

**REVISED FINAL REPORT:**

**COMMUNITY PARTICIPATORY SCORE CARD SURVEY ON  
RURAL WOMEN ACCESS TO AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION  
SERVICES IN SELECTED STATES OF NIGERIA.**

**BY**

**PROF. TUNJI AROKOYO**

**A STUDY COMMISSIONED BY ACTIONAID NIGERIA**

**APRIL, 2018**

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

For a start, I want to express my deep gratitude to God for the gift of life and good health of body and mind to enable me conduct this study; to Him be all the glory.

Next, my sincere appreciation goes to ActionAid Nigeria, for the opportunity given me to conduct this important study. I am particularly, thankful to Azubike Nwokoye and Blessing Akhile, who worked directly with me, for facilitating the field studies in all the participating States and for making themselves available for consultations as needed.

To all the ActionAid partners in the States, the Directors in the States' Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources and the Agricultural Development Programmes (ADP) Project Managers and their Management that were involved in the Participatory Scorecard exercise, I say a very "Big Thank You" for your time and valuable contributions.

Finally, I want to specially recognize and express my deep appreciation to all the hard working women, members of the various Cooperative Societies and Women Farmers' Associations in the selected States under the umbrella of Small-Scale Women Farmers Organization in Nigeria (SWOFON), who were the primary actors in this participatory Community Score Card Study.

**Prof. Tunji Arokoyo**



## ACRONYMS

ADP	Agricultural Development Programme
AEAS	Agricultural Extension and Advisory Services
ASAPIN	Association of Small-scale Agro-producers in Nigeria
BEA	Block Extension Agent (Female only)
BES	Block Extension Supervisor (Male or Female)
BTRM	Bi-Monthly Technology Review Meetings
EA	Extension Agent
FBO	Farmer-based Organization
FF	Farm Family
FDAE	Federal Department of Agricultural Extension
FGD	Focussed Group Discussions
GAP	Good Agricultural Practices
GESS	Growth Enhancement Support Scheme
MTP	Management Training Plots
MTRM	Monthly Technology Review Meeting
NARP	National Agricultural Research Project
OFAR	On-Farm Adaptive Research
QTRM	Quarterly Technology Review Meeting
SG2000	Sasakawa Global 2000
SMS	Subject-Matter Specialist
SPAT	Small Plot Adoption Technique
SWOFON	Small-scale Women Farmers' Organizations in Nigeria.
VEA	Village Extension Agent

## Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
ACRONYMS .....	iv
LIST OF ANNEXES .....	ix
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	x
<b>CHAPTER 1: PROJECT BACKGROUND AND STUDY OBJECTIVES:</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1. Background to the Study: .....	1
<b>1.2. Study Objectives:</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY:</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>2.1. Small-scale Women farmers Score Card Analysis (Scoring) of the Extension Services:</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>2.2. Limitations of the Study:</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>CHAPTER 3: RESULTS AND FINDINGS:</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>3.1. BAUCHI STATE:</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>3.1.1. Bauchi ADP (self-assessment) Extension Service Performance Scorecard:</b> .....	<b>12</b>
3.1.2: Community Participatory Score Card by the selected small-scale women farmers on Access to ADP Extension Service in Bauchi State:	15
<b>3.2. DELTA STATE:</b> .....	<b>19</b>
<b>3.2.1: Delta ADP (self-assessment) Extension Service Performance Scorecard:</b> .....	<b>19</b>
3.2.2: Community Participatory Score Card by the selected small-scale women farmers on Access to ADP Extension Service in Delta State:	21
<b>3.3. EBONYI STATE:</b> .....	<b>26</b>
<b>3.3.1: Ebonyi ADP (self-assessment) Extension Service Performance Scorecard:</b> .....	<b>26</b>
3.3.2. Community Participatory Score Card of the Ebonyi ADP Extension Service Delivery by Small-scale Women farmers of Ebonyin State: .....	28
<b>3.4. Federal Capital Territory (FCT):</b> .....	<b>33</b>
<b>3.4.1. FCT ADP (self-assessment) Extension Service Performance Scorecard:</b> .....	<b>33</b>
3.4.2. Community Participatory Score Card of the FCT ADP Extension Service Delivery by Small-scale Women farmers of FCT: .....	35
<b>3.5. GOMBE STATE:</b> .....	<b>38</b>
3.5.1: Gombe ADP Extension Service Performance Indicators:.....	38

3.5.2. Community Participatory Score Card of the Gombe ADP Extension Service Delivery by Small-scale Women farmers of Gombe State:.....	41
<b>3.6. KOGI STATE:.....</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>3.6.1. Kogi ADP Extension Delivery Performance Indicators Score Card: .....</b>	<b>46</b>
3.6.2. Community Participatory Scorecard of the Kogi ADP Extension Service Delivery by Small-scale Women farmers of Kogi State:.....	49
<b>3.7. KWARA STATE: .....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>3.7.1. Kwara ADP Extension Delivery Performance Indicators Scorecard: .....</b>	<b>52</b>
3.7.2. Community Participatory Scorecard of the Kwara ADP Extension Service Delivery by Small-scale Women farmers in Kwara State:.....	54
<b>3.8. ONDO STATE:.....</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>3.8.1. Ondo State ADP Extension Delivery Performance Indicators Scorecard: .....</b>	<b>58</b>
3.8.2. Community Participatory Scorecard of the Ondo ADP Extension Service Delivery by Small-scale Women farmers of Ondo State:.....	60
<b>CHAPTER 4: SUMMARY OF BUDGET PERFORMANCE BY FDAE AND THE STATES ADPS .....</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSIONS OF FINDINGS AND RESULTS: .....</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>5.1. Scorecard for Public Extension Service Performance: .....</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>5.2. State Funding of Public Extension Services: .....</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>5.3. The Women Participatory Scorecard on Access to Extension Services:.....</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>CHAPTER 6: CHALLENGES: .....</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>6.1. Extension Service Agency: .....</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>6.2. Challenges for small-scale women farmers: .....</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS: .....</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>CHAPTER 8: REFERENCES:.....</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>CHAPTER 9: ANNEXES: .....</b>	<b>72</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Summary of Steps involved in the Participatory Scorecard Study in the States .....	9
Table 2: Bauchi State ADP Performance Indicators:.....	12
Table 3: Bauchi State Public Financing of Agricultural Extension:.....	14
Table 4: Rating of Extension Services by Small-scale Women Beneficiaries .....	16
Table 5: Rating of Extension Delivery Methods and Approaches.....	17
Table 6: Overall Rating of the State’s ADP Extension Services .....	18
Table 7: Delta State ADP Performance Indicators Score Card:.....	19
Table 8: Delta State Financing of Public Agricultural Extension: .....	20
Table 9: Rating of Delta State Extension Service Delivery by Women Beneficiaries.....	22
Table 10: Rating of Delta State ADP Extension Methods and Approaches by women. ....	22
Table 11: Overall Rating of the Delta State Extension Services.....	23
Table 12: Ebonyi State ADP Performance Indicators Score Card: .....	26
Table 13: Ebonyi State Financing of Public Agricultural Extension:.....	28
Table 14: Rating of Extension Services Delivery by Ebonyi State Women Beneficiaries.....	29
Table 15: Rating of Ebonyi State ADP Extension Methods and Approaches:.....	30
Table 16: Overall Rating of the Ebonyi State ADP Extension Services.....	31
Table 17: FCT ADP Extension Delivery Performance Indicators Score Card:.....	33
Table 18: FCT Financing of Public Agricultural Extension: .....	35
Table 19: Rating of Extension Technical Support Services by FCT Women Beneficiaries .....	36
Table 20: Rating of Extension Methods and Approaches.....	36
Table 21: Overall Rating of the FCT ADP Extension Services .....	37
Table 22: Gombe State ADP Performance Indicators Score Card: .....	38
Table 23: Gombe State Financing of Public Agricultural Extension Service: .....	40
Table 24: Rating of Extension Technical Services by Gombe State Women Beneficiaries.....	42
Table 25: Rating of Gombe Extension Methods and approaches .....	43
Table 26: Overall Rating of the Gombe State Extension Services .....	44

Table 27: Kogi ADP Extension Service Performance Indicators Score Card: .....	46
Table 28: Kogi State Public Financing of Agricultural Extension:.....	48
Table 29: Kogi State Payment of Counterpart Funding For FADAMA III AF .....	48
Table 30: Rating of the Extension Technical Support Services by Kogi Women: .....	49
Table 31: Rating of Extension Methods and Approaches.....	50
Table 32: Overall Rating of the Kogi State ADP Extension Services.....	51
Table 33: Kwara ADP Agricultural Extension Service Performance Indicators Score Card: .....	52
Table 34: Kwara State Financing of Public Agricultural Extension: .....	54
Table 35: Rating of Kwara State Extension Technical Support Services by Women farmers:.....	54
Table 36: Rating of Kwara State ADP Extension Methods and Approaches.....	55
Table 37: Overall Rating of the Kwara State Extension Services .....	56
Table 38: Ondo ADP Agricultural Extension Service Performance Indicators Score Card.....	58
Table 39: Ondo State Financing of Public Agricultural Extension:.....	60
Table 40: Ondo State Counterpart Funding for FADAMA III AF.....	60
Table 41: Rating of Ondo State ADP Extension Technical Support Services by Women Beneficiaries:.....	61
Table 42: Rating of Extension Methods and Approaches:.....	62
Table 43: Overall Rating of the Ondo State ADP Extension Services.....	62
Table 44: FED. DEPT. OF AGRIC. EXTENSION (FDAE) BUDGET PERFORMANCE.....	63

## LIST OF ANNEXES

9.1	State ADP (Public Extension Service Provider) Performance Score Card Tool.....	67
9.2	Community Score Card Tool for Smallholder Women Farmers' accessibility to Agricultural Extension and Advisory Services in Nigeria.....	69

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Community Participatory Score Card study was conducted between September 2017 and January 2018 to determine small-scale women farmers' access to public agricultural extension and advisory services in seven selected States plus the Federal Capital Territory (FCT).

Two community participatory score card tools were developed and approved by ActionAid Nigeria for the study: one was for the public agricultural extension and advisory service providers, the Agricultural Development Programmes (ADPs) of the States' Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources, based on the Standard agricultural extension service performance indicators (staffing, funding, and extension delivery activities).

The other score card tool was for the beneficiaries (clientele) of the extension and advisory services, i.e: small-scale women farmers belonging to various associations and groups under the umbrella of Small-scale Women Farmers Organizations of Nigeria (SWOFON) as selected by ActionAid and its partners in the participating States for them to evaluate their access to public extension services in their States.

The ADPs extension services was scored based on the staffing situation, especially at the critical extension agent/farmers interface (Village Extension Agent (VEA), Block Extension Agent (BEA) and Block Extension Supervisors (BES)); funding and key extension delivery activities.

The score card tool for the small-scale women farmers was based on key extension delivery variables, including technical facilitation and backstopping and extension delivery methods and approach. The scoring was on a scale of 1 – 4, with 1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good and 4 = Very Good.

The analysis was done using weighted mean, with the weighted mean score as 2.5. Weighted mean score below the cut-off point of 2.5 was considered not satisfactory (Poor – Fair) and weighted mean score above 2.5, as satisfactory (Good – Very Good)

The results of the study showed that a majority (66.0% - 84.0%) of the women participants in all the States, except Gombe (33.0%) were aware of the ADPs and extension services in their

various States. However, their overall access to the ADP extension services, were scored as majorly poor (mean weighted score of 1.0 – 1.75) in all the States.

Apart from their poor access to agricultural extension services, the small-scale women farmers also stated that their most serious agricultural challenges include: lack of or very limited access to production-enhancing inputs, especially; improved seeds/seedlings, fertilizers, tractors for land preparation, poor storage, processing facilities and credit.

With respect to the ADPs, the study revealed that they were all “top-heavy” in staffing while seriously lacking needed staff at the critical extension agent/farmers interface.

The study further showed that the acute shortage of essential qualified staff was compounded by very poor and irregular funding in all the States, hence; the poor extension service coverage and delivery.

The major challenges of the ADPs as revealed by their score card include: acute shortage of critically needed staff in the right positions, poor and irregular funding, lack of opportunities for regular and continuous capacity building and poor mobility for field operations.

Consequent upon the findings, the following recommendations are made:

- i. The enactment of an agricultural extension policy to guide and regulate the practice of agricultural extension and advisory services in Nigeria, for assured and sustainable funding mechanism and quality control.
- ii. Significant improvement in the funding of public agricultural extension services by the Federal and State governments.
- iii. Immediate recruitment of adequate and qualified extension personnel and putting in place a funded capacity building programme for extension personnel in all the ADPs centres.
- iv. Special Extension Outreach programme for Women and Youths and other marginalized groups.

- v. Facilitation of access to production-enhancing inputs including access to land, and credit.

## **Revised Final Report:**

### **Community Participatory Score Card Survey on Rural Women Access to Agricultural Extension Services in Selected States of Nigeria**

#### **CHAPTER 1: PROJECT BACKGROUND AND STUDY OBJECTIVES:**

##### **1.1. Background to the Study:**

The varied and important roles and contributions of rural small-scale women farmers to sustainable agricultural development in developing countries, Nigeria inclusive, have been extensively documented. These contributions however, can be significantly enhanced if these rural women farmers are given the opportunity and access to agricultural extension and advisory services.

There is ample evidence in literature to show that gender inequality, substantially limits women's access to and control of services and productive resources. Women face numerous challenges within the agricultural sector. These include inadequate capital, shortage of female farm extension workers, limited access to production inputs, inadequate storage facilities, and lack of access to appropriate technologies.

The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nation's Report on the *State of Food and Agriculture 2010-11, Women in Agriculture: Closing the Gender Gap for Development*, provided incontrovertible evidence that agriculture is underperforming because half of its farmers- women, do not have equal access to the resources and opportunities they need to be more productive to enable them significantly reduce their poverty status and to have a better quality of life.

This situation remains a serious challenge; even today, that any serious organization or agency involved in agricultural advisory services (AAS) must address.

Recently, the International Food and Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) and FAO combined to also provide very compelling data on *“Gender in Agriculture: Closing the Knowledge Gap”*. The data examined gender gaps in agriculture and the critical need to close them for improved and sustainable agricultural development, especially with respect to access to assets, agricultural inputs and markets (IFPRI, 2014).

It is important to recognize the key role women play in agriculture. They need support to help them adapt to these challenges and to seize emerging opportunities. IFAD-supported projects demonstrate that investing in women can generate significant improvements in productivity and food security.

The entire communities benefit socially and economically when women have access to land, water, education, training, financial services and strong organizations. World Bank studies show that, in many countries of sub-Saharan Africa, food production could increase by 10 to 20 per cent if women faced fewer constraints. Unfortunately however, “women receive only 5 per cent of the extension resources of men, and are granted fewer and smaller loan” (IFAD, 2011).

According to the Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (2006) “Women are responsible for carrying out 70% of agricultural labour, 50% of animal husbandry related activities and 60% of food processing activities”. Despite the integral role that women play in the agricultural sector, their contributions are not valued or recognized, they are not reflected in the National Accounting Systems or given prime consideration in agricultural policy processes.

Consequently, the issues and concerns of women employed in the agricultural sector have been largely overlooked in programmes dedicated to improving agricultural productivity. Women have access to less than 20% of available agricultural resources- a serious impediment to maximising agricultural production. Men are generally presumed to be the chief actors in agricultural production and, as such; are often the main participants in and/or recipients of programme-related support.

According to the Technical Center for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation's (CTA) ***Gender Strategy Document of 2014***, "women are the backbone of the rural economy in the developing world. Yet, compared to men, they access only a fraction of productive resources, such as land, credit, inputs, (improved seeds and fertilizers), agricultural training and information. Thus; empowering and investing in rural women has been shown to significantly increase productivity, reduce hunger and malnutrition and improve rural livelihoods for everyone".

In Nigeria, "despite their significant contributions to the national food security, no formal recognition was given to them by way of a policy pronouncement to encourage, protect, and facilitate their access to inputs and services until 1986, when there was a government policy directive to establish the "Women In Agriculture" (WIA) component in the World Bank supported Agricultural Development Projects (ADPs), responsible for grassroots' extension and advisory services in all the States of Nigeria" (Arokoyo and Auta, 2014). Unfortunately the WIA programme collapsed along with the ADP after the withdrawal of the World Bank support.

(Galligan, Yvonne, 2000) stated: "Gender equality is about providing men and women with "equal conditions for realizing their full human rights and their potential to contribute to national, political, economic, social and cultural development and to benefit equally from their results."

Realizing this ideal is the main objective of the Federal Government's National Gender Policy. Of course, Gender equality is one of the United Nation Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) of which Nigeria is a signatory. It is also a human right.

According to Nigeria's National Gender Policy of 2006, the Government is "committed to building a nation devoid of gender discrimination, guaranteeing equal access to political, social and economic wealth creation opportunities for women and men; and developing a culture that places premium on the protection of all; including children. In furtherance of this goal,

government shall promote the full participation of women, men, girls and boys by involving both the public and private sectors as agents of development”.

(Foreword to the **National Gender Policy** by Mrs. Inna Maryam Ciroma, Hon. Minister of Women Affairs and Social Development, Abuja, 2006).

The major goal of agricultural extension, regardless of the systems or approaches used, is to help farmers meet present and emerging challenges, improve their productivity, take advantage of market opportunities to create wealth and improve their quality of life.

Nigeria’s national agricultural extension service has been dominated by the government-sponsored public agricultural extension services. The service has evolved over five decades, from a rudimentary export crop-focused service to what can now be described as a professional service, using a variety of agricultural extension systems and approaches.

However, the effectiveness and efficiency of the extension system have remained a major source of concern as they have not produced the desired results that will ensure sustainable agricultural development, poverty alleviation and improved livelihood, especially for rural farm families.

The collapse of the ADP system in Nigeria along with the much talked about Training and Visit (T&V) extension system, coupled with the termination of the World Bank assisted-National Agricultural Research Project (NARP) in the late 90s, is food-for-thought for the key stakeholders in the agricultural sector. There is critical need to identify and fund sustainable agricultural extension and advisory services (AEAS) systems that will engineer, sustainable agricultural development to ensure national and household food security, poverty alleviation, and improved livelihood for Nigerians.

The Federal Department of Agricultural Extension (FDAE) was established 2012, under the Agricultural Transformation Agenda policy. The Department is expected to provide the critically needed policy direction, leadership, coordination, quality control and assurance and the overall effective and efficient delivery of all agricultural extension and advisory services in Nigeria, While the States Agricultural Development Projects (ADPs) are responsible for extension services delivery at the grassroots (as a public service good).

The Agricultural Development Program (ADP) system currently, remains the veritable and dominant tool, for grassroots agricultural extension services delivery in Nigeria.

Access to agricultural advisory services and productive resources no doubt, has remained a major challenge for rural women. Research has shown that women are discriminated against in most aspects relating to agricultural resources, such as land, credit, inputs (seeds, fertilizers, pesticides, fodder, and irrigation water) and external labor.

Apart from socio-economic and cultural factors, gender discrimination also hinders women's access to resources (Danso et al., 2004). It is evident that gender relations profoundly influence agriculture and food production, and the pattern of women's participation (Simiyu & Foeken, 2013). Thus although agriculture provides economic opportunities for women, this usually takes place under "formidable constraints" (Hovorka, 2006a).

## **1.2. Study Objectives:**

The overall aim of the study is to evaluate small-scale women farmers' access to public agricultural extension and advisory services in Nigeria.

Specific Objectives:

- i. To determine the capacity of the States' Agricultural Development Programmes (ADPs) in the seven targeted ActionAid States plus FCT to deliver effective and efficient agricultural extension services to their clientele selected States with special interest in

service delivery to small-scale women farmers, using a self-assessment participatory score card instrument.

- ii. To determine the adequacy or otherwise of the level and regularity of funding to the ADPs to ensure effective and efficient delivery of extension services.
- iii. To determine small-scale women farmers' (specifically members of SWOFON) access to agricultural extension and advisory services in the targeted States of Bauchi, Delta, Ebonyi, Gombe, Kogi, Kwara and Ondo States plus FCT, using the Community Participatory Score Card methodology.
- iv. To determine the challenges of the ADPs in providing effective and efficient extension services.
- v. To determine the challenges of small-scale women farmers' in accessing agricultural extension services and in their agricultural production efforts.

## **CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY:**

Both secondary and primary data were collected in this study, using the community participatory score card strategy.

**Study Design:** The process involved the development of scorecard tools for both the public Agricultural Extension and Advisory Services Providers, the Ministry of Agriculture in the various States and their Extension Agencies, the Agricultural Development Programs (ADPs) and for the clientele/beneficiaries of the extension services, the small-scale women farmers belonging to various women farmers' associations and cooperatives under the umbrella of the small-scale women farmers' organization in Nigeria (SWOFON) in all the participating States.

After the Score Card Tools (for both the service providers and the beneficiaries) were developed, they were submitted to ActionAid for review, confirmation and approval.

Suggested amendments were then incorporated and the final tools used for the field work.

Field visits to the participating States for the study started on day one, with a courtesy call to the Honorable Commissioner of Agriculture or Permanent secretary in the absence of the Honorable Commissioner, with the relevant Directors (Agriculture Services, Planning Research and Statistics and the ADP Program Manager).

The courtesy call was immediately followed by in-depth discussions with the Ministry's Directors and secondary data collected from the Planning and Financial documents of the Ministry with special focus on Budget allocations, disbursement and performance of the Ministry.

The rest of the day was spent with the State's ADP, the primary extension service provider, in focused group discussion (FGD), using the ADP Extension Performance Indicators Tool (see Annex 7.1). Participants at this session include the Programme Manager, Director PME, Director, Extension, Director, Women in Agriculture (WIA), Directors of Livestock, Fisheries,

Crops and other management staff. The completion of Extension Performance Indicators score card Tool was a self-evaluation by the ADP.

Day two of the State's visit, was devoted to facilitating the completion of the Community Participatory Score card Tool (see Annex 7.2) by the small-scale women farmers selected from all the Local Governments of each of the study State (by ActionAid and its partners in the State), representing various women farmers' associations and cooperatives, all belonging to the small-scale women farmers' organizations in Nigeria (SWOFON).

This was a very interactive session in all the States with the women completely taking "charge" of the sessions. The consultant only provided guidance and focus on the subject-matter. To ensure effective communication, in-depth and focused discussions interpretation, use of the local language was adopted as means of communication during the session.

The last day was an interactive interface between the Ministry of Agriculture and the ADP staff (the agricultural extension service providers in the State) and the small-scale women farmers essentially, to validate the Participatory score card by the women with respect to their access to extension services.

The wrap-up session, also provided an opportunity to share and exchange ideas on how agricultural extension and advisory services can be significantly improved, so as to be accessible to rural women and to ensure sustainable agricultural development, food security and poverty alleviation.

**Table 1: Summary of Steps involved in the Participatory Scorecard Study in the States**

Stage	What was done	Outputs/Remarks
1. Preparatory groundwork	Preparation of the Participatory Score Card Tools for both the Extension Providers & beneficiaries of the Study.	<b>Service Provider Tool:</b> based on Extension Performance Indicators <b>Beneficiary Score Card Tool:</b> based on the women's rating of their access to the States' extension services
Developed Tools submitted to ActionAid for Review	Tools reviewed, approved and suggested inputs incorporated.	Final Study Tools produced and used for the Field work
2. Consultation with the selected Agencies (MANR and States' ADPs)	Clarification of purpose of mission, verification of service tracking matrix: Completion of the Scorecard Tools.	Understanding and cooperation of stakeholders and facilitation of access to relevant documents.
3. State ADP self-evaluation scorecard	Based on service performance standards and assessment matrix	State ADP self-evaluation scorecard of its extension services
4. Community score of the State ADP Extension services and service standards	Community verify service standards, based on situation on ground and develop its own service performance scorecard	Community scorecard of ADP extension services; an assessment of the ADP services by the women beneficiaries.
5. Interface meeting between State ADP and Representative of the Women Farmers'	Plenary presentation of community and service provider scorecards, clarifications, validation and	Interactive interface to clarify differences, validate and decide on way forward to make extension services accessible to rural women

Organizations (Extension Service Providers end & Users)	agreement on way forward.	and to ensure sustainable agricultural development, food security and poverty alleviation.
---	---------------------------	--

**Study Locations:** The study was conducted in Bauchi, Delta, Ebonyi, Gombe, Kogi, Kwara Ondo States and the Federal Capital Territory (FCT).

**Study Population and sample size:** Both the study population and sample size was as determined by ActionAid and its partners in the targeted States. The Consultant had no control over the selection of the women for the score card exercise.

**2.1. Small-scale Women farmers Score Card Analysis (Scoring) of the Extension Services:**

The rating of the extension services were based on selected extension performance variable. The Variables accessed include: facilitation of access to improved inputs and land preparation; access to the technical backstopping services for Crops, livestock, fisheries; post-harvest management and market information.

This was followed by the rating of extension methods and approaches including: Trainings and workshops; on-farm farmer-managed demonstrations; on-farm equipment demonstrations for post-harvest handling; processing and storage; Radio and TV programmes; Agricultural Shows and Field Days, and Information/Communication Technologies (ICTs) for production and market information.

**Data Analysis:** Based on all of the above, the women gave an overall score for extension services delivery accessed by the small-scale women farmers.

**Average Mean score calculation:**

- i. Weighted average used. Whereby the Average Score is calculated as  $(n1*1) + (n2*2) + (n3*3) + (n4*4)$  divided by  $n1+n2+n3+n4$  (no. people).  
Where: **Nx** = number of people who gave a specific score (from 1 to 4).

Example: 10 participants, of whom 5 gave 1; 3 gave 2; 0 gave 3; and 0 gave 4; the Average Score =  $(5*1)+(3*2)+(0*3)+(2*4)/5+3+0+2$  (no. of people) = 1.9

## **2.2. Limitations of the Study:**

- i. One of the limitations of the study was the selection of the women groups to participate in the study. The study population and sample size were entirely determined by ActionAid and its partners in all the study States
- ii. It was restricted to only the small-scale women associations, cooperatives and groups belonging to the small-scale women farmers association of Nigeria (SWOFON) with whom ActionAid and its partners in the various States are working with.
- iii. Although deliberate efforts were made to select participants from all the Local Governments of the participating States, the numbers were very small compared to the population from which the selections were made.
- iv. Another limitation of the study is the current state of the extension services itself. Most of the activities of the ADPs, the public extension agency are donor-driven. Donor projects have their own beneficiary groups and if SWOFON members do not belong to these groups, by implication, their access to extension services would be limited.

With these limitations, one can only make a cautious generalization of the results. Nevertheless; the findings are a reflection of the state of public agricultural extension services in Nigeria and the challenges of small-scale women farmers in accessing the services.

## CHAPTER 3: RESULTS AND FINDINGS:

### 3.1. BAUCHI STATE:

Bauchi State Agricultural Development Project (BSADP)

Dass Road, PMB 050, Bauchi

Contact: Alhaji A. Gital, Programme Manager

Email: [bauchiadp@yahoo.com](mailto:bauchiadp@yahoo.com)

The Bauchi State Agricultural Development Project (BSADP) is one of the high performing ADPs in Nigeria but has also suffered from poor funding in recent years. Most of its activities are now donor-driven.

#### 3.1.1. Bauchi ADP (self-assessment) Extension Service Performance Scorecard:

i). **Current Extension Approaches:** BSADP uses a variety of extension delivery approaches including:

- Training and Visit (T & V)
- Training and Demonstration (T & D)
- Farmer Field School (FFS)
- Mass Media

The BSADP detailed Extension Performance Indicators scorecard results are presented in **Table 2** below:

**Table 2:** Bauchi State ADP Performance Indicators:

S/No.	Indicators	Target	Achieved	Difference	Remarks
1.	Farm Families 2014		987,925		
2.	EA: Farmer Ratio 2017	1:1000	1:3500		Staff shortage
3.	No. of SMS, 2017	35	31		
4.	<b>No. of BESs</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>83</b>	Staff & Funding Challenges
5.	No. of VEAs	<b>1080</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>858</b>	

6.	No. BEAs	<b>135</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>89</b>	
7.	No. of extension Visits		59,268		
8.	No. of Exchange Visits 2012-2017	30	15	15	
9.	No. of OFAR Estab.	989	723	266	
10.	No. of SPATs Estab. 2012 – 2017	-	-	-	
11.	No of MTPs Estab. 2012 – 2017	7,200	5,292	1,408	
12.	No. of FNTs/MTS	72	40	32	
13.	No. of MTRMs/OTRMs	72	40	32	
14.	No. of staff Trainings (On Station) 2012-17	30	20		
15.	No. of staff Trainings (Off Station)	-	35	-	
16.	<b>No. of farmers trained: 2015/2016 2016/2017</b>	<b>30,000 30,000</b>	<b>5,250 3,170</b>	<b>24,750 26,830</b>	
17.	<b>No. of FBOs formed</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>24</b>	
18.	No of Agric. show Organized 2015/2016 2016/2017	24 24	- -	24 24	
19.	No of field days Organized 2015/2016 2016/2017	226 226	126 32	100 194	
20.	No of Techs. Promoted	20	14	6	
21.	No of Techs. Adopted	20	8	12	

**Source: Field Survey 2017.**

From the above Table 2, the clear and rather significant differences between Targets and Achievements (based on National Standard) of the Extension services delivery is due majorly to inadequate staffing and funding. The situation got so bad with staffing shortage that the State government approved a special waiver of two years for the Staff of the ADP to remain in their positions to allow for new extension agents to be trained to fill the vacancies. However, implementation has been faced with challenges.

**ii). Monitoring and Evaluation of Agricultural Extension and Advisory Services:**

Yes.....X.... (Quarterly)

**iii). Public Funding of Agricultural Extension Services:**

The State Funding of agricultural Extension Services is as shown in Table 3 below for period 2012 - 2016. Unfortunately, the actual allocation to extension could not be determined. The budget performance has not been impressive, ranging from a very low of 4.0% in 2015 to a maximum of 52.0% in 2014 for the whole of the Ministry of Agriculture. The meagre allocation to extension services is directly responsible for the poor extension performance.

**Table 3:** Bauchi State Public Financing of Agricultural Extension:

Year	Agric. Budget	Allocation to ADP	Actual Release	Time Released	Remarks/Budget Performance (%)
2012	5,634,912,531.00	NA	1,048,153,334.00	Nil	22.0%
2013	4,264,574,947.00	NA	1,789,443,598.37	Nil	46.0%
2014	3,015,192,660.00	NA	1,549,287,442.00	Nil	52.0%
2015	3,081,892,338.00	NA	69,790,939.33	Nil	4.0%
2016	NA	NA	NA	Nil	NA

**Source: Field Survey 2017.**

**Actual Allocation to Extension could NOT be determined. NA =Not Available**

**Counterpart Funding Payment for Donor Projects**

Year	Project	Total	Ratio (%)			Actual Release		
			Donor	Federal	State	Donor	Federal	State
2012/2013								
2013/2014	FADAMA AF Plus					Paid		
2014/2015	FADAMA AF Plus					Paid		
2015/2016	FADAMA AF Plus					Paid		

**Source: Field Survey 2017.**

The State Government made a counterpart payment for the Fadama III Additional Funding but same cannot be said with the other donor-assisted projects in which the government is involved.

**iv). State Agricultural Policy:**

There is no State policy on Agriculture or Agricultural extension services. However; an Agricultural Policy is currently in the works with assistance from OXFAM

**v). Major Extension Challenges:**

The major challenges of the ADP in the State include:

- Inadequate funding and irregular releases (for both capital and operational funds)
- Inadequate staffing (retired and dead staff not being replaced). The special waiver for extension staff due for retirement to remain in position for additional two years, was observed to be having challenges of implementation.
- No opportunity for capacity development.
- Poor conditions of service, including lack of mobility and working tools.

3.1.2: Community Participatory Score Card by the selected small-scale women farmers on Access to BSADP Extension Services:

**i. Awareness of BSADP and its Services: (N=19) Yes=17, No=2**

There is evidence that a majority of the women (**89.4%**) were aware of BSADP (“Gidan Gonna”) and its extension service delivery responsibilities.

**ii. Scoring of Extension Service performance by the small-scale women farmers:**

The rating of the extension services and delivery approaches are as presented in Tables 4, 5 and 6 below. The Variables accessed include: facilitation of access to improved inputs and land preparation; access to the technical backstopping services for Crops, livestock, fisheries; post-harvest management and market information.

This was followed by the rating of extension methods and approaches including: Trainings and workshops, on-farm farmer-managed demonstrations, on-farm equipment demonstrations for post-harvest handling, processing and storage, Radio and TV, Agricultural shows and Field Days and ICTs for production and market information.

**a). Rating of Extension Technical Support Services:**

**Table 4: Rating of Extension Services by Small-scale Women Beneficiaries**

Type of Ext. Services	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Weighted total	Weighted mean
i. Inputs Facilitation (n=19)	-	-	5 (26.3%)	14 (73.7%)	19	1.0
ii. Land Preparation Services.	-	-	3 (15.8%)	16 (84.2%)	22	1.2
iii. Technical Back-stopping: Crop Production	-	-	3 (15.8%)	16 (84.2%)	22	1.2
iv. Technical Back-stopping: Livestock Production (n=19)	-	2 (10.5%)	3 (15.8%)	14 (73.7%)	24	1.3
v. Technical Back-stopping: Fisheries Production (n=19)	-	2 (10.5%)	2 (10.5%)	15 (78.9%)	25	1.3
vi. Post-Harvest Management (PHM) (Processing & Storage) (n=19)	-	-	3 (15.8%)	16 (84.2%)	22	1.2
vii. Market information Services and Facilitation (n=19)	-	-	-	19 (100.%)	19	1.0
<b>Overall Mean Score</b>						<b>1.17</b>

**Source: Field Survey 2017.**

Only the Livestock and Fisheries extension services that got a rating of “Good”. The two women beneficiaries of the service stated **that** *“they come any time as soon as you call them”*

**b). Rating of Extension Methods and Approaches:**

**Table 5:** Rating of Extension Delivery Methods and Approaches

i. Type of Ext. Methods	V. Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Weighted Total	Weighted Mean
ii. Training and Workshops (n=19)	-	-	5 (26.3%)	14 (73.7%)	24	1.3
iii. On-Farm Demonstrations (n=19)	-	-	2 (10.5%)	17 (89.5%)	21	1.1
iv. Machinery and Equipment Demonstrations for Post-Harvest Management. (n=19)	-	-	2 (10.5%)	17 (89.5%)	21	1.1
v. Post-Harvest Management (Processing & Storage) (n=19)	-	-	5 (26.3%)	14 (73.7%)	24	1.3
vi. Radio Programs (n=19)	-	5 (26.3%)	3 (15.8%)	11 (57.9%)	32	1.7
vii. TV Programs. (n=19)				19 (100%)	19	1.0
viii. Field Days.				19 (100%)	19	1.0
ix. Agric. Shows				19 (100%)	19	1.0
x. ICTs (Mobile Phone) SMS for Production, Processing and Market Information				19 (100%)	19	1.0
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>						<b>1.17</b>

**Source: Field Survey 2017.**

With respect to the various extension delivery methods and approaches on which the women were assessment. The results revealed majority of the women score them as poor and in some instances 100% of the women had a poor rating especially for Field Days, TV, and ICTs (SMS messages).

The latter was used for the delivery of subsidized production inputs (GESS) on the platform of E-Wallet.

**a). Overall Rating on the State’s Extension Services:**

**Table 6: Overall Rating of the State’s ADP Extension Services**

Overall Rating of State Services	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Weighted total	weighted mean
i). State ADP (n=19)			<b>11</b> <b>((57.9%))</b>	<b>8</b> <b>(42.1%)</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>1.6</b>
ii). FADAMA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
iii). State Ministry of Agriculture (n=19)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

**Source: Field Survey 2017.**

According to the Women groups, the overall Score card rating for the State’s Extension Services is **“FAIR”**.

**iii). Access to Credit:** Only **4nos (21.1%)** of the beneficiaries in the Livestock sector (**n=19**) confirmed access to a special Credit facility/scheme (BAOBA CREDIT SCHEME) for women, from the Bank of Agriculture (BOA). This is a special facility that small-scale women producers could access without too much bureaucracies and so referred to it as  **(“Sharp, sharp loan”)**. This BOA facility is targeted to women who could make regular monthly repayments back to the Bank within a period of three months. It is particularly suitable for women in livestock (poultry and aquaculture).

**iv). Challenges of Small-scale Women Farmers in Bauchi State:**

- Lack of access to Credit
- Poor access to Land and land preparation of equipment
- Inadequate extension agents especially female extension agents
- Lack of access to quality production-enhancing inputs.

### 3.2. DELTA STATE:

Delta State Agriculture and Rural Development Authority,  
Delta ADP, Ibusa, Delta State.

**Contact:** Ben Agamah

Mobile Phone: 08023436798; 09038645657

**Email:** [deltaadpibusa@yahoo.com](mailto:deltaadpibusa@yahoo.com),

#### 3.2.1: Delta ADP (self-assessment) Extension Service Performance Scorecard:

##### i). Agricultural Extension Delivery Approaches:

- Training and Visit (T & V) modified Extension System
- Community-based participatory extension approach
- Farmer Field School (FFS).

Details of the Delta State self-assessment participatory scorecard compiled during the interactive focus group discussions with the ADP Management, is presented in Table 7 below.

**Table 7: Delta ADP Performance Indicators Score Card:**

S/No.	Indicators	Target	Achieved	Difference	Remarks
1.	Farm Families	Nil	179,256		
2.	EA: Farmer Ratio	1:800	1:2988	1:2188	Low staff strength
3.	No. of SMSS	15	12	3	Low staff strength
4.	No. of BESs	25	22	3	Low staff strength
5.	No. of VEAs	200	60	140	Low staff strength
6.	No. BEAs	25	11	14	Low staff strength
7.	No. of extension Visits	9963	5532	4431	Low staff strength
8.	No. of Exchange Visits	-	-	-	
9.	No. of OFAR Estab.	6	NIL	6	Lack of funding
10.	No. of SPATs Established	--	-	-	-
11.	No of MTPs Established	676	NIL	676	Lack of funding
12.	No. of FNTs/MTS	24	16	8	
13.	No. of MTRMs/OTRMs	12	NIL	12	Lack of funding
14.	No. of staff Training (On		25		

	Station)				
15.	No. of staff Training (Off Station)		<b>12</b>		
16.	Farmers trained: 2015/2016 2016/2017	<b>Nil</b>	<b>1600</b> <b>2080</b>		
17.	No. of FBOs formed				
18.	Agric. show organized 2015/2016 2016/2017	<b>3</b> <b>3</b>	<b>Nil</b> <b>Nil</b>	<b>3</b> <b>3</b>	Lack of funds
19.	No of field days Organized 2015/2016 2016/2017	<b>15</b> <b>15</b>	<b>Nil</b> <b>Nil</b>	<b>15</b> <b>15</b>	
20.	No of Technologies Promoted	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>Nil</b>	
21	No of Technologies Adopted	<b>15</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>1</b>	

**ii). Monitoring and Evaluation of Agricultural Extension and Advisory Services:**

Yes...X....Quarterly.

**iii). Public Funding of Agricultural Extension:**

The State funding for Agriculture and Extension is presented in Table 8 below.

Although there were budgetary allocations to the ADP for field extension services, there were no releases for two consecutive years, 2013 – 2014 and only a 35.7% release in 2015.

There was a better budget performance of 57.4% in 2016 but not good enough to significantly improve extension field operations. With inadequate budgetary allocation and untimely and irregular releases for time-bound extension activities, there could be operational challenges in effective service delivery.

**Table 8: Delta State Financing of Public Agricultural Extension:**

Year	Agric. Budget	Allocation to AEAS	Actual Release	Time Released	Remarks
<b>2013</b>	1,550,263,830.11	25,000,000.00	<b>0.00 (ADP)</b>		

<b>2014</b>	4,315,745,015.00	40,000,000.00	<b>0.00 (ADP)</b>		
<b>2015</b>	427,968,629.00	0.00	<b>0.00 (ADP)</b>		
		10,000,000.00 (MANR)		Release not regular	
		240,000,000.00 (ADP)	<b>85,778,450.33 (ADP)</b>		<b>Supplementary Budget (35.7%)</b>
<b>2016</b>	705,87,284,00.00	50,000,000.00	<b>28,677,192.00 (ADP)</b>	Release not timed	

**Source: Field Survey 2017.**

**iv). State Agricultural Policy:**

During the period of review, there was no State owned Agricultural Policy or Agricultural Extension Policy.

**3.2.2: Community Participatory Score Card by the selected small-scale women farmers on Access to Delta State ADP Extension Services**

**i). Awareness of Delta ADP's Extensions Services:**

Majority (70.6%) of the participants were aware of the ADP extension activities in the State, while only about 29% were not aware.

**ii). Scoring of Extension Service Performance by the small-scale women farmers:**

**a). Rating of Extension Technical Support Services:**

Table 9, shows the rating of extension Services by women beneficiaries in Delta State. Out of the seven variables, all (100%) the participants rated five (71.4%) of the variables namely land preparation services, technical Back-stopping for Livestock Production; technical Back-stopping for Fisheries; Production; Post-Harvest Management (PHM) (Processing & Storage) and market information services and facilitation, as poor with a weighted mean score of 1.0. each.

However, 41.2% of the participants rated input facilitation as fair, while 58.8% rated it as poor with a weighted mean of 1.41. About 6% of the participants rated technical backstopping of

crop production extension services as very good, 35.3% as fair and 58.8% as poor with a weighted mean of 1.53.

**Table 9: Rating of Delta Extension Services Delivery by Women Beneficiaries**

Type of Ext. Services	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Weighted Total	Weighted Mean
i. Inputs Facilitation (n=17)			7 (41.2%)	10 (58.8%)	24	1.41
ii. Land Preparation Services. (n=17)				17 (100.0%)	17	1.0
iii. Tech. Back-stopping Crop Production (n=17)	1 (5.9%)	-	6 (35.3%)	10 (58.8%)	26	1.53
iv. Tech. Back-stopping Livestock Production (n=17)				17 (100.0%)	17	1.0
v. Tech.Back-stopping: Fisheries Production (n=17)				17 (100.0%)	17	1.0
vi. Post-Harvest Management (PHM) (Processing & Storage) (n=17)				17 (100.0%)	17	1.0
vii. Market information Services and Facilitation (n=17)				17 (100.0%)	17	1.0
<b>Overall Mean Score</b>						<b>1.13</b>

Source: Field Survey 2017.

**b). Rating of Extension Methods and Approaches by Women Beneficiaries:**

Table 10 shows the rating of extension methods and approaches by Women Beneficiaries in Delta State. The table shows that all (100%) the participants rated all the 9 types of extension methods as poor with a weighted mean of 1.0 each.

**Table 10: Rating of Delta ADP Extension Methods and Approaches by women.**

Type of Ext. Methods	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Weighted total	Weighted mean
----------------------	---------------	----------	----------	----------	----------------	---------------

i). Training and Workshops. (n=17)				<b>17 (100.0%)</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>1.0</b>
ii). On Farm Demonstrations (n=17)				<b>17 (100.0%)</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>1.0</b>
iii). Machinery and Equipment Demonstrations for Post-Harvest Management. (n=17)				<b>17 (100.0%)</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>1.0</b>
iv). Post-Harvest Management (Processing & Storage). (n=17)				<b>17 (100.0%)</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>1.0</b>
v). Radio Programs. (n=17)				<b>17 (100.0%)</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>1.0</b>
vi). TV Programs. (n=17)				<b>17 (100.0%)</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>1.0</b>
vii). Field Days. (n=17)				<b>17 (100.0%)</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>1.0</b>
viii). Agric. Shows. (n=17)				<b>17 (100.0%)</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>1.0</b>
ix). ICTs (Mobile Phone) SMS for Production, Processing and Market Information. (n=17)				<b>17 (100.0%)</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>1.0</b>
<b>Overall Mean Score</b>						<b>1.0</b>

**c). Overall Rating of the State’s ADP Extension Services by Women.**

About 12% of the participants rated the ADP extension services as fair, while 88.2% rated it as poor with a weighted mean of 1.1. On the other hand all (100%) the participants rated the extension services of Delta State, Ministry of Agriculture as poor.

However, the participants could not rate the FADAMA project extension activities in the state because they reported not to be aware of its extension activities in the State as shown in Table 11.

**Table 11: Overall Rating of the Delta State Extension Services**

<b>Overall Rating of State Services</b>	<b>Very Good (4)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>	<b>Fair (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Weighted total</b>	<b>Weighted mean</b>
i. State ADP. (n=17)	-	-	<b>2 (11.8%)</b>	<b>15 (88.2%)</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>1.12</b>
ii. Fadama**						<b>NA</b>
iii. State Ministry of Agriculture (n=17)	-	-		<b>17 (100.0%)</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>1.0</b>

**Source: Field Survey 2017.**

**iii). Access to Credit:**

All the participants (100%) opined that they had not had the opportunity to access any credit facilities from the government through the ADP or facilitation from financial institutions.

**iv). Challenges of Women Groups.**

- Lack of training on improved agricultural production.
- Difficulty in Land preparation.
- Lack of funds in the ADP to provide services optimally especially for women.
- Inadequate/lack of transparency in input distribution.
- Lack of mobility and incentives/ motivation for field staff

**vi). Comments/Reactions of Delta State ADP and Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Development officials during interface Meeting:**

The officials of Delta ADP and Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development did not initially agree with the scores/observations made by the participants during the interface meeting. They defended the State and gave reasons for low performance.

They agreed with the need for the ADP to employ new E.As due to the fact that vacancies exist due to retirement or death of field staff. The officials also advocated Harmonization of all third party projects under ADP so as to make them more relevant.

In addition to the challenges faced by the ADP, the officials mentioned the issue of Parallel extension projects in the State, which uses the ADP field staff to operate, thereby creating shortage of field staff to carry out extension activities.

The need to provide incentives to field staff and mobility was also identified as a major challenge.

**vii). Conclusion:**

Based on the calculated weighted mean of all the variables under the extension service; extension methods and approaches; and overall rating of the state ADP is less than the cut-off mean of 2.5 (for a 4 point scale used) signifying that all the variables were adjudged and perceived as poor by the participants.

This is also corroborated by the fact that the overall mean were also less than the cut-off mean of 2.5, it can therefore be concluded that there is need for immediate intervention to revive the more or less moribund extension and advisory services that requires immediate attention by all stakeholders, especially the State government.

### 3.3. EBONYI STATE:

Ebonyi State Agricultural Development Program,  
Km 8, Abakaliki – Ogoja Express Way, Abakaliki.

**Contact Person:** Dr. (Mrs.) A. U. Ibe-Enwo

Mobile Phone: 08037427591.

**Email:** [ibeenwotonia@yahoo.com](mailto:ibeenwotonia@yahoo.com)

#### 3.3.1: Ebonyi ADP (self-assessment) Extension Service Performance Scorecard:

##### i). Current Extension Delivery Methods and Approaches:

- Training and Visit (T & V) Extension approach (modified)
- Farmer Field and Business School (FFBS) extension strategy
- Contact Farmers/Farmer-to-Farmer Extension strategy

The details of the ADP extension performance indicators scorecard as compiled during the in-depth discussions with the ADP Management and from documents from the Agency are presented in Table 12 below. A close examination reveals the obvious differences between set targets and achievements, a sad trend across most of the ADPs in Nigeria.

**Table 12: Ebonyi ADP Performance Indicators Score Card:**

S/No.	Indicators	Target	Achieved	Difference	Remarks
1.	Farm Families	<b>800,000</b>	<b>525,150</b>	<b>274850</b>	
2.	EA: Farmer Ratio	<b>1:1000</b>	<b>1:5040</b>	<b>4040</b>	Insufficient e.a
3.	No. of SMSs	<b>18</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>	
4.	No. of BESS	<b>24</b>	<b>24</b>	-	
5.	No. of VEAs	<b>500</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>397</b>	Inadequate vea
6.	No. BEAs	<b>48</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>24</b>	Doubling as eas
7.	No. of extension Visits	<b>3242</b>	<b>1200</b>	<b>2042</b>	Lack of funds and mobility
8.	No. of Exchange Visits	1	-	1	Lack of funds
9.	No. of OFAR Established	3	-	3	Lack of funds
10.	No. of SPATs	8240	3200		Lack of monitoring &

	Established				supervision
11.	No of MTPs Established	350	120		Lack of monitoring & supervision
12.	No. of FNTs/MTS	26	25	1	On going
13.	MTRMs/ <b>OTRMs</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>		No MTRM, QTRM on going Supported by IFAD-VCDP
14.	No. of staff Trainings (On Station)	2	-	2	
15.	No. of staff Trainings (Off Station)	-	-		
16.	No. of farmers trained: 2015/2016 2016/2017	500000 1,000,000	10000 20,000		Lack of funds & mobility Lack of fund
17.	No. of FBOs formed	6500	5,204	1296	Lack of funds
18.	No of Agric. show Organized 2015/2016 2016/2017	3 15	1 8	2 7	
19.	No of field days Organized 2015/2016 2016/2017	430 430	100 120	Nil 210	Lack of funds
20.	No of Technologies Promoted	50	40	10	
21.	No of Technologies Adopted	40	38	-	Relevance, labor saving & low cost

**Source: Field Survey 2017.**

**ii). Monitoring and Evaluation of Agricultural Extension and Advisory Services:**

No ...X..... Monitoring and Evaluation is an important activity which could not be carried out because of lack of funds.

**iii). Public Funding of Agricultural Extension (PFAE):**

Although there were Budgetary allocations for the period 2014 – 2016, there are no documentary evidence as shown in Table 13 of releases to the Ministry or to the ADP for field operations except payment of staff salary.

**Table 13: Ebonyi State Financing of Public Agricultural Extension:**

Year	Agric. Budget	Allocation to AEAS	Actual Release	Time Released	Remarks
2012/2013					
2014	<b>180.0m</b>		<b>Nil</b>		
2015	<b>117.0m</b>		<b>Nil</b>		
2016	<b>255.25m</b>		<b>Nil</b>		

**Source: Field Survey, 2017.**

There was no clear documentation to show how much was located to extension and what was actually released.

**iv). State Agricultural Policy:**

There is no evidence to show that there is a State Extension or Agricultural Policy in operation in the State.

**3.3.2. Community Participatory Score Card of the Ebonyi ADP Extension Services by Small-scale Women farmers:**

**i). Awareness of ADP's Extensions Services:**

Majority (82.4%) of the participants were aware of the ADP extension activities in the State, while only 17.6% were not aware.

**ii). Scoring of Ebonyi State ADP Extension Performance by Women Beneficiaries:**

**a). Rating of Extension Technical Support Services:**

Table 14, shows the rating of Extension Services by women beneficiaries in Ebonyi State. Out of the 7 variables, all the participants (100%) rated 3 (42.9%) variables namely, technical back-stopping for Livestock Production; technical back-stopping for Fisheries and Market Information services and facilitation, as poor; with a weighted mean score of 1.0. each.

It is worthy of note, that 14nos (82.4%) out of 17nos of the participants reported that they were engaged in livestock production while only 4nos (23.5%) engaged in fishery production.

However, 11.8% of the participants rated input facilitation good and very good, 17.6% as fair while 58.8% rated as poor with a weighted mean of 1.76.

Also 11.8% rated land preparation services and technical backstopping of crop production extension services as very good, 5.8% as fair and 82.4% as poor with a mean of 1.41.

About 11% of the participants rated Post-Harvest Management (PHM) (Processing & Storage) as very good and 88.9% as poor with a mean of 1.3.

Notably, all (100%) participants reported that they were engaged in processing and storage.

**Table 14: Rating of Extension Services Delivery by Ebonyi Women Beneficiaries.**

Type of Ext. Services	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Weighted Total	Weighted mean
i. Inputs Facilitation. (n=17)	2 (11.8%)	2 (11.8%)	3 (17.6%)	10 (58.8%)	30	1.76
ii. Land Preparation Services. (n=17)	2 (11.8%)	0	1 (5.8%)	14 (82.4%)	24	1.41
iii. Technical Back-stopping: Crop Production. (n=17)	2 (11.8%)	-	1 (5.8%)	14 (82.4%)	24	1.41
iv. Technical Back-stopping: Livestock Production. (n=17)	-	-	-	17 (100.0%)	17	1.0
v. Technical Back-stopping: Fisheries Production (n=14)	-	-	-	14 (100.0%)	14	1.0
vi. Post-Harvest Management (PHM) (Processing & Storage) (n=18)	2 (11.1%)			16 (88.9%)	24	1.33
vii. Market Information Services and Facilitation. (n=16)	-	-	-	16 (100.0%)	16	1.0
<b>Overall Mean Score</b>						<b>1.27</b>

Source: Field Survey, 2017.

**b). Rating of Ebony Extension Methods and Approaches:**

Table 15, shows the rating of extension methods and approaches by women beneficiaries in Ebonyi State. The table reveals that 4 (44.4%) types of extension methods were rated as poor with a weighted mean of 1.0 each.

These extension methods were Machinery and Equipment Demonstrations for Post- Harvest Management; radio programmes, Television programmes; and ICTs (Mobile Phone) SMS for Production, Processing and Market Information.

As for training and workshop methods, 5.6% of the participants rated it as very good and fair, while 88.9% rated as poor with a mean of 1.2.

However, only 5.6% of participants rated Post-Harvest Management (Processing & Storage) as very good and 94.4% as poor with a mean of 1.1 as indicated in Table 15.

**Table 15: Rating of Ebonyi ADP Extension Methods and Approaches:**

<b>i. Type of Ext. Methods</b>	<b>Very Good (4)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>	<b>Fair (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Weighted total</b>	<b>Weighted mean</b>
ii. Training and Workshop 90 (n=18)	<b>1 (5.6%)</b>		<b>1 (5.6%)</b>	<b>16 (88.9%)</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>1.22</b>
iii. On Farm Demonstrations (n=18)	<b>2 (11.1%)</b>	<b>1 (5.6%)</b>	-	<b>15 (83.3%)</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>1.44</b>
iv. Machinery and Equipment Demonstrations for Post- Harvest Management. (n=18)	-	-	-	<b>18 (100.0%)</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>1.0</b>
v. Post-Harvest Management (Processing & Storage) (n=18)	<b>1 (5.6%)</b>	-	-	<b>17 (94.4%)</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>1.17</b>
vi. Radio Programmes (n=18)				<b>18 (100.0%)</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>1.0</b>
vii. TV Programmes. (n=18)				<b>18 (100.0%)</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>1.0</b>
viii. Field Days.	<b>2 (11.1%)</b>			<b>16 (88.9%)</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>1.33</b>
ix. Agric. Shows	<b>1(5.6%)</b>			<b>17 (94.4%)</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>1.17</b>
x. ICTs (Mobile Phone) SMS for	-	-		<b>18</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>1.0</b>

Production, Processing and Market Information				(100.0%)		
<b>Overall Mean Score</b>						<b>1.14</b>

**Source: Field Survey, 2017.**

**c). Overall Rating of the State’s ADP Extension Services by Women**

About 12% of the participants rated the ADP extension services as fair, while 76.5% rated it as poor with a weighted mean of 1.4 (Table 16).

94.1% of the participants rated the extension services of Ebonyi State Ministry of Agriculture as poor, 5.8% as fair with a weighted mean of 1.1.

However, the participants could not rate the FADAMA project extension activities in the state because they reported not to be aware of its extension activities in the State as shown in Table 16 below.

**Table 16: Overall Rating of the Ebonyi State’s ADP Extension Services**

<b>Overall Rating of State Services</b>	<b>Very Good (4)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>	<b>Fair (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Weighted total</b>	<b>weighted mean</b>
i. State ADP (n=17)	<b>1 (5.8%)</b>	<b>1 (5.8%)</b>	<b>2 (11.8%)</b>	<b>13 (76.5%)</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>1.42</b>
ii. Fadama Project						<b>NA</b>
iii. State Ministry of Agriculture (n=17)	<b>-</b>	<b>1 (5.8%)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>16 (94.1%)</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>1.12</b>

**Source: Field Survey, 2017.**

**iii). Access to Credit:**

Only 11.1% of the participants reported that they had access to credit facilities from the government through the ADP and all (100%) participants reported inability to access credit facilities from regular financial institutions.

**iv). Challenges of Ebony State small-scale Women farmers:**

The participants listed/perceived the following as their challenges as it pertains to agricultural extension and advisory services in the State:

- Inadequate funding of State ADP to effectively provide services to the AEAS clientele especially women farmers.
- Extension Agents residing too far from communities where they are present
- Inadequate and late availability of inputs.
- Lack of Information
- Lack of involvement of women farmers in extension training of farmers.

**v). Comments/ Reaction of State ADP and Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Development officials during interface meeting:**

There was consensus among all the Stakeholders on the scores and observations during the stakeholders meeting.

### 3.4. Federal Capital Territory (FCT):

FCT Agricultural Development Project (ADP),

PMB 165, Garki, Abuja.

**Contact Person:** Musa S. Doma, Programme Manager,

Mobile Phone: 08052924950

Email: [fctadp1990@yahoo.com](mailto:fctadp1990@yahoo.com),

#### 3.4.1. FCT ADP (self-assessment) Extension Service Performance Scorecard:

##### i). Current Extension Services delivery systems:

The FCT ADP currently uses a combination of a “modified” Training and Visit (T & V) extension system and the Farmer Field School (FFS) extension strategy for service delivery.

Table 17 below presents the scorecard of the activities of the FCT as compiled during the interactive focus group discussions with the Director of Extension and his Team

**Table 17: FCT ADP Extension Delivery Performance Indicators Score Card:**

S/No.	Indicators (2012 – 2017)	Target	Achieved	Difference	Remarks
1.	Farm Families	<b>170,000</b>	<b>168,000</b>	<b>2000</b>	Staff shortage
2.	EA: Farmer Ratio	<b>1:000</b>	<b>1:3580</b>		“
3.	No. of SMSs	<b>21</b>	<b>21</b>		
4.	No. of BESs	<b>26</b>	<b>26</b>		
5.	<b>No. of VEAs</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>Serious staff shortage</b>
6.	<b>No. BEAs</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>Serious staff shortage</b>
7.	No. of extension Visits	-	-		
8.	No. of Exchange Visits	-	-		
9.	No. of OFAR Estab.2017	<b>5</b>	-	<b>5</b>	Lack of funds
10.	No. of SPATs Established				
11.	No of MTPs Established	<b>10</b>	-	<b>10</b>	
12.	No. of FNTs/MTS	<b>24</b>	-	<b>24</b>	
13.	No. of MTRMs/OTRMs	<b>12</b>		<b>12</b>	
14.	No. of staff Trainings (On Station)	<b>100</b>	-	-	
15.	No. of staff Trainings (Off Station) 2017	<b>131</b>	<b>40</b>		

16.	No. of farmers trained: 2016 2017*	- <b>1,050</b>	- <b>1050</b>		*Trained Farmers' on GAP for Ginger, Soybeans, and Sorghum production for FDAE
17.	No. of FBDs formed				
18.	Agric. show Organized 2015/2016 2016/2017				
19.	Field days Organized 2015/2016 2016/2017	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>		
20.	No of Techs. Promoted	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>		
21.	No of Techs. Adopted				

**Source: Field Survey, 2018.**

It is clear from the above, that staff shortage at the most critical Extension-Farmer interface couple with the funding challenges has virtually grounded the extension activities of the FCT ADP. The only major activity in 2017 was the training of 1050 farmers on Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) on Ginger, Soybeans and Sorghum Production at the instance of the Federal Department of Agricultural Extension (FDAE).

**ii). Monitoring and Evaluation of Agricultural Extension and Advisory Services:**

Yes.....X.... (Quarterly)

**iii). Public Financing of Agricultural Extension (PFAE):**

The FCT financing of public agricultural extension is presented in Table 17 below. The funding trend seems to be so erratic. In 2013, a release of 96.9% was accessed but NIL in 2014.

Again there was a high of 88.6% in 2015 and another low of only 6.8% in 2016. The allocation for Extension from the Agricultural allocation over the reporting period, except year 2016 was meagre.

**Table 18: FCT Financing of Public Agricultural Extension:**

Year	Agric. Budget	Allocation to FCT ADP	Actual Release	Time Released	Budget Performance (%)
2013	1,825,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	48,493,418.00	NA	96.9%
2014	220,000,000.00	115,000,000.00	NIL		0.0
2015	300,000,000.00	40,000,000.00	35,453,698.00	Late	88.6%
2016	60,689,875.00	160,566,668.00	10,896,900.00	Late	6.8%

**Source: Field Survey, 2018.**

**iv). State Agricultural Policy/Extension Policy:**

In the period of review, there was no Agricultural Policy/Agricultural Extension Action Plan for the FCT.

**v). Major Challenges of the FCT ADP:**

- Dwindling and irregular funding
- Inadequate Staff
- Lack of operational vehicles and tools for field activities
- Poor conditions of service.

**3.4.2. Community Participatory Score Card of the FCT Extension Delivery by Small-scale Women farmers of FCT:**

**i). Awareness of the FCT ADP Extension Services:**

Majority of the women groups, 13nos (61.9%) out of 21nos were aware of the FCT ADP extension activities.

**ii). Scoring of FCT ADP Extension Delivery Performance by Women Beneficiaries.**

**a) Rating of Extension Technical Support Services:**

Details of the scorecard as compiled during the in-depth discussions with the women are presented in Tables 19, ((technical support services), 20 (Extension Methods and Approaches and Table 21 (Overall rating of the State’s Extension Services) below.

**Table 19: Rating of Extension Technical Support Services by FCT Women Beneficiaries**

Type of Ext. Services	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Weighted total	Weighted mean
i. Inputs Facilitation			7	14	28	<b>1.33</b>
ii. Land Preparation Services.				21	21	<b>1.0</b>
iii. Tech. Back-stopping: Crop Production			6	15	27	<b>1.29</b>
iv. Tech. Back-stopping: Livestock Production				21	21	<b>1.0</b>
v. Tech. Back-stopping: Fisheries Production (n=21)			2	19	23	<b>1.1</b>
vi. Post-Harvest Management (PHM) (Processing & Storage)			3	18	24	<b>1.14</b>
vii. Market Information Services and Facilitation				21	21	<b>1.0</b>
<b>Overall Mean Score</b>						<b>1.14</b>

**Source: Field Survey, 2018.**

**b). Rating of Extension Methods and Approaches:**

**Table 20: Rating of Extension Methods and Approaches**

Type of Ext. Methods	V. Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Weighted Total	Weighted Mean
i. Training and Workshops			9	12	30	<b>1.43</b>
ii. On Farm Demonstrations				21	21	<b>1.0</b>
iii. Machinery and Equipment Demonstrations for Post-Harvest Management.			2	19	23	<b>1.1</b>
iv. Post-Harvest Management (Processing & Storage)			4	17	28	<b>1.33</b>
v. Radio Programs			2	19	23	<b>1.1</b>
vi. TV Programs.				21	21	<b>1.0</b>
vii. Field Days				21	21	<b>1.0</b>
viii. Agric. Shows				21	21	<b>1.0</b>
ix. ICTs (Mobile Phone) SMS for Production, Processing and Market Information				21	21	<b>1.0</b>
<b>Overall Mean Score</b>						<b>1.11</b>

**Source: Field Survey, 2018.**

**c). Overall Rating of the State's Extension Delivery Services:**

**Table 21: Overall Rating of the State's ADP Extension Services**

Overall Rating of State Services						
i). FCT ADP			7	14	28	1.33
ii). FADAMA						NA
iii). State Ministry of Agriculture						NA

**Source: Field Survey, 2018.**

### 3.5. GOMBE STATE

Gombe Agricultural Development Project (GADP)

**Contact Person:** Programme Manger: Mr Maina Laban,

Mobile Phone: 08023804020

**Email:** [gombeadp@yahoo.com](mailto:gombeadp@yahoo.com)

Gombe State ADP was adopted from Bauchi State ADP. Gombe State was created from Bauchi State in 1996.

#### 3.5.1: Gombe ADP Extension Service Performance Indicators:

##### i). Current Extensions Systems and Approaches in the State:

- Training and Visit
- Training and Demonstration
- Farmer Field Schools
- Demand-Driven Extension

Table 22 presents the Scorecard result as collected during the interactive session with the Gombe ADP Management. A close examination reveals similar pattern of decline in the targets achieved in the standard established extension performance indicators. Again, similar to the other ADPs covered in the study, the staffing situation and activities as measured between the targets set and the relatively limited achievements, tell the story of the challenges in offering effective and efficient extension services to the clientele especially small-scale women producers.

**Table 22: Gombe ADP Performance Indicators Score Card:**

S/No.	Indicators	Target	Achieved	Difference	Remarks
1.	Farm Families	422,400	422,364	36	Declining coverage area
2.	EA: Farmer Ratio	1:800	1:6,922	6,122	Poor funding, inadequate staff
3.	No. of SMSs	422,400	422,364	36	Declining coverage area
4.	No. of BESs	1:800	1:6,922	6,122	Poor funding, inadequate

					staff
5.	No. of VEAs	<b>528</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>482</b>	„
6.	No. BEAs	<b>66</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>51</b>	„
7.	No. of extension Visits	<b>5,280</b>	<b>760</b>	<b>4,520</b>	„
8.	No. of Exchange Visits	<b>Nil</b>	<b>Nil</b>	<b>0</b>	
9.	No. of OFAR Estab.	20	18	<b>2</b>	Lack of funds
10.	No. of SPATs Established	525	525	<b>0</b>	Community-managed, SG2000-funded
11.	No of MTPs Established	Nil	Nil	<b>0</b>	
12.	No. of FNTs/MTS	20	18	<b>2</b>	Lack of funds
13.	No. of MTRMs/OTRMs	525	525	<b>0</b>	Community-managed, SG2000-funded
14.	No. of staff Training (On Station)	0	3	<b>-3</b>	„
15.	No. of staff Training (Off Station)	0	140	<b>-140</b>	Organized by SG2000
16.	Farmers Trained 2015-2016	<b>0</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>-140</b>	Organized by SG2000
	Farmers Trained 2016-2017	<b>0</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>-175</b>	Organized by SG2000
17.	No. of FBDs formed	<b>140</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>0</b>	SG2000-supported.
18.	Agric. Show 2015/2016	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	Only PM attended one.
	Agric. Show 2016/2017	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	Only PM attended one.
19.	Field Days 2015/2016	<b>175</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>135</b>	SG2000-supported.
	Field Days 2016/2017	<b>175</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>40</b>	SG2000-supported.
20.	No of Techs. Promoted	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	Farmers saw the difference.
21	No of Techs. Adopted	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	Farmers saw the difference.

\*TAP = Technology Adoption Plot

Source: Field Survey, 2017.

Despite the challenges of staffing and paucity of funds, the GADP still had strong partnership and collaboration with Sasakawa Global 2000 (SG2000). The implication is that SG2000 has its special Women Groups that it and its partners work with and if the ActionAid Women Group members do not belong to the SG2000 groups, it is unlikely that they will benefit from the Extension Services by its implementing partner, GADP, in the State.

**ii). Monitoring and Evaluation of Agricultural Extension and Advisory Services:**  
**YES, Quarterly.**

**iii). Public Financing of Agricultural Extension ((PFAE):**

The performance of the Gombe State government financing of public agricultural extension services is as shown in Table 23 below.

**Table 23: Gombe State Financing of Public Agricultural Extension Service:**

Year	Agric Budget	Allocation to Extension	Actual Release	Time Released	Budget Performance (%)
2012/2013	5,384,300,000	Agric budget*	2,132,773,990	Timely	<b>39.6%</b>
2013/2014	4,986,140,000	„	3,708,707,079	„	<b>74.4.0%</b>
2014/2015	3,710,633,187	„	1,354,038,322	„	<b>36.5%</b>
2015/2016	2,518,578,117	„	2,493,959,299	„	<b>99.0%</b>
2016/2017	Not available	„	70% (recurrent only).	„	<b>Nil for capital</b>

**Source: Field Survey, 2017. \*Agric Budget figures include allocation to extension services**

**\*Separate allocation figures for extension services not available**

**iv). State Agricultural Policy/Extension Policy:**

No Policy document and none currently being developed as observed during the period of review.

**v). Extension Challenges for GADP:**

- Inadequate staffing.
- Poor funding.
- Politicization of the inputs distribution system.
- Lack of training opportunities for extension personnel.
- Lack of mobility for extension personnel,
- Lack of parity in remuneration between crop and livestock extension agents.
- Lack of agricultural policy for the State

**3.5.2. Community Participatory Score Card of the GADP ADP Extension Services by Small-scale Women farmers:**

The assessment of the GADP Extension Services delivery as compiled by the Women beneficiaries using the participatory Scorecard tool is presented below:

**i). Awareness of GADP and its Extension Services:**

Only 6nos (33.0%) out of the 18nos women present confirmed that they were part of the GADP and its extension services in the State. As observed in the ADP self-scorecard above, the ADP is actively engaged with SG2000 that has its own group and that could have excluded the ActionAid partners and their own group. The other details of the women's scorecard of the ADP are presented in Table 24, 25 and 26 below.

a). Rating of Extension Technical Support Services by Small-Scale Women Farmers.

Table 24: Rating of Extension Technical Services by Women Beneficiaries

Type of Ext. Services	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Weighted total	Weighted mean
Inputs Facilitation (n=18)	0	0	18 (100.0%)	0	36	<b>2.0</b>
Land Preparation Services.		4 (23.5%)	10 (58.8%)	3 (17.6%)	35	<b>2.1</b>
Tech. Back-stopping: Crop Production	0	1 (6.3%)	0	15 (93.7%)	18	<b>1.1</b>
Tech. Back-stopping: Livestock Production	1 (5.9%)	14 (82.4%)	2 (11.8%)	0	50	<b>2.9</b>
Tech. Back-stopping: Fisheries Production	7 (58.3%)	0	5 (41.7%)	0	38	<b>3.2</b>
Post-Harvest Management (PHM) (Processing & Storage)	14* (77.8%)	0	0	4 (22.2%)	60	<b>3.3</b>
viii). Market information Services and Facilitation (n=18)	0	18 (100.0%)	0	0	54	<b>3.0</b>
<b>Overall Mean Score</b>						<b>2.51</b>

Source: Field Survey, 2017.

**\*Score is suspect\*** Rating may be partly influenced by the activities of some projects having this component in the Maize and Rice value chains; but not GADP extension services per se.

It was observed during the discussions, that there is a good level of fisheries extension service in some localities of the State, hence; the good score. Similarly, the communities unanimously expressed appreciation of the contribution of farm radio programmes in keeping farmers informed on market information and this they confirmed has made impact on output and marketing in the State.

**b). Rating of Extension Methods and Approaches:**

**Table 25: Rating of Gombe Extension Methods and approaches**

Type of Ext. Methods	V. Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Weighted Total	Weighted Mean
Training and Workshops	0	0	2	16	20	1.11
On-Farm Demonstrations	0	2	12	3	33	1.94
Machinery and Equipment Demonstrations for Post-Harvest Management.	0	0	0	15	15	1.0
Post-Harvest Management (Processing & Storage)	3	8	0	3	39	2.79
Radio Programmes	13*	4	0	0	64	3.76
TV Programmes.	0	9	4	4	39	2.29
Field Days.	0	0	0	16	16	1.0
Agric. Shows	0	8	0	0	24	3.0
ICTs (Mobile Phone) SMS for Production, Processing and Market Information	0	0	0	18	18	1.0
<b>Overall Mean Score</b>						<b>1.99</b>

**Source: Field Survey, 2017.**

Three of the variables, Radio Programmes (Weighted Mean=3.76 =Very good), Post-Harvest management, Processing and Storage (Weighted Mean=2.79 =Good) and Agric. Shows (Weighted Mean=3.0 =Good) scored well above the cut-off standard mean of 2.5 and so adjudged to be Very Good as shown compared to the other variables.

**c). Overall Rating of the State's Extension Services:**

The overall of the State's extension service delivery is as presented in Table 26 below. Both the Ministry and the FADAMA III AF which are also involved in some measure of extension services were also scored by the women, with FADAMA III AF having the highest rating, slightly above the standard cut off point (Fair). This is indicative of the fact that the women were not only aware of this donor-assisted project, but also benefitted from it. The State's mean score of 2.0 was observed to be better than most of the other Study States.

**Table 26: Overall Rating of the State's Extension Delivery Service**

<b>Overall Rating of State Services</b>	<b>V. Good (4)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>	<b>Fair (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>Weighted Mean</b>
State ADP	0	0	18	0	36	2.0
FADAMA III AF	10	0	5	1	41	2.56
State Ministry of Agriculture	0	0	0	18	18	1.0

**Source: Field Survey, 2017.**

GADP is poorly funded. This has over the years, weakened its strength and ability to provide adequate and effective extension services to its end users. FADAMA on the other hand, as a World Bank-assisted project operating in the State, is better funded.

iii). Access to Credit:

All the women (n=18), claimed that the extension service have never facilitated their access to credit, either from Government or through linking them to any financial institution for them to benefit from a loan facility.

**iv). Challenges faced by the Women communities:**

- Discrimination based on gender, social and economic status
- Low commitment on the part of extension staff
- Lack of access to Credit
- Lack of training & development opportunities and incentives for extension staff (Poor Service Conditions)
- Farmers lack of capacity building opportunities for women farmers
- Poor staffing of the extension services
- Poor funding of the extension services

**iv). Recommendations:**

- Recruit more extension agents especially females
- Improve the conditions of service for extension agents
- Increase the funding for GADP and ensure timely releases
- Provide training opportunities for farmers
- Provide credit for Women farmers

### 3.6. KOGI STATE:

Kogi State Agricultural Development Project,

Abuja – Okene Express Way,

PMB 1067, Lokoja.

**Contact Person:** Paul O. Okatahi, Managing Director,

Mobile Phone: 08052097037

Email: [kogiagridev2000@yahoo.com](mailto:kogiagridev2000@yahoo.com)

Website: [www.kogiadp.com](http://www.kogiadp.com)

#### 3.6.1. Kogi ADP Extension Delivery Performance Indicators Score Card:

##### i). Extension Delivery Systems and Approaches used by the ADP:

- Training and Demonstrations (With FADAMA III providing Inputs for demonstrations)
- Farmer Field Schools (18nos schools still running with Fadama clusters for Rice and Cassava).

Details of the participatory score card for extension performance as compiled from documents from the ADP and during the participatory in-depth discussions with the ADP Management are as presented in Table 27 below.

**Table 27: Kogi ADP Extension Service Performance Indicators Score Card:**

S/No.	Indicators	Target	Achieved	Difference	Remarks
1.	Farm Families		<b>473,142</b>		
2.	EA: Farmer Ratio	<b>1:1000</b>	<b>1:4000</b>	<b>3000</b>	Staff shortage
3.	No. of SMSs	<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5</b>	“
4.	No. of BESs	<b>24</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>2</b>	“
5.	No. of VEAs	<b>192</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>91*</b>	*Npower-Agro complementing
6.	No. BEAs	<b>24</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>16</b>	
7.	No. of extension Visits	<b>Nil</b>	<b>Nil</b>		No field visits: No Funds
8.	No. of Exchange Visits	-	-		No funds
9.	No. of OFAR Estab.	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>		Sponsored by FADAMA

10.	No. of SPATs Established	-	-		
11.	No of MTPs Established	<b>250</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>93</b>	With FADAMA Support
12.	No. of FNTs	<b>24</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>6</b>	Funding
13.	No. of MTRMs/OTRMs	<b>12</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>10</b>	Funding
14.	Staff Trainings (On Station)	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>		Pre-Season
15.	Staff Trainings (Off Station)	-	<b>1</b>		Special program by IITA (5nos EAs & 5nos Farmers)
16.	Farmers trained: 2015/2016 2016/2017	-	-		
17.	No. of FBOs formed		<b>80</b>		Special Programme for women
18.	Agric. show Organized 2015/2016 2016/2017	-	-		
19.	No of field days Organized 2015/2016 2016/2017	<b>2</b> <b>3</b>	<b>2</b> <b>3</b>		
20.	No of Technologies Promoted	<b>5</b>			
21.	No of Technologies Adopted	<b>3</b>			
22.	ADP Mobility*		<b>2.0%</b>		

**Source: Field Survey, 2017.**

The number of empty boxes in the table and the differences between the set targets and levels of achievement are indicative of the rather low performance of the ADP with several of their activities sponsored by the FADAMA III AF in the State who have their own FADAMA Users Groups (FUGs) and FADAMA Community Associations (FCAs). So, unless the SWOFOM members are registered members of the FUGs or FCA in their various communities, they are not likely to benefit from the FADAMA services, at least, not maximally.

**ii). Monitoring and Evaluation of Agricultural Extension and Advisory Services:**

Yes.....X ..... **Only Yearly.**

This important activity was conducted once a year because of funding constraints.

**iii). Public Funding of Agricultural Extension (PFAE):**

The abysmal funding situation of the agricultural sector in Kogi State especially to the ADP that is responsible for agricultural extension is reflected in Table 28 below. It would appear that the

only project that got any type of funding was the World Bank-assisted **FADAMA III AF** (See Table 29)

**Table 28: Kogi State Public Financing of Agricultural Extension:**

Year	Agric. Budget	Allocation to AEAS	Actual Release	Time Released	Budget Performance
2012	2,781,500,000.00	Nil	Nil		0.0%
2013	2,884,500,000.00	Nil	Nil		0.0%
2014	1,967,500,000.00	Nil	Nil		0.0%
2015	2,605,500,000.00	100,000,000.00	NA		3.8%
2016	1,730,500,000.00	20,000,000.00	NA		1.2%

Source: Field Survey, 2017.

**Table 29: Kogi State Payment of Counterpart Funding For FADAMA III AF**

Year	Project	Total	RATIO	Federal
		AMOUNT PAID		
2013	FADAMA III AF	N56,000,000		
2014	FADAMA III AF	N56,000,000		
2015	FADAMA III AF	N56,000,000		
2016	FADAMA III AF	N56,000,000		

Source: Field Survey, 2017.

**iv). State Agricultural Policy/Extension Policy:**

At the time of this review, there was no State Agricultural Policy/ Extension policy document.

**v). Extension Challenges:**

- Shortage of staff due to retirements, resignation or death and no replacement
- Poor or non-funding (for the past four years) and irregular releases.
- Lack of training of extension personnel

- Lack of mobility for extension personnel
- Lack of parity in remuneration between crop and livestock extension agents
- Lack of agricultural policy for the State

### 3.6.2. Community Participatory Scorecard of the Kogi ADP Extension Services Delivery by Small-scale Women farmers of Kogi State

#### i). Awareness of Kogi State ADP and its Extension Services:

Out of the total number of women 20nos representing the various women groups and associations drawn from the various local governments of the State, only **11nos (55.0%)**, were aware.

#### a). Rating of Extension Technical Support Services by Small-scale Women Farmers.

Details of the women's participatory scorecard for the Kogi ADP Extension Delivery Services are presented in Tables 30, 31 and 32 below.

**Table 30: Rating of the Extension Technical Support Services by Kogi Women:**

Type of Ext. Services	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Weighted total	Weighted mean
Inputs Facilitation (n=20)			7 (35%)	13 (65%)	27	1.23
Land Preparation Services. (n=20)			1 (5%)	19 (95%)	21	1.05
Technical Back-stopping: Crop Production (n=20)			6 (30%)	14 (70%)	26	1.3
Technical Back-stopping: Livestock Production			0	20 (100%)	20	1.0
Technical Back-stopping: Fisheries Production (n=20)			0	20 (100%)	20	1.0
Post-Harvest Management (PHM) (Processing & Storage) (n=20)			1 (5%)	19 (95%)	20	1.0
Market information Services and Facilitation				20 (100%)	20	1.0

(n=20)						
<b>Overall Mean Score</b>						<b>1.08</b>

**Source: Field Survey, 2017.**

None of the mean scores measuring variables of the various Extension delivery service types was close to the cut-off mean of 2.5 and same for the overall mean as can be seen in the Table 30 above.

**b). Rating of Kogi ADP Extension Methods and Approaches:**

The women's participatory scorecard with respect to Extension approaches and Methods are presented in Table 31 below. It will be noticed that none of the variables scored above the cut-off weighted mean of 2.5 and so adjudged as not satisfactory (poor=1.0 – 1.75) overall.

**Table 31: Rating of Extension Methods and Approaches**

<b>Type of Ext. Methods/Approaches</b>	<b>V. Good (4)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>	<b>Fair (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>Weighted Mean</b>
1. Training and Workshop (n=20)			5 (25%)	15 (75%)	25	1.25
2. On-Farm Demonstrations (n=20)			2 (10%)	18 (90%)	22	1.1
3. Machinery and Equipment Demonstrations for Post-Harvest Management. (n=20)			4 (20%)	16 (80%)	24	1.2
4. Post-Harvest Management (Processing & Storage) (n=20)			4 (20%)	16 (80%)	24	1.2
5. Radio Programmes (n=20)				20 (100%)	20	1.0
6. TV Programmes (n=20)				20 (100%)	20	1.0
7. Field Days.				20 (100%)	20	1.0
8. Agric. Shows				20 (100%)	20	1.0
9. ICTs (Mobile Phone) SMS for Production, Processing and Market Information				20 (100%)	20	1.0
<b>Overall Mean Score</b>						<b>1.1</b>

**Source: Field Survey, 2017.**

**c). Overall Rating of Kogi State Extension Services:**

Table 31 below presents the overall rating of the Kogi State extension services as scored by the women beneficiaries.

**Table 32: Overall Rating of the State’s ADP Extension Services**

<b>Overall Rating of State Services</b>	<b>V. Good (4)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>	<b>Fair (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>Weighted Mean</b>
i). State ADP (n=20)				<b>20 (100%)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>1.0</b>
ii). FADAMA			<b>8 (40%)</b>	<b>12 (60%)</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>1.4</b>
iii). State Ministry of Agriculture (n=20)			<b>2 (10%)</b>	<b>18 (90%)</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>1.1</b>

**Source: Field Survey, 2017**

**iii). Access to Credit:** All the women (n=20) confirmed that they had neither benefitted from any government loan nor has the extension services linked any of them to any financial institutions.

**iv). Major Challenges for the Kogi State small-scale women farmers:**

- Lack of Access to credit.
- Lack of access to quality and timely delivery of production inputs.
- Access to land and conflicts with herdsmen.
- Poor extension services

### 3.7. KWARA STATE:

Kwara State Agricultural Development Project,  
Ilorin – Jebba Road, Ilorin

#### 3.7.1. Kwara ADP Extension Delivery Performance Indicators Scorecard:

##### i). Approaches used in delivering extension services in the State

- Training and Visit (T & V) Extension system (Modified, so many REFILS activities uncompleted)
- Group approach

The details of the Extension services participatory scorecard as sourced from the ADP documents and recorded during the interactive session with the ADP management are as presented in Table 33 below:

**Table 33: Kwara ADP Agricultural Extension Service Performance Indicators Score Card:**

S/No.	Indicators	Target	Achieved	Difference	Remarks
1.	Farm Families	<b>354,518</b>	<b>350,000</b>	<b>4,518</b>	
2.	EA: Farmer Ratio	<b>1,1000</b>	<b>1,1013</b>	<b>13</b>	N-Power Agro
3.	No. of SMSs	<b>16</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10</b>	Funding problems
4.	No. of BESs	<b>32</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>30</b>	Funding problems
5.	No. of VEAs	<b>355</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>5</b>	Staffing & Funding
6.	No. BEAs	<b>32</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>31</b>	Staffing & Funding
7.	No. of Extension Visits	<b>8,520</b>	<b>2130</b>	<b>6390</b>	No, allowance, No funds
8.	No. of Exchange Visits	-	-	-	Funding
9.	No. of OFAR Estab.	<b>16</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>12</b>	Funding
10.	No. of SPATs Established	-	-	-	Funding
11.	No MTPs Established	<b>32</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>24</b>	Funding
12.	No. of FNTs/MTS	<b>25</b>	-	-	Funding
13.	No. of MTRMs/OTRMs	<b>12</b>	-		Funding
14.	No. of staff Training (On Station)	<b>36</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>36</b>	
15.	Staff Training (Off Station)	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	-	

16.	Farmers trained: 2015/2016 2016/2017	<b>2000</b> <b>6000</b>	<b>5200</b>	<b>600</b>	
17.	No. of FBOs formed	<b>613</b>			Commodity based (Rice, Soybeans & Maize.
18.	No of Agric. show Organized 2015/2016 2016/2017	<b>2</b> <b>2</b>	<b>0</b> <b>0</b>	<b>2</b> <b>2</b>	
19.	Field days Organized 2015/2016 2016/2017	<b>8</b> <b>8</b>	<b>0</b> <b>4*</b>		
20.	No of Technologies Promoted	<b>5</b>	<b>5*</b>		Done in collaboration with Agric. Student Teachers Training (ASTET), University of Ilorin
21.	No of Technologies Adopted	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>		

**Source: Field Survey, 2017**

The empty spaces in the Table and the differentials are all indicative of the low level of public extension services recorded using the participatory scorecard tool.

**ii). Monitoring and Evaluation of Agricultural Extension and Advisory Services:**

Yes...X.

This activity is only performed once a year and only in collaboration with the National Agricultural Extension and Research Liaison Services of Ahmadu Bello University (NAERLS/ABU, Zaria) during its annual Agricultural Performance Survey (APS).

**iii). Public Financing of Public Agricultural Extension:**

The allocation of a paltry sum of N3.2million per month cannot be said to be adequate for an agency that is expected to provide extension services for millions of rural farm families. The ADP therefore has had to make-do with the N-power Agro interns, many of whom have no agricultural background.

**Table 34: Kwara State Financing of Public Agricultural Extension:**

Year			Agric. Budget	Allocation to AEAS	Actual Release	Time Released	Remarks
2013				3.2m	3.2m/m	Timely	
2014					3.2m/m		
2015					3.2m/m	Late	
2016					3.2mx2	Late	

**Source: Field Survey, 2017**

**iv). State Agricultural Policy:**

An International NGO, OXFAM, is currently assisting Kwara State to develop an Agricultural Policy.

**3.7.2. Community Participatory Scorecard of the Kwara ADP Extension Services Delivery by Small-scale Women farmers in Kwara:**

**i). Awareness of Kwara ADP and its Extension Services:**

Out of the total number of women 21nos representing the various women groups and associations drawn from the various local governments of the State, only **14nos (66.67%)**, were aware.

**a). Rating of Kwara ADP Extension Delivery Services by Small-scale women farmers:**

Details of the women’s participatory scorecard for the Kwara ADP Extension delivery Services are presented in Table 35, 36 and 37 below.

**Table 35: Rating of Kwara Extension Technical Support Services by Women farmers:**

Type of Ext. Services	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Weighted total	Weighted mean
i). Inputs Facilitation (n=21)				21 (100%)	21	<b>1.0</b>
ii). Land Preparation Services. (n=21)				21 (100%)	21	<b>1.0</b>
iii). Technical Back-stopping: Crop Production (n=21)				21 (100%)	21	<b>1.0</b>
iv). Technical Back-stopping: Livestock Production (n=21)				21 (100%)	21	<b>1.0</b>

vi). Technical Back-stopping: Fisheries Production (n=21)				21 (100%)	21	<b>1.0</b>
vii). Post-Harvest Management (PHM) (Processing & Storage) (n=21)				21 (100%)	21	<b>1.0</b>
viii). Market information Services and Facilitation (n=21)				21 (100%)	21	<b>1.0</b>
<b>Overall Mean Score</b>						<b>1.0</b>

**Source: Field Survey, 2017**

When this Table is read along with Table 32 above, the Extension Performance Indicators scorecard reveal concurrence in the poor rating of the scorecard by the women.

**b). Rating of Kogi ADP Extension delivery methods and Approaches:**

The scorecard results with respect to Extension Methods and approaches variables (in Table 35 below), show a similar pattern with the overall mean far below the cut-off mean of 2.5 (compared to the weighted overall mean of 1.0) hence the poor rating.

**Table 36: Rating of Kwara ADP Extension Methods and Approaches**

<b>Type of Ext. Methods</b>	<b>Very Good (4)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>	<b>Fair (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Weighted Total</b>	<b>Weighted mean</b>
Training and Workshop (n=20)				21 (100%)	21	<b>1.0</b>
On Farm Demonstrations (n=20)				21 (100%)	21	<b>1.0</b>
Machinery and Equipment Demonstrations for Post-Harvest Management. (n=20)				21 (100%)	21	<b>1.0</b>
Post-Harvest Management (Processing & Storage) (n=20)				21 (100%)	21	<b>1.0</b>
Radio Programmes (n=20)				21 (100%)	21	<b>1.0</b>
TV Programmes. (n=20)				21 (100%)	21	<b>1.0</b>
Field Days (n=20)				21 (100%)	21	<b>1.0</b>
Agric. Shows (n=20)				21 (100%)	21	<b>1.0</b>

ICTs (Mobile Phone) SMS for Production, Processing and Market Information (n=20)				21 (100%)	21	<b>1.0</b>
<b>Overall Mean Score</b>						<b>1.0</b>

**Source: Field Survey, 2017**

**c). Overall Rating of the Kogi State Extension Services:**

It was interesting to note that women who had received extension services from both the FADAMA Project and directly also from the Ministry of Agriculture also scored them in the overall extension services of the State.

**Table 37: Overall Rating of the State Extension Services**

Overall Rating of State Services	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Weighted Total	Weighted mean
i. State ADP (n=20)				21 (100%)	21	1.0
ii. Fadama	1 (5%)	2 (10%)		18 (85%)	28	1.4
iii. State Ministry of Agriculture (n=20)		2 (10%)	4 (19%)	15 (71%)	29	1.45

**Source: Field Survey, 2017**

**iii). Access to Credit:**

All the women (n=20) reported not to have benefited from any credit facility either from the government or any financial institution.

**iv). Challenges as enumerated by the Women Groups:**

- Poor access to extension workers and their services.
- Lack of recognition of small-scale women farmers.
- Lack of access to production inputs including tractors for land preparation.
- Lack of access to credit facilities.
- Access to land compounded by Herdsmen/farmer clashes (Security).

- Lack of capacity building for small-scale women farmers. No loans for women farmers.
- Lack of access to market information and high cost of transportation for farm produce.

### 3.8. ONDO STATE:

Ondo State Agricultural Development Project,

88, Obafemi Awolowo Avenue, Akure.

Contact Person: Mr. O. Adeniyani,

Program Manager,

Mobile Phone: 08063550230

Email: [ondostateadp@yahoo.com](mailto:ondostateadp@yahoo.com)

#### 3.8.1. Ondo State ADP Extension Delivery Performance Indicators Scorecard:

##### i). Current Extension Approaches:

Ondo State ADP is in partnership with several NGOs and Donors agencies. The State is utilizing a variety of extension strategies and approaches as shown below:

- Group Commodity approach in PPP collaboration with USAID-MARKETS.
- Farmer Business School (FBS) in collaboration with GIZ.
- Group Commodity Approach under Cassava Adding Value for Africa (CAVA) with support from Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.
- Mass Media

The Ondo State ADP detailed Extension Performance Indicators scorecard as compiled during the focus group discussions with the Project Management is presented in Table 38 below:

**Table 38: Ondo ADP Agricultural Extension Service Performance Indicators Score Card**

S/No.	Performance Indicators	Target	Achieved	Difference	Remarks
1.	Farm Families	501,000	<b>180,000</b>	<b>*321,000</b>	Staffing and funding challenges
2.	EA: Farmer Ratio	<b>1:1000</b>	<b>1:2500</b>		
3.	No. of SMSs	<b>20</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7</b>	
4.	No. of BESs	<b>18</b>	<b>18</b>		
5.	No. of VEAs	<b>144</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>86</b>	“
6.	No. BEAs	<b>36</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>19</b>	“
7.	No. of extension Visits	19,340	1,990	17,350	“
8.	No. of Exchange Visits	0	0		
9.	No. of OFAR Estab.	0	0		
10.	No. of SPATs Established				

11.	No of MTPs Established	0	0		
12.	No. of FNTs/MTS	104	104		Source of Techs?
13.	No. of MTRMs/OTRMs	12	1		Sponsored by UNICEF
14.	Staff Training (On Station)	0	0		
15.	Staff Training (Off Station)	0	0		
16.	Farmers trained: 2015/2016 2016/2017		175 0		
17.	No. of FBDs formed				
18.	No of Agric. show Organized 2015/2016 2016/2017	0 0	0 0		
19.	No of field days Organized 2015/2016 2016/2017				
20.	No of Technologies Promoted	2			Citrus budding & Control of Army worms
21.	No of Technologies Adopted				

**Source: Field Survey, 2017**

But for the Donors and other partners, Ondo ADP would have been dormant in the area of public extension services delivery. The implication of the current situation is that women groups which do not belong to the groups identified by the partners and donors are not likely to benefit from the extension services of the ADP.

**ii). Monitoring and Evaluation of Agricultural Extension and Advisory Services:**

No .....X.... **Lack of funds.**

This important activity especially with respect to field operations has been abandoned.

**iii). Public Funding of Agricultural Extension Services (PFAE):**

Although there were provisional allocations to the Ministry of Agriculture during the reporting period, there was no concrete evidence of what was released. Importantly, there was no evidence of any release for extension field operations as shown in Table 39.

Like other States, though there were no releases to the ADP for its activities, the States managed to pay required counterpart fund for its donor-assisted project, the Fadama III AF (See Table 40) which was also rated in the overall extension delivery of the State, with evidence that the women benefitted from its services.

**Table 39: Ondo State Financing of Public Agricultural Extension:**

Year	Agric. Budget Allocation	Allocation to AEAS	Actual Release	Time Released	Remarks
2013	168,047,380.00	-	Nil	Erratic	
2014	55,763,140.00	-	Nil		
2015	114,273,122.00	-	Nil		
2016	7,980,000.00	-	Nil		

**Source: Field Survey, 2017.**

**Table 40: Ondo State Counterpart Funding for FADAMA III AF**

Year	Project	Actual Release		
		STATE	FEDERAL	REMARKS
2013	FADAMA III	116,670,000.00	NA	
2014	FADAMA II AF	200,000,000.00	NA	
2015	FADAMA II AF	35,335,000.00	NA	
2016	FADAMA II AF	35,335,000.00	NA	

**Source: Field Survey, 2017**

**iv). State Agricultural Policy:**

There is a State Agricultural Policy currently under consideration within the Ministry. In addition, there is State Agricultural Development Implementation Plan in use.

**3.8.2. Community Participatory Scorecard of the Ondo ADP Extension Services Delivery by Small-scale Women farmers of Ondo**

**i). Awareness of Ondo ADP and its Extension Services:**

All the 9nos (100%) of the women in attendance, representing the various women groups from the selected Local Governments indicated awareness of the ADP activities.

**a). Rating of Ondo ADP Extension Delivery Services by Small-scale women farmers:**

The detailed assessment of the extension delivery services of the Ondo State ADP as scored by the women in the participatory score card exercise are presented in Tables 41, 42 and 43 below.

**Table 41: Rating of Ondo ADP Extension Technical Support Services by Women Beneficiaries:**

Type of Ext. Services	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Weighted total	Weighted mean
Inputs Facilitation (n=9)		2		7	13	1.44
Land Preparation Services. (n=9)				9	9	1.0
Technical Back-stopping: Crop Production (n=9)		8	1	-	26	2.89
Technical Back-stopping: Livestock Production (n=)		7	2	-	25	2.78
Technical Back-stopping: Fisheries Production (n=9)			1	8	10	1.11
Post-Harvest Management (PHM) (Processing & Storage) (n=9)		8	1	-	26	2.89
Market Information Services and Facilitation (n=9)				9	9	1.0
<b>Overall Mean Score</b>						<b>1.46</b>

**Source: Field Survey, 2017**

Three of the variables Crop production, Livestock support, and PHM scored above the cut-off mean of 2.5 and so adjudged to be fairly good' However, the overall mean was way below (1.46) and so not satisfactory (**Poor =1.0 - 1.75**)

**b). Rating of the Ondo ADP Extension delivery Methods and Approaches:**

**Table 42: Rating of Extension Methods and Approaches:**

Type of Ext. Methods	V. Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Weighted Total	Weighted Mean
Training and Workshop		3		6	15	1.67
On-Farm Demonstrations (n=)			9			
Machinery and Equipment Demonstrations for Post- Harvest Management. (n=9)			9		9	1.0
Post-Harvest Management (Processing & Storage) (n=9)		2	7		20	2.22
Radio Programmes (n=9)				9	9	1.0
TV Programmes (n=9)				9	9	1.0
Field Days				9	9	1.0
Agric. Shows				9	9	1.0
ICTs (Mobile Phone) SMS for Production, Processing and Market Information				9	9	1.0
<b>Overall Mean Score</b>						<b>1.10</b>

Source: Field Survey, 2017.

**c). Overall Rating of the Ondo State's Extension Delivery Services:**

**Table 43: Overall Rating of the Ondo State's ADP Extension Services**

Overall Rating of State Services	V. Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Weighted Total	Weighted Mean
i). State ADP (n=17)		2	5	2	18	2.0
ii). Fadama		5	2	2	21	2.3
iii). State Ministry of Agriculture (n=17)						

Source: Field Survey, 2017

#### CHAPTER 4: SUMMARY OF BUDGET PERFORMANCE BY FDAE AND THE STATES ADPS

The Federal Department of Agricultural Extension as already established in the introduction, has the major responsibility for providing the policy direction for extension, leadership, coordination, quality assurance and control and facilitation assistance to the States, without direct implementation of extension at the grassroots. These roles and responsibilities would require significant budgetary allocations. The budgetary performance as shown in Table 44 is hardly impressive.

Table 44: FED. DEPT. OF AGRIC. EXTENSION (FDAE) BUDGET PERFORMANCE

Year	Amount Appropriated	Actual Released	Budget Performance
2012	720,000,000.00	396,000,000.00	55.0%
2013	887,994,496.26	840,045,208.92	94.6%
2014	719,043,000.00	187,000,000.00 *157,000,000.00	26.0% *MoU with SAA.
2015	101,930,880.00	50,965,440.00	50.0%
2016	936,661,600.00	603,699,242.32	62.6%

Source: Field Survey, 2017

## **CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSIONS OF FINDINGS AND RESULTS:**

This discussion is an attempt to interpret the findings and make them not only meaningful but to give a clear understanding of what is the reality of the state of public extension services in the recent past to date.

It was made clear to all the stakeholders involved in this community participatory scorecard study in all the States, during the all interactive sessions, that the study was neither a witch-hunt nor a fault finding exercise.

This in no small way “calmed nerves” and potential tensions and obvious natural attempts to “defend positions” especially during the wrap-up sessions (interactive interface) between the extension service providers, the Ministry of Agriculture and the ADP, and the extension clientele/beneficiaries, the small-scale women farmers in the states.

Consensus was reached at all the sessions in all State about the results presented in the scorecards and this facilitated proffering solutions and recommendations, by all the stakeholders, providers and consumers for extension services, to significantly improve public extension services delivery in Nigeria.

### **5.1. Scorecard for Public Extension Service Performance:**

From the overall results emanating from the States, there was a clear negative difference between the targets set by the ADPs and their achievements as revealed in the significant shortage of staff, especially at the critical Extension Agent/Farmer interface in the field and most importantly, female agents (BEAs).

Inadequate staff translates into reduced field activities and clientele coverage.

Other key issues:

- i. The lack of synergy between the ADPs and the donor supported projects with most of the projects having their own “working groups” at the exclusion of other potential clients.

- ii. State governments establishing other essentially extension agencies at the expense of the ADPs, in some cases, depleting the staff of the ADPs by sending the staff to this created agencies and funding them rather than the ADP.

These new agencies invariably result in wastage, duplication of efforts and actual rivalry. *(Names of States and agencies have been deliberately left out).*

- iii. It must be made clear that FADAMA III AF is a community-driven development project with extension activities and not an entirely government funded project. This was also rated by the small scale women who benefitted in some of the States. Similarly, the Ministry engaged directly in some extension activities but most often with “political colouration” and this was generally ignored.

### **5.2. State Funding of Public Extension Services:**

The shortage of extension staff during the reporting period especially at the critical agent/farmer interface due to none replacement of those who were no longer actively engaged due to death or retirement, was compounded by budgetary constraints in most of the States studied with some reporting “no allocation” for extension field operations for about 4years.

Even when there was no funding allocation to the ADP, several of the States were able to pay their required counterpart funds for the donor-assisted projects especially “Fadama III AF” However, rural women can only benefit from the project if, they belong to the Fadama Users’ Associations.

### **5.3. The Women’s Participatory Scorecard on Access to Extension Services:**

A 4-point-scale was used for scoring (with 4 = Very Good; 3 = Good; 2 =Fair, and 1 = Poor), giving a ***Mean weighted score of 2.5*** for all the variables.

So any variable less than the mean of 2.5, is not satisfactory (poor=1.0 – 1.75; fair 1.76- 2.49).

Applying this to all the variables scored, gives a poor or only fair overall for all variables with less than 2.5, a clear reflection of the extension indicators performance scorecard.

Thus; it can be concluded that there is an agreement between the service provider (ADPs) scorecard and the consumers of the service (rural small-scale farmers) scorecards.

## **CHAPTER 6: CHALLENGES:**

The major challenges limiting women's access to effective extension delivery services that the critical stakeholders (government (Federal and States), development partners and CSOs need to focus on are summarized below.

### **6.1. Extension Services Agency:**

Although the various ADPs gave a variety, but often similar challenges limiting effective delivery of extension services. This can be summarized as below:

- i. Inadequate staffing
- ii. Poor funding
- iii. Lack of training opportunities for extension personnel
- iv. Lack of mobility for extension personnel and for field monitoring
- v. Lack of parity in remuneration between the livestock extension agents and others

### **6.2. Challenges for small-scale women farmers:**

- i. Lack of access to important production-enhancing inputs particularly, improved seeds and seedlings, fertilizers, and land preparation processing equipment
- ii. Limited access to farming land, compounded by insecurity in the farms
- iii. Limited access to agricultural extension services
- iv. Lack of capacity building opportunities
- v. Lack of access to credit (Only in two States did women indicate access (11.0% & 21.1%), to some form of credit
- vi. Lack of access to processing and storage facilities
- vii. Lack of access to market information

## **CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

This study has attempted to determine rural women's access to public agricultural extension services in seven selected States and the FCT where ActionAid Nigeria and its partners are working to build the capacity of small-scale women farmers in various groups and cooperatives under the umbrella of SWOFON, in order to facilitate their access to public agricultural extension services to significantly improve their productivity, incomes and improved quality of life.

Using the community participatory scorecard strategy, it was revealed that the scorecard results for the public extension service provider, the ADPs and the service consumers, the rural small-scale farmers in the various selected States and the FCT, range from **Poor** to **Fair**.

This was mainly because of inadequate staffing situation of the ADPs, due to non-replacement of staff who have left due to retirement, resignation or death. The situation has led to reduced field operations and services which are further compounded by budgetary constraints.

The major challenges on the part of the small-scale women farmers as reported by those captured in the report include: lack of access to credit from government or regular financial institutions, lack of access to production inputs, (land, improved seeds, fertilizers, tractors etc), Lack of opportunities for training of women farmers, and high cost of transport.

These have limited small-scale women farmers' access to public agricultural extension and advisory services and hence; majority of them scored the service as poor.

## **Recommendations:**

- i. That the extension services in a poor State is evidenced by the multitude of unclear and confused systems supposedly being used by the States.  
It is also no doubt, due to lack of regular and continuous capacity building of extension staff as required by a virile and functional extension service. There must therefore be regular capacity building for the extension staff of the ADPs.
- ii. It is imperative to urgently recruit qualified extension agents especially at the critical agent/farmer interface (BES, VEA, and BEA) with special focus on female extension agents.
- iii. Funding is a major challenge and must be addressed both by the Federal and the State governments. Presently, it is very difficult to determine the actual extension allocations within the Ministry budget, so it is recommended that the ADPs get direct allocation from government.
- iv. Extension staff service conditions require review to make the service attractive especially now that youths are being encouraged to go into agriculture. The dichotomy between the Livestock salary scale and others in the agricultural sector must be addressed.
- v. There MUST be synergy between the donor-assisted projects located within the Ministry and the ADP activities to avoid duplication, wastage and unhealthy rivalry. The same must be done with the other State created agencies that have extension objectives. Rather than create new structures, the ADP structures and staff must be strengthened to take on the new responsibilities.
- vi. The WIA component/Unit of the ADPs must be strengthened to have the capacity to focus on the extension needs of rural women.
- vii. Mobility: Without mobility for field extension field visits and monitoring, there would be no extension services and so adequate mobility must be provided for the staff of the ADPs.

- viii. ActionAid and its partners must strengthened their linkages with the Ministry of Agriculture and the ADPs and establish linkages with the other donor assisted Projects housed within or outside the ADP.
- ix. There is need for ActionAid and its partners to build the capacity of the women groups to demand for both research and extension services. Most importantly, ActionAid must strengthen their linkages and those of their partners in the participating States, to relevant agencies and organization focusing on women development within and outside the Ministry of Agriculture especially the financial institutions.
- x. It was observed during the study that a few States were in the process of developing Agricultural (Extension) policy. It is recommended that the States key into or adapt the National Agricultural Extension and Advisory Services Policy as it meets their own peculiar needs rather than waste resources in developing individual ones.
- xi. All the States' ADPs seem to still be in the analogue as none indicated the use of ICTs for extension delivery (e-Extension via SMS), despite the successes and the potentials of the e-Wallet platform and a facility currently being deployed by the Fadama III AF.
- xii. The ADPs must invest in and develop the capacity to deploy e-Extension services to make up for the acute shortage of extension agents.

## CHAPTER 8: REFERENCES:

**Arokoyo, T. (2017):** “Agricultural Extension Services in Nigeria: Improving Availability and Effectiveness” An Invited Paper presented at the 2017 Joint Sector Review , Rock View Hotel, Abuja, Sept. 28<sup>th</sup> -29<sup>th</sup>.

**Arokoyo, T. and Auta, S. (2014):** “Gender-responsive Agricultural Advisory Services for Poverty Reduction in Nigeria” A Consultancy Report of a Study commissioned by the African Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services (AFAAS), December 2014.

**British Council Nigeria (2012)** Gender in Nigeria Report 2012: Improving the Lives of Girls and Women in Nigeria: Issues, Policies Action. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition.

**CTA (2014):** The CTA Gender Policy (2014). Technical Centre for Agriculture and Rural Cooperation, Wageningen, the Netherlands.

**FDAE/FMARD (2017):** Final Report: The Development of a National Agricultural Extension and Advisory Services Policy for Nigeria. FDAE/FMARD, Abuja, September 2017.

**FGN (2006):** National Gender Policy. Federal Ministry of Women Affairs and Social Development, Abuja, Nigeria, December 2006.

**Galligan, Yvonne (2000):** The Development of Mechanisms to Monitor Progress in Achieving Gender Equality in Ireland” Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform, Dublin quoted in: Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister (2005) “Gender Matters: Towards a cross-departmental strategic framework to promote gender equality for women and men 2005-2015” Executive Summary Document. Gender Equality Unit OFMDFM Room E3.17 Castle Buildings Belfast BT4 3SR. Email: [admin.gender@ofmdfmi.gov.uk](mailto:admin.gender@ofmdfmi.gov.uk),

**Hovorka, A.J. (2006a):** The no. 1 ladies’ poultry farm: A feminist political ecology of urban agriculture in Botswana. *Gender Place and Culture*, 13(3), 207-225.

**IFAD (2011): Women and Rural Development.** Gender, Empowerment and Social Inclusion Policy and Technical Advisory Division, IFAD, Rome.

**Rebecca Sullivan (2014):** Gender Differences in Agriculture: Mind the Gap”  
<http://www.ifpri.org/staffprofile/rebecca-sullivan>, Dec. 10, 2014.

**Simiyu, R., & Foeken, D. (2013):** Gendered divisions of labor in urban crop cultivation in a Kenyan town: implications for livelihood outcomes. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 17.

**CHAPTER 9: ANNEXES:**

**Annex 9.1: ADP Extension Service Performance Indicators Score Card Tool**

S/No.	Indicators	Target	Achieved	Difference	Remarks
1.	Farm Families				
2.	EA: Farmer Ratio				
3.	No. of SMSs				
4.	No. of BESS				
5.	No. of VEAs				
6.	No. BEAs				
7.	No. of extension Visits				
8.	No. of Exchange Visits				
9.	No. of OFAR Estab.				
10.	No. of SPATs Established				
11.	No of MTPs Established				
12.	No. of FNTs/MTS				
13.	No. of MTRMs/OTRMs				
14.	No. of staff Trainings (On Station)				
15.	No. of staff Trainings (Off Station)				
16.	No. of farmers trained: 2015/2016 2016/2017				
17.	No. of FBOs formed				
18.	No of Agric. show Organized 2015 2016				
19.	No of field days Organized 2015 2016				
20.	No of Technologies Promoted				
21.	No of Technologies Adopted				

**Annex 9.2. Community Score Card Tool for smallholder Women farmers' accessibility to Agricultural Extension and Advisory Services in Nigeria**

**State:** .....

**ADP/Authority:** .....

**Date of Visit:** .....

**1. Awareness of ADP's Extensions Services:** Yes (Numb)..... No (Numb).....

**2. Rating of Extension Technical Support Services by Women:**

<b>Type of Ext. Services</b>	<b>Very Good (4)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>	<b>Fair (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>
i. Inputs Facilitation				
ii. Land Preparation Services				
iii. Technical Back-stopping: Crop Production				
iv. Technical Back-stopping: Livestock Production				
v. Technical Back-stopping: Livestock Production				
vi. Technical Back-stopping: Fisheries Production				
vii. Post-Harvest Management (PHM) (Processing & Storage)				
viii. Market information Services and Facilitation				

**4. Extension Methods and Approaches for Women Beneficiaries**

<b>Type of Ext. Methods</b>	<b>Very Good (4)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>	<b>Fair (2)</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>
i). Training and Workshops				
ii). On Farm Demonstrations				
iii). Machinery and Equipment Demonstrations for Post- Harvest Management.				
iv). Post-Harvest Management (Processing & Storage)				
v). Radio Programmes				

vi). TV Programs				
vii). Field Days				
viii). Agric. Shows				
ix). ICTs (Mobile Phone) SMS for Production, Processing and Market Information				

**5. Overall Rating of the State’s ADP Extension Services by Women**

Overall Rating of State Services	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)
i. State ADP				
ii. Fadama				
iii. State Ministry of Agriculture				

**6. Access to Credit:**

Direct from Government through the ADP i) Yes (Numb) ..... ii) No (Numb).....

Through facilitation from a Financial Institution: i) Yes (Numb) ..... ii) No (Numb).....

**7. Challenges of Women Groups.**

.....  
 .....

**8. Recommendation:** .....