeds can be severely reduced. Both seed dealers and small farmers, including local leaders are encouraged to work as a team.
SECTION D: FOOD AVAILABILITY

A farmer and a teacher said that the issue of food security is not taken seriously by the community. Every year there is famine and not much is being done to reverse the trend. He further noted, "The simple reason given is that women do not have land, and yet they are the major stake holders who can manage food security in the community".

That it has also been noted that over the past years, the population has grown very high and the land is becoming small. This has led to the fragmentation of land for farming, giving very limited land for use in farming. Further, what is produced to be consumed at homes are instead spent on something else. This coupled with climate change, and with the fragmented land, the issue of food insecurity becomes real.

The number of bags per crop produced per household per year was asked and the responses in the table below were provided by the farming households interviewed:

Table 1.6: Number of bags of crops per household per year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bags ranges per year</th>
<th>Percentages of farmers producing various crops per year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 and above</td>
<td>29.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>12.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>16.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>17.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>11.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1</td>
<td>12.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data

Let's all talk to farmers to check the secret numbers which are found on the packing materials and report to the authorities concerned

Respondent from Nobel Agric.
From the table above, 46.93% of millet farmers produce less than one bag per year as compared to the 12.01% of maize and 17.32% of cassava farmers respectively. This is contrary to the 1.4% of millet farmers, 29.05% of maize farmers and 41.06% of cassava farmers producing nine bags and above. This means that more focus is needed on millet production to increase number of bags produce per year per household not forgetting improving on maize and cassava production which is already at some level but still below average.

It is also noted with concern that some of the households do sell some/whole of what is produced per year as seen in the table bellow;

Table 1.7: Sale of various crops per farmer per year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity sold</th>
<th>Percentages of farmers selling various crops per year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenth</td>
<td>20.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>18.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter</td>
<td>8.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data

From the above table 50% of the respondents sold off half of their maize as compared to 21.79% of millet farmers and 27.37% cassava farmers. This may be as a result of the multipurpose nature and available market for maize as opposed to millet and cassava. Important to note also is the 70.95% of millet farmers and 58.94% of cassava farmers who did not sell their produce compared to only 18.16% of maize farmers in that category. This quite encouraging because if we sell all that we have produced, we will be promoting food security problems in our communities.

There is also concern that some of the households do reserve some/whole of what they produce per year for household consumption as seen in the table bellow;
FGD held with women, youth, disable persons and a combined group of men, women and disable persons agree that the issue of food insecurity is serious and has affected the community very badly. They all seem to agree that apart from the concern of limited access to quality seeds and land, climate has also contributed to a greater extent. A youth from Ngetta openly said “Climate change is a major problem in the area’. While a disable participant said “It is poverty which is contributing to food insecurity”. Meanwhile a woman participant from Amach said the farming methods are poor and men sell all the food produced, leaving them with nothing to feed on. She also added that as a result they are left with nothing even to sell and buy seeds. Another youth expressed concern on the fact that seeds given by government arrive late for planting season, therefore giving poor yield. There was also concern by a youth participant that the land is small and the same food produced from the small land is used for paying school fees. One participant from the combined FGD from Agali-Okile repeated the same sentiment, but added “Sale of food to meet basic needs at home and for drinking”. This means that despite the small land used, what is got from it has to cover domestic consumption as well as school fees. The point raised by a participant of a combined group about drinking does not sound well and should be taken seriously by local leaders.

Table 1.8: Reservation of various crops per year for home consumption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity reserved for consumption</th>
<th>Percentages of farmers reserving various crops per year for home consumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half</td>
<td>48.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenth</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>12.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>11.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data
From the above table, it can be seen that 31.28% of millet farmers and 44.69% of cassava farmers leave everything produced for household consumption as compared to only 11.17% of maize farmers. This implies that one of the reasons for food security problem probably is because farmers sell most of their produce and very little is left for home consumption as seen with maize farmers.

An attempt made to know how often respondents buy food from the market to feed their homes. Most of the farmers buy food, especially the youth and the PDWs. Though women also do buy food at times, the research confirmed that they are the ones who make a lot of efforts to produce food, irrespective of the size of the available land.

All the PWDs interviewed were buying food from the market unlike the youth and women where some do not buy food from the market. In summary, the food produced by the households cannot meet household food demand that is why there is a lot of buying of food from the market by the households that participated in the survey. The major reason for this is either due to limited access to land or lack of access to quality seeds.

Food consumed by the households was obtained from different sources: 80.61% from harvest, 72.07% from markets, 4.47% from donations, 0.84% trade labour and 0.28% from others sources respectively.
In line with food security problems in the communities, farmers were asked about the number of person(s) who approached them because they had no food in the last six months and their responses were very positive.

- Majority of youth reported that they were approached mostly 1-3 times followed by 4-6 times, 7 and above times with only two reporting not being approached

- PWDs reported that they were approached mostly 1-3 times followed by 4-6 times, 7 and above times with only four reporting not being approached

- Women reported that they were mostly approached 1-3 times followed by 7 and above times, those that were not approached completely while some few were approached 4-6 times

From the frequency of approach it’s clear that majority of the farming households have food security problems that needs urgent attention from the relevant authorities. Asked whether they have registered official complains to the relevant authorities to address the issues of food insecurity.
About 63% of youth that raised the issues to relevant authorities were unsatisfied with responses provided by those authorities.

72% of PWDs that raised the issue were unsatisfied with responses provided by those authorities

27.7% were completely unsatisfied with the responses got from the authorities with only one youth reporting that the response was satisfactory.

An attempt was made to know if the households are satisfied with the services/support received from extension workers in the last six months where 35.47% said they are very satisfied compared to the 17.32% who were completely unsatisfied as in the table bellow;

Table 1.9 Satisfaction of extension workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfactory level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>35.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately satisfied</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>24.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>22.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely unsatisfied</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>17.32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data

Above 70% of youth interviewed were very satisfied with extension services provided to them while the balance is shared among those that moderately satisfied, unsatisfied and completely unsatisfied.

43% of the PWDs were very satisfied with extension services while 25% were moderately satisfied and the rest were either unsatisfied or completely unsatisfied.

39% of women were very unsatisfied, 29% were moderately satisfied, 19% were unsatisfied and the rest completely unsatisfied.

It is interesting to note that 81.84% of the farming households think they have a role to play in order to provide food for their people while only 18.16% think they do not have a role to play to provide food for their people.
90% of the youth interviewed think they have a role to play to provide food for their people while 10% think they do not have a role to play.

83% of PWDs interviewed think they have a role to play to provide food for their people while 17% think they do not have a role to play.

79% of women interviewed think they have a role to play to provide food for their people while 21% think they do not have a role to play.

The roles that these people said they can play are summarized in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct involvement in production</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>79.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing of produce</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>48.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to credit</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>30.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data

90% of the youth interviewed think they can directly be involved in production to provide food for their people while 10% think they can do marketing of produce to provide food for their people.

89% of the PWDs interviewed think they can directly be involved in production to provide food for their people while 11% think they can do marketing of produce to provide food for their people.

82% of the women interviewed think they can directly be involved in production to provide food for their people while 9% think access to credit can help them provide food for their people while they can do marketing of produce to provide food for their people while 9% think they can do marketing of produce to provide food for their people. Though these are good suggestions, it is of great interest to note that a good number (285) are willing to participate in direct production.
The respondents were asked if their local governments have accepted any proposals on food security to be included in their plan, at the sub county or district level, 74.3% said no proposal was accepted while 25.7% said their proposals were accepted and included in the local government plan.

71% of youth said their proposals were not accepted the local governments while 29% had their proposals accepted by the local governments

53% of PWDs had their proposals accepted by the local governments while 47 said their proposals were not accepted the local governments.

80% of women said their proposals were not accepted the local governments while only 20% had their proposals accepted by the local governments. For those respondents whose proposals were accepted, it was not clear to what extent they benefited from such positive responses from the local government.

In trying to respond to shortage of food in the communities, they agreed the following copying mechanisms in the table bellow should be adopted to improve food production.

Table 1.9.2: Mechanism to be copied to improve food production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Copying mechanism</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planting improved variety of seeds</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>89.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on best agronomic practices</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>81.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pest and disease management</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>81.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice conservation farming</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>43.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to land for production</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>27.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data

In the others category, we have access to credit, agro inputs and improved post harvest handling technologies.
The respondents said according to the importance, there is need to do the following to increase food production in their areas;

**A: Youth**

- Plant improved varieties of seeds
- Proper handling of pests and disease
- Training on best agronomic practices
- Improved postharvest handling technologies
- Practice conservation farming

**B: PWDs**

- Plant improved varieties of seeds
- Training on best agronomic practices
- Practice conservation farming

**C: Women**

- Plant improved varieties of seeds
- Training on best agronomic practices
- Pests and disease management
- Access to land for production
- Access to credits

The following comments were made by the respondents;

**A: Youth**

- More extension services needed
- Low price for agricultural produce hence low income
- Cassava diseases to be handled with a lot of care

**B: PWDs**

- Cassava diseases to be handled with a lot of care
- Community awareness on land use is needed
Proper settling of land disputes is important to increasing production

- Linkage to quality seed for ease of access
- Climate smart varieties of crops to be availed to farmers
- For government programme, there is need for timely input delivery

C: Women

- Linkage to financial institution to increase production
- Rationing of the available food
- There is need for more extension services
- Climate change is to blame for food shortages in our communities

Technical persons

Efforts have been made to ensure that food security initiatives or easy access and ownership of land for production are attained. Land ownership and quality seeds have been recognized as the core project of food security. This is a clear indication of the concern about food security. However, the integrated seed sector does not ensure that farmers get quality seeds for food security. Since only 15% of the total farmers get seed from seed dealers, this means that 85% of the farmers are food insecure (Ngetta ZADRI seed Expert). This is another indication that the population that is still food insecure is very high.

Training of farmers who are seed entrepreneurs who are called local seed breeders may seem to be a positive move, but how many of the farmers will access such benefits from the training? Even training of LSBs may be costly and the impact may not be felt soon. Another thing that shows the determination to make sure quality seeds are accessible is the link of LSBs to research to buy seeds and plant, and the fields are inspected, and test them in the labs. Another good plan noticed is the testing of seed at a regional laboratory which is established by NARO and MAAIF. These are well intended purposes to make sure there is food security in Lango sub-region.

Other important indicators found on the ground as ways of realizing food security include; the inspection of the fields by District Agricultural Officers and training of farmers in Marketing (Agro business skills). This will help the farmers to understand quality seeds and sell what is recommended. The application sensitization and provision of inputs that are satisfied is also
another clear concern to improve on food security. The technical bodies can be seen to be making tireless efforts to discourage food insecurity. Access to land as another way of improving food security has been driven through advocacy for equal utilization of land and agricultural production resources. The district has shown interest to the process of supporting food security. At the meantime they have what is called agricultural policies that warrant the quality seeds. There is also ordinance about counterfeit seeds which is to be passed to Attorney General’s office. All these are positive move to avert food insecurity. The big concern is the level of implementation.

The idea of working with social support and protection organizations such as; VEDCO, TPO, UFSRT and NECKPA as social partners to strengthen the voice of technical people when advocating for vulnerable women, youth and persons with disabilities is a good move towards access to quality seeds and land. Ngetta ZARDI has government programme and it is enough voice as the capacity to advocate, mobilize stake holders at national levels of which the decisions is used as a policy. These kinds of arrangements to work with social support organizations must be welcome as a way forward to allow access to land and quality seeds, which will later lead to food security in the communities of Lango sub-region.

The idea to meet the communities and address the issue of food security is a positive idea. It is also realized that the technical people take advantage of funeral gatherings and pass the message. This is taking the advantage of any opportunities that arise and letting the public to know that there is need for people to be food secure. The new ordinance that Lira district has come up with will play a big role to control the flow of counterfeit seeds in the markets by seed dealers, leading to exploitation of ignorant small farmers. But the idea of waiting when farmers raise the issue then action is taken is not positive enough. It must be realized that there are many small farmers out there who do not know their rights, and would only keep quiet even after buying counterfeit seeds. There is therefore need for responsible persons/offices to be pro-active than reactive.

A call for technical people to always pay visits to farmers in the company of political leaders should be endorsed as an opportunity to reach the small farmers. The people need a close voice
to support their interest. It is a good initiative to enlighten farmers about food security and quality seeds. When independent technical persons are attached to the district, it will lead to easy access to information on quality seeds and access to land by vulnerable groups in society such as; women, youth and disable persons. The presence of agro input dealers in any meetings organized at the district levels will be a big advantage to the dissemination of messages on access to land and quality seeds. The idea of drafting the ordinance is good, but the fear of noon implementation of the measures proposed my render the ordinance irrelevant. Any appropriate document produced must have a meaning and meet farmers’ demand. It must also support government programmes. When dealers are found selling counterfeit seeds, the law must be applied. This will discourage any common persons from selling seeds in the local markets, and in the long run food insecurity is reduced. The mobilization of farmers that was taken as action can only be successful when it is followed up with actions on the ground.

The change in the budget allocation to enhance food security is low due to lack of knowledge on quality seeds and access to land. And where the budget is mentioned as being increased for agricultural development, it is explained in terms of; Operation wealth creation and NUSAF3. The small farmers may not be aware or understand this. The type of efforts being made to increase funding to agricultural department at the district is not explained. Who is to benefit and in what areas of production? Unless these are clear, the plans by local government to change budget will remain irrelevant.

The frequency of lobby meetings is not adequate to move processes forward. One technical personnel says they hold lobby meetings two times a year, while other officials state between 2-3 times in each quarter. This implies inconsistencies in the engagement to lobby for more resources. Worse still, beneficiary farmers are left in suspense as these meetings exclude their input/contribution.

In the remarks of one participant,

"...... the proposals made to improve access to quality seeds and land sound good, but require tough laws to make it have impacts on farmers. For example farmers must buy seeds from
recognized farmers. If there is no law to protect farmers when they are sold counterfeit seeds, the dealers can do anything to cheat innocent farmers”.

Though it was strongly noted that women must be allowed to own land, if they (women) are not protected by law on their rights to own land, this will remain in papers. Therefore all recommendations by technical people must be supported by appropriate laws.

**Recommendations of opinion leaders:**

1) Re-introduction of ‘Dero Kec’ (storage system to guard against future famine), specifically to take care of PWDs.

2) Youth should be encouraged in all areas of food production. They can use some small land for the cultivation of tomatoes, onions etc.

3) Women: They must be allowed to access land since they are the most developmental. They produce about 85% of food in the community. Women leaders, especially at council level must sensitize fellow women on their rights to access land.

4) PWDs- Must should be treated as human beings who should be allowed to own land and assets that can lead to food security.

5) Women- The level of access to land is still very low compared to men. They should have equal power over land like men to produce more food. I know women can produce more food when given equal opportunity to own land.

6) The clan leaders should play very important role to make sure land is shared with women. This will stop the idea of women going to till land for other for food.

7) Youth must be educated. Educated youth will not only relay on land from the parents.

**General Comments**

Training of farmers who are seed entrepreneurs who are called local seed breeders may seem to be a positive move, but how many of the farmers will access such benefits from the training. Even training of LSBs may be costly and the impact may not be felt soon. Another thing that shows the determination to make sure quality seeds are accessible is the link of LSBs to research to buy seeds and plant, and the fields are inspected, and test them in the labs. Another good plan
noticed is the testing of seed at a regional laboratory which is established by NARO and MAAIF. These are well intended purposes to make sure there is food security in Lango sub-region.

Other important indicators seen on the ground as ways of realizing food security include; inspection of the fields by District Agricultural Officers, and training of farmers in Marketing (Agro business skills). This will help the farmers to understand quality seeds and sell what is recommended. The application sensitization and provision of inputs that are satisfied is also another clear concern to improve on food security. The technical bodies can be seen to be making tireless efforts to discourage food insecurity. Access to land as another way of improving food security has been driven through advocacy for equal utilization of land and agricultural production resources. The district has shown interest to the process of supporting food security. At the meantime they have what is called agricultural policies that warrant the quality seeds. There is also ordinance about counterfeit seeds which is to be passed to Attorney General’s office. All these are positive move to avert food insecurity. The big concern is the level of implementation.

The idea of working with social support and protection organizations such as; VEDCO, TPO, UFSRT and NECKPA as social partners to strengthen the voice of technical people when advocating for vulnerable women, youth and persons with disabilities is a good move towards access to quality seeds and land. Ngetta ZARDI has government programme and it is enough voice as the capacity to advocate, mobilize stake holders at national levels of which the decisions is used as a policy. These kinds of arrangements to work with social support organizations must be welcome as a way forward to allow access to land and quality seeds, which will later lead to food security in the communities of Lango sub-region.

The proposal to meet the communities and address the issue of food security is a positive move. It is also realized that the technical people take advantage of funeral gatherings and pass the message to the public to know that there is need for people to be food secure. The new ordinance that Lira district has come up with will play a big role to control the flow of counterfeit seeds in the markets by seed dealers, leading to exploitation of ignorant small farmers. But the idea of waiting when farmers raise the issue then action is taken is not positive enough. It must be realized that there are many small farmers out there who do not know their rights, and would
only keep quiet even after buying counterfeit seeds. There is therefore need for responsible persons/offices to be pro-active than reactive.

A call for technical people to always pay visits to farmers in the company of political leaders should be endorsed as an opportunity to reach the small farmers. The people need a close voice to support their interest. It is a good initiative to enlighten farmers about food security and quality seeds. When independent technical persons are attached to the district, it will lead to easy access to information on quality seeds and access to land by vulnerable groups in society such as women, youth and disable persons. The presence of agro input dealers in any meetings organized at the district levels will be a big advantage to the dissemination of messages on access to land and quality seeds. The idea of drafting the ordinance is good, but the fear of noon implementation of the measures proposed my render the ordinance irrelevant. Any appropriate document produced must have a meaning and meet farmers’ expectations, and must also support government programmes.

All the comments given above are clear indications that limited access to land has negative impact on the lives of many families in the communities. It could actually be physically noticed by the survey team when on the ground. The numbers of children running around, looking underfed was remarkably present at the nearby homes. The farmers are willing to grow crops and use the proceeds for their benefits, but limited land access is the barrier.

Though the participants seem to have some good ideas of what good quality seeds are, these responses still leave a lot unanswered questions in terms of their understanding of what quality seeds are. There are other responses from different participants and from different groups that show that they actually do not know what good quality seeds are. That can be used to make a comfortable judgment that all these people do not understand what is meant by quality seeds.

Accessing of quality seeds differ from group to group, and from participant to participant. There are really no single uniformed way and place of accessing quality seeds. The various responses given indicate that many of the farmers do not know where to get quality seeds. They all take different directions in search for quality seeds. For example a woman participant said “from our stores at home”. Another one said “from our mother in-law, friends, neighbor or buy from the
local markets in the villages”. The reason is that quality seeds are very expensive and packed in small quantities. That means they plant anything so long as it is a seed that they had stored. Only one (disable person) was able to say that they buy from seed dealers. But the question is, do these seed dealers sell quality seeds? It could be any seed and they feel comfortable with because the person selling it is a seed dealer. Others also indicated that their sources of quality seeds are from NGOs who donate to them. In 2013 FAPAD was reported to have given free seeds. What is not clear is whether buying from local markets means from dealers operating in the market of just from any person. It is most likely that such (so called quality seeds) could be from any business person. These indicate some level of ignorance by the small farmers about where to access quality seeds. It means the way of accessing quality seeds is still a big challenge.

All the participants from different groups admitted having experience poor quality seed as a legitimate problem. Both disable persons and youth participants admitted by saying ‘yes’ without elaboration. By saying ‘yes’ it is enough to ascertain what they mean. The fact remains that there are problems in accessing quality seeds, and that the experiences are real. Some attempts have been made to try and resolve the above issues, for example women said that always they try to take the seeds back, but the sellers refuse to refund their money. Instead they are blamed for not preparing the gardens well enough. In a nutshell, these are all about understanding quality seeds and where to find them. Many of these small farmers have no idea of quality seeds and how to access them. Others participants said they report such cases to site coordinators, but get no response. At the same time they are not compensated either. It is therefore important to know where one buys the seeds from. There are possibilities that a farmer may be compensated if the seeds are bought from recognized dealers. But for those who buy from local markets, it is very difficult to trace the seller in case of any problems.

Women disclosed that they do not report cases of poor quality seeds to any authority. They argued that even if they report, nothing is done. The same sentiment was echoed by disable persons and the combined group. Youths said they report to the Agricultural officer at the sub-county level, but no action is taken. The youths seem to be aware of what to do here, but get discouraged because of lack of support from the responsible offices. With this kind of response to challenges facing these vulnerable groups, fight against food insecurity through quality seeds and access to land becomes challenging.
Much as the disable person and youth participants complained that the government has not given them any assistance in terms of accessing quality seeds, but they got support from NGOs like LEMU and FAPAD. This means the government needs to step up their support and reach the rural areas.

Another woman participant said that government should give seeds through groups, and in terms, and that it should be in time for planting. Meanwhile a disable person participant proposed that sub-county officials should sensitize the community to look at them as people with rights too. He added that they as disable persons are not benefiting from many government programmes (From Ngetta sub-county). On the other hand, a youth participant said “the criteria of selecting farmers group to get support should be open so that everyone knows”. These are sentiments being sent out to leaders to show that the community is willing to promote food security, but there is no willingness to help them achieve that. All these people irrespective of their status are determined to fight against food insecurity at all cost. Therefore their vices must be heard. The small farmer groups are willing to work together with the responsible offices and make things work out. The women participants have stated that they can individually help change the situation. One of them said, “We can Form VSLA group so that we can save and also borrow from the group to start a small business. E.g. buying produce and selling, buying goats and keep for sometime then sell and get profit, and also buy quality seeds”. Meanwhile a disable participant said, “We can come together as disable groups, start a VSLA and start saving and borrow and pay back with little interest, say 1%. This will help many of us to afford quality seeds and start small businesses such as; selling rice, tomatoes, beans and other things that are easy to manage”. The same interest was also aired by one youth participant who simply said, “We are ready to Start VSLA group to change the situation”. All statements made above, though by individuals from different groups, seem to represent the voices of all. The women, youth and disable persons are ready and hopeful to sustain food security in their communities so long as they are listened to.

The women and youth operate as farmer’s groups, while the disable persons say they are a group of VSLA but also farmers. By all giving such expression, it is clear that they are affected by limited access to quality seeds and land. Therefore the need to provide solutions surrounding the concerns raised is inevitable.
All the groups seem to have benefited from working together as farmers group. They are not clear on cooperatives. As small farmer groups, women were very clear that they benefited from the group by jointly doing art and craft to raise more money for the group, but this year they were unable to do that due to lack of capital. The disable participants also added their voices by saying that they also benefited by starting small businesses and sharing problems which made them to come up with solutions which has made them to develop in very many ways. This are positive indications that working as a small farmer group has many benefits, but for the challenges of access to quality seeds and land. However, the youths were not open, though there was indication that they have not benefited from the cooperatives. This could mean that they are not operating as a cooperative, and therefore no benefit. On the other hand, they appreciated working together as a farmer group.

**Challenges that need to be addressed**

1. Absence of a facilitative regulatory framework: Limited regulation of inputs trade which has make markets to be flooded with substandard and fake inputs like seeds, tools, fertilizers among others.

2. Inadequate government interventions to address insufficiencies of storage facilities, poor road networks, cost of electricity at the local levels makes it difficult for most farmers to meet the required standards.

3. Limited information dissemination and capacity building from the national level to the local government level to facilitate enforcement and monitoring of access to quality seeds and land by small scale farmers.

4. Absence of a mechanism for pricing in line with grades of seeds, this hinders rewards/incentives for compliance to recommended quality and discourage farmers from incurring both time and financial cost related to ensuring quality production.

5. Absence of legislations such as ordinances and by-laws on ensuring quality of grains at the local levels has provided a lee way for value chain actors to engage in malpractices like spraying seeds to speed up drying which affect both quality and safety, hence poor production.
6. Inadequate policy interventions on addressing climate change effects; farmers note that timely planting and proper postharvest handling is becoming more challenging due to inability to predict seasonal changes and the volatility of onset and cessation of rain because of climate change.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Conclusion

The study found that the progress of formulation and implementation of policies/ by-laws or ordinances on access to quality seeds and access to land inadequate. An ordinance on control of malpractises in post-harvest handling, storage, trade, and movement of agro-products have remained in offing for a long while despite pleas on related concerns emanating from grassroots farmers. In addition, offices or institutions mandated to handle issues about quality seeds and access to land for farming are not meeting the expectations of those to benefit from such policies/by-laws and ordinances. There are not enough resources (human) for inspections and monitoring services provided, as well as programmes put in place for farmers. For example, UNBS whose major task is to make sure that quality for goods and services provided to the consumers are adhered to, is not visible in the rural areas where small scale farmers are found. UNBS only deals with monitoring of the functions of scales in the markets and shops (as per information got from the regional office in Lira).

On the other hand the office of the commercial office located at the municipal offices has no mandate to prosecute any dealer found selling counterfeit seeds. What it only does is check for trading license and if found doing business without it, the business premise is closed. All these leave a wide gap in the fight against food insecurity.

The level of awareness of quality seeds and access to land is very low. Many small scale farmers from different farmer groups did do not know where to buy quality seeds and what to do if they failed to access land. They also did not know how to identify quality seeds from poor quality seeds. The same applied to some local leaders. After buying poor quality seeds, the study found out that the farmers do not know where to report to. The reason for this was stated that, most of
the seeds are given free so no need to report in case it is found to be of poor quality. For those farmers who buy from the local markets, they lose everything when the seeds they have bought are found to be of poor quality. In case of limited access to land, the study found out that many farmers who have no access to land end up renting/hiring small pieces of land which are expensive and cannot allow for enough cultivation of food to feed their families as these small farmers have large families (Ref. table 1.2, 97% have children, with 20.95% having between 5-6 children) making it challenging to avert food insecurity.

A good number of stakeholders such as; Ngetta ZARDI, MAAIF, WFP, FAPAD are trying hard to make sure that small farmer groups are supplied with quality seeds. FAPAD even goes as far as sensitizing the farmers on the need for quality seeds and access to land. It tries to send the voices of the affected farmers to the respective offices. The police have been trying and making sure that seed dealers found selling poor quality seeds are arrested and prosecuted. On the issue of access to land, traditional leaders together with police have been trying to make sure that the women, youth and disable persons have equal opportunities to access land. The police also work hand in hand with business community and the farmer groups themselves to see to it that access to quality seeds and land is attained, with the aim of attaining food security.

From the evaluation, it’s clear that limited access to land has a big role to play on attainment of food security in Lango sub-region, coupled with how land is put into use (Ref. Table1.5). Also access to quality seed is responsible for food insecurity among the communities in Lango sub region, as 74.86% of the respondents still buy seeds from the open markets. Because of these, some families have big problems of food availability as 58.1% of households reported that many household approached them in the last six months between one to three times asking for food. 80.06% of household reported that most food consumed in their households come from harvest.
**Recommendations**

i. The government should increase financial support to UNBS and MAAIF to help in the implementation and monitoring of access to quality seeds.

ii. There is need for adequate extension services and availability of climate smart seed varieties and high yielding varieties as means of curbing food security problems in the sub region.

iii. There is need for increase awareness on the causes of food insecurity e.g. rapid population growth, climate change, pests and diseases among others, and take pro-action measures.

iv. There is need to strengthen household resource capacity to produce and utilize food through improved technologies and extension information. This can be done from the support from the government by introducing good agricultural programmes that are easy to adopt, especially by small scale farmers.

v. Introduce support services for food security e.g. extension services and financial services

vi. Address inequalities in accessing land for agricultural purposes by different sub farmer groups as well as categories of people living in society. E.g. women, youth and disable persons. Issues of predisposing factors such as; gender inequality and discrimination among others must be stopped.

vii. Stakeholders such as NGOs and human rights should advocate for policies/by-laws and programmes that enhance food security in the whole region.

viii. The Local Government should sensitize the public, especially the small scale farmers on proper post harvest handling. The agricultural extension workers should focus on dissemination of information on how the small scale farmers can be empowered to handle post harvest challenges, especially on grains.

ix. There is need to put more efforts on awareness of quality seeds and how to acquire them. The study found out that awareness on quality seeds and how to acquire them is narrowed to urban areas only and the rural poor small scale farmers are left out.

x. The local Government should enact by-laws that would empower the district commercial officers to enforce access to quality seeds. At the moment the role lies with central government who has the technical persons in districts with only job descriptions and power to act on the grown.
xi. **UNBS in Lira should have the central laboratory/ or mobile testing equipments that can be used to test seeds from the suspected dealers. This can only be done by the central government by more funding to UNBS. Otherwise the office in Lira has no relevance to the small scale farmers as far as access to quality seeds is concerned.**

xii. **Non implementation of existing policies: The pace at which polices are implemented is very slow. For example, the draft seed and plant regulation 2009 which were developed to guide the effective implementation and enforcement of the seed and plant act 2006 have never been passed. Similarly, the Uganda Grain trade policy is still a draft and has yet to be tabled for cabinet consideration. Responsible persons/offices should speed up on this so that the intended purposes of such policies reach the beneficiaries.**

xiii. **Lack of Capacity by implementing agencies: The national seed certification service is under-capacitated to perform its official mandate of enforcing and regulating seed quality control mechanism, as a result counterfeits are rampant on the market. The study found out that UNBS does not conduct this exercise in Lira. UNBS is a key institution responsible for enforcement of government programmes to farmers, but it has unclear and conflicting mandates, making it very weak and making enforcement very difficult. The government therefore should make sure that its wings such as UNBS are equipped to implement its programmes.**
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## Annexes

### Annex 1: Key informants Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 1</td>
<td>Agronomist</td>
<td>Best Yield Ug.Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>Sales Officer</td>
<td>Victoria Seeds-Lira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>Sales Officer</td>
<td>Friends of Farmers-Lira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Nobel Agro Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 5</td>
<td>Seed expert</td>
<td>Ngetta ZARDI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 6</td>
<td>Sec. to production</td>
<td>Anai sub-county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 7</td>
<td>Agric Officer</td>
<td>Lira District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 8</td>
<td>Commercial Officer</td>
<td>Lira Municipal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 9</td>
<td>LC3</td>
<td>Barr Sub- County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 10</td>
<td>LC3</td>
<td>Amach Sub-County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 11</td>
<td>LC3</td>
<td>Ngetta Sub-County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 12</td>
<td>LC1</td>
<td>Ayac Parish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 13</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>UNBS- Lira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 14</td>
<td>CID</td>
<td>Lira Central Police</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annex 2: FGDs Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of group</th>
<th>Location/ sub-county</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awape women</td>
<td>Ayac Parish, Amach sub-county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed Angwal mot (Disable)</td>
<td>Ayac Parish, Amach Sub-County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangabango Moko (Youth)</td>
<td>Ngetta Sub-County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annex 3: Opinion Leaders Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 1</td>
<td>Teacher/Farmer</td>
<td>ASUL/Amach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>Farmer/Business man</td>
<td>Adekokwok</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 4: Farmer Groups Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of group</th>
<th>Location/parish/sub-county</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gen Anyim</td>
<td>Amach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Par Pi Anyim</td>
<td>Amach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Abwocolil</td>
<td>Amach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gen Rwot</td>
<td>Amach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Bangabango Moko</td>
<td>Ngetta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Aol Iwot Women group</td>
<td>Ngetta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Oliolo Farmers</td>
<td>Oliolo- Barr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Orib Cing</td>
<td>Ober- Barr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Bed Ilero</td>
<td>Angwetangwet-Adekokwok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. St. Bruno Akia</td>
<td>Adekokwok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Orincing</td>
<td>Abongorwot – Agali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Agali Farmers</td>
<td>okile – Agali</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>