

Missing Owner's Manual: The Marginalization of Extension Services in Malawi's Farm Input Subsidy Programme (FISP)

Blessings Chinsinga

Chancellor College, University of Malawi

Department of Political and Administrative Studies

P.O Box 280, Zomba, MALAWI

E-mail: kchinsinga@yahoo.co.uk

IDS, Brighton, UK December 6-7 2012

Outline of the Presentation

- Setting the Context
- Extension in Perspective in Malawi
- FISP and Extension Debate
- Accounting for the Missing Owners Manual?
 - Crisis of extension human resource?
 - Folly of the demand driven and pluralistic extension policy?
 - Other extension challenges?
- Tentative Concluding Remarks

Setting the Context

- Malawi has been on the global map due to FISP whose success stimulated debate about a possible rethink of the role of subsidies in African agriculture
- FISP was widely projected as a pacesetter for a uniquely African Green Revolution
 - A model showing the rest of the African governments the way towards a sustainable version of the African Green Revolution (AGRA, 2009)
 - Africa's Green Revolution may be several steps nearer after a pioneering experiment in seed and fertilizer subsidies to smallholder farmers in Malawi (Perkins, 2009)
 - In few years Malawi has come from famine to feast: from food deficit to surplus; from importing country to food exporting country (UN Secretary General, 2009)
- However, critical assessments have called for caution in projecting Malawi's FISP as an absolute success story in order to paint a realistic picture about its replicability elsewhere especially now that this success story is unraveling

Setting the Context Cont'd

- FISP has failed to realize its full potential because of the inadequate attention to extension services among many other things (Masangano & Mthinda, 2011 and Khaila, 2012)
- Maize yields have indeed improved ranging between 1 to 2 tonnes per hectare yet the yields could go up as high as 5 tonnes per hectare, a clear reflection of the underlying deficiencies in the extension system
- The paradox is that extension is one of the priority areas in the Agricultural Sector Wide Approach (ASWAp) which is a CAADP inspired framework
- The overall goal of CAADP is to reconfigure the way agricultural development issues are formulated, policies are generated and debated, investment decisions are implemented and interventions are scrutinized
- The goal of the ASWAp in as far as extension is concerned ***is to strengthen the efficiency and effectiveness of the public extension systems in order to successfully respond to farmers needs and to generate and transfer technologies required to achieve food security and sustainable agricultural growth***

Setting the Context Cont'd

- Why is FISP being marginalized in the provision of extension services when it is the government's flagship programme?
- The paper therefore attempts to explore the underlying political economy drivers that have led to the marginalization of extension services in FISP when it is a priority in ASWAp which is the overall guiding strategy for the agricultural sector
- ***Political economy analysis is critical because it provides a clear understanding of the underlying political and economic processes at work in a given context, and how they influence institutional capacity and choices***

Extension in Perspective in Malawi

- There is unanimity that the history of extension can be traced back to the colonial era as early 1903 when the first extension agents were commissioned followed by the establishment of the Department of Agriculture in 1907
- Four major approaches to provision of extension were distinguished as follows: 1) technology transfer approach; 2) participatory extension approach; 3) market orientated approach; and 4) farmer field schools approach
- First three approaches have had a discernible impact on the practical provision of extension services in the country with the first one being particularly dominant regardless of the changes
- ***Technology Transfer Approach***
 - Premised on the assumption of linear linkage between research, extension and farmers
 - Inspired by the belief that low productivity in agriculture is largely as a result of farmers' lack of access to technologies and of knowledge and skills to put them into use
 - Main feature of extension therefore is to encourage farmers to take up more productive and sustainable technologies
 - Technology transfer approach techniques in Malawi have included the following: 1) the master farmer model; 2) the Mchikumbi model; and 3) block extension system model

Technology Transfer Approach

- ***Master Farmer Model***

- Introduced in the 1950s during the colonial era when the nature of extension was still coercive in nature whereby extension workers saw their role primarily as that of enforcing agricultural regulations rather than advising farmers
- Involved the selection and concentration of resources on a group of farmers who were considered to be progressive
- Provided access to loans and given permission to grow some of the crops which were a preserve for the settler farmers such as tobacco, coffee and tea
- Received more friendly visits from extension agents and were given printed materials to supplement extension agents' visits
- Rest of African farmers were subjected to an extension system whose primary role continued to be that of enforcing agricultural regulations
- Master farmers condemned as stooges of the colonial political system

Technology Transfer Approach Cont'd

- ***Mchikumbi Model***

- Initiated immediately after independence in July 1964
- Modeled on the colonial concept of master farmer except that the extension system as a whole ceased to be coercive in its orientation
- President himself described as Mchikumbi No.1 underlying the progressive nature of these farmers, and were targeted for extension and provision of inputs in anticipation that the rest of the farmers would learn from them
- Marginalized the rest of the farmers who were expected to learn on the basis of the trickle down effects
- Model intended to create a group of farmers who were mostly political elites supporting the regime
- Underlined by the continuance of a dualistic agricultural system that favoured progressive farmers who were mostly civil servants, parastatal employees, senior party cadres and traditional leaders than the smallholders
 - ***Manifested through the exploitative land legislative framework as well as the pricing policies for agricultural produce***
 - ***Just like in the colonial era smallholders, farmers were excluded from growing certain lucrative crops such as burley tobacco, sugar and tea***

Technology Transfer Approach Cont'd

- ***Block Extension System***

- Evolved on the basis of not so successful experiments with the integrated rural development projects (IRDP) which later transitioned to the national rural development programme (NRDP), massively supported by the World Bank
- Under the NRDP, the country was divided into eight agricultural development divisions (ADDs) on the basis of the distinctiveness of agro-ecological zones
- ADDs were then sub-divided into rural development projects (RDPs) which have now been transformed into the district agricultural development offices (DADOs)
- RDPs/DADOs are sub-divided into Extension Planning Areas (EPAs) which are then sub-divided into Sections
- Each extension worker is responsible for a section as a point of service delivery to the farmers
- Each Section was divided into eight blocks each with a block garden through which the extension worker engaged with farmers on the basis of the Train and Visit (T&V) extension strategy inspired by the World Bank

Technology Transfer Approach Cont'd

- ***Block Extension System Cont'd***

- Working with about 30 farmers in each, an extension worker was responsible for about 700-850 farming families, visiting them once a very fortnight and delivering to them urgent extension messages through block gardens
- Focus was on the block gardens as a vehicle for farmers' learning with the expectation that they would apply the techniques learnt on their own gardens
- Missed out on the sociological aspects of learning especially with regard to who becomes a member and who does not
- The poor were marginalized even more when the groups were used for purposes of accessing credit for agricultural inputs through the Smallholder Agriculture Credit Administration (SACA)
- Extension messages tended to promote capital intensive technologies such as fertilizers and hybrid maize seed which tended to exclude those farmers who did not have the capacity to access these technologies
- Suffered serious challenges in designing extension messages for mixed groups of farmers with different interests
- System was rigid hence unworkable due to various unplanned social activities such as funerals and other social events

Participatory Extension Approach

- Influenced by the apparent failure of the technology transfer approach to the provision of extension
- Gist of the participatory approaches is that farmers and extension agents should engage in co-learning about what works and does not work under local conditions
- Extension is construed as facilitating innovation and encouraging adaptation and experimentation than as adoption of precise set of recommendations
- Emphasizes on the importance of farmers' learning principles rather than simple recipe for action and of making available options rather than a one size fits all technology
- Mostly described as the innovation systems model whereby interests of farmers and their prior knowledge have to be respected in designing and delivering extension services
- Not working in practice because: 1) farmers fear researchers since they often project themselves as know it all; and 2) NGOs lack patience since they want to replicate the same 'successful programmes' everywhere
 - ***Yet farmers are very good at adapting technology at the farm level to their socio-economic circumstances but they are not simply given space or opportunity to demonstrate their ingenuity***
 - ***Examples cited included the challenges experienced with regard to conservation agriculture and ability of farmers to produce wet land groundnuts yet unrecognized by mainstream researchers and extension agents***

Market Oriented Extension Approach

- Inspired by the apparent crisis in the provision of extension services due to the devastating impact of structural adjustment programmes (SAPs)
- Financial squeeze made public provision of extension services ineffective and unsustainable
- ***Prompted to adopt extension reforms culminating in the demand driven and pluralistic extension policy in 2000 to promote decentralized, demand driven services and to encourage the participation of many service providers in agricultural extension***
- Approach seen as an important step towards greater accountability to farmers and responsiveness to what they need and want from extension
- Covers a wide range of initiatives which, among others, include the following:
 - *Decentralizing the management and delivery of extension services*
 - *Devolving responsibility for extension to local governments within a broader programme of decentralization and local government reform*
 - *Cost recovery from farmers and contracting of private sector organizations and individuals to deliver extension services*

Market Oriented Extension Approach Cont'd

- The demand driven and pluralistic extension policy has its own institutional framework which is in tune with the decentralized system of local governance
 - The Department of Agricultural Extension Services (DAES) in the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MoAFS) is charged with the responsibility of implementing the pluralistic and demand driven extension policy through the District Agricultural Extension Services System (DAESS)
 - The DAESS translates the extension policy into practice using two main structures: the Stakeholder Panels at the district and area levels and the District Agricultural Extension Coordinating Committee (DAECC)
 - The stakeholder panels represent all actors in the agricultural sector, which include farmers, farmer organizations and NGOs
 - The stakeholder panels are supposed to be facilitated by the DADO and the agricultural extension coordinator at district and area levels respectively
 - The district agricultural extension system rests on four pillars: 1) organization of farmer demand; 2) facilitation of service provide response; 3) coordination and agricultural development strategy; and 4) funding acquisition

FISP and Extension Debate

- The impact of FISP on extension is debated although on balance it is felt that it has undermined the provision of extension services to the farmers in the country
- On a positive note, some argue that FISP has promoted extension work because it has enabled farmers to access modern technologies that they would not have otherwise accessed permitting extension workers to carryout their work
 - This has made capital intensive extension messages to be utilized by farmers which would not have otherwise been possible
 - It is estimated that the uptake of hybrid maize seed among smallholder farmers has improved from 43 to about 65 percent since the launch of the FISP during the 2005/06 growing season
 - “.....has resulted in technology overtaking the system since farmers have had access to fertilizer and improved seed giving extension workers an opportunity for practical implementation”
- FISP has not promoted extension because there is no deliberate attempt to build capacity of extension services to facilitate its implementation, meaning that there are no special extension efforts targeted at FISP
- The claims are that MoAFS is using conventional mechanisms or channels for delivering extension messages for the FISP

FISP and Extension Debate Cont'd

- This differs from the Starter Pack (SP) or Targeted Input Programme (TIP) that had detailed extension messages to facilitate the usage of the inputs in addition to the conventional strategies and mechanisms
 - Leaflets were designed by the Agricultural Communications Branch (ACB)
 - Extension workers were expected to set up 15 on-farm demonstration plots in each section
 - Radio messages played a dual role of alerting farmers to the programme and reinforcing the technical advice
- These strategies had their own set-backs but by time when TIP was superseded by FISP substantial improvements had been made in the design leaflets that were accessible to farmers on which FISP could have built on
- Extension workers are not serving FISP through provision of extension of services but rather through supporting its administrative logistics such as updating farm family registers, registration of beneficiaries and distribution of vouchers
 - “No specific resources are dedicated to extension; extension workers focus almost exclusively on the administrative aspects of the FISP yet it requires more than just giving out inputs to farmers”
 - “FISP crowds out other important activities since once its season sets in almost all personnel in MoAFS are called upon to facilitate its logistics”
 - “Extension workers’ involvement in FISP has had negative impact on crop estimates which takes 15-20 percent of their time hence credibility of questionable FISP harvests”

FISP and Extension Debate Cont'd

- Extension workers are immersed in the FISP logistics leaving them with very little time for the actual provision of extension services
 - “Extension workers are supposed to engage in the provision of extension services to farmers through demonstration plots but this is hardly effective because they do not have time to do so”
- FISP is crowding out other important investments in the agricultural sector since it is taking up as much as 85 percent of the total budget of the MoAFS
 - “It is estimated that about 75 or 85 percent of the MoAFS budget goes to FISP hence we cannot talk about MoAFS budget rather the FISP budget”
- The huge chunk of the budget of the FISP prioritizes procurement and distribution of inputs which are activities monopolized by politicians
 - “FISP has been captured by politicians as a vehicle of rent seeking, and they are making a killing out of it”
 - “It is the politicians who are benefiting rather than the people...this is why when the new government came in, it cancelled all the FISP contracts so as to ensure that its own people benefit”
- ***This is clearly reflected in the CAADP inspired investment framework which allocates 70 percent of the budget to FISP and the Green Belt Initiative (GBI) while technology development and dissemination is only allocated 6.2 percent while only 4 percent is devoted to strengthening public management systems and capacity building***

FISP and Extension Debate Cont'd

- Thus even if farmers were to express demand for extension services, it would not be met since extension workers are not only short of time but also resources
- Provision of extension services was supposed to be further complemented by seed companies and agro-dealers but this has not really worked mainly since the agro-dealers are interested in making profit
 - Messages from agro-dealers are not as objective as they should be since they are interested to sell as much as they can to maximize profit
 - Agro-dealers are not operating as envisaged mainly as a result of the nature of FISP itself; most of them are seasonal making it difficult for them to be held accountable by farmers as move from one place to another from year to year
 - Messages are not centrally coordinated by MoAFS as was the case during SP or TIP creating substantial room for abuse
- Contributed to loss of people's trust in extension workers' integrity since their involvement in FISP sometimes put them at the centre of highly politically controversial decisions; FISP is a political programme technicians cannot mess up with it
- FISP has missed an opportunity to build capacity not only of extension but the entire agricultural sector such that "the end of the programme will mean the end of everything"

Accounting for the Missing Owner's Manual?

- ***Deepening crisis in extension human resource***
 - Limited numbers of qualified extension workers; the numbers have dwindled almost by half from 3000 in the late 1980s to about 1500 currently
 - Attributed largely to the closure of the Natural Resources College (NRC) for almost 10 years due to demands structural adjustment programmes (SAPs)
 - Closure of NRC has contributed to creating massive shortage of extension workers as the then existing pool was never replenished
 - A good number of extension workers retired, moved on to the NGO sector and some lost to the HIV/AIDS pandemic
 - NRC reopened but it is no longer supported by government which has resulted in mounting programmes that are not really a priority in the agricultural sector but are key for the students to get jobs
 - Thus not developing programmes with the 'profile of an extension worker' needed to spur agricultural revolution in the country; thus lacks guidance from MoAFS about the exact profile of the type of extension worker required for potential sustainable and transformative agriculture
 - Not responding to demand for the required profile of an extension worker on the ground since it offers specialized training and not an all rounder extension worker

Accounting for the Missing Owner's Manual? Cont'd

- *Deepening crisis in extension human resource cont'd*
 - Most NRC graduates are reluctant to venture into rural areas describing themselves as a network generation
 - Most of them are reluctant to work for the public sector as they are very keen to recoup the investment made in their training as quickly as possible
 - “NRC is very expensive...most of the students come for urban areas and are not interested to work in rural areas which contributes to the diminished numbers of extension workers”
 - “Poor people are not able to send children to NRC since it charges market rate fees”
 - “People trained at NRC are elite children making it difficult to deploy them to rural areas”
 - Shortage of qualified extension workers has popularized Lead Farmers as a stop gap which, however, appears to be poised to evolve into a permanent solution
 - Lead Farmers are trained by extension workers to work with their fellow farmers but who unlike qualified extension workers are only experts in one or two technologies, and their main strength is that they are able to communicate with fellow farmers
 - Prominence of lead farmers is tantamount to the abandonment of the agricultural sector unless they would have adequate technical orientation beyond the current status

Accounting for the Missing Owner's Manual? Cont'd

- ***Deepening crisis in extension human resource cont'd***
 - Reliance on lead farmers is like “the blind leading the blind”
 - Lead farmers cannot substitute trained extension workers but there is some danger that this could be the case given that the vacancy rate in the MoAFS is estimated at 40 percent
- Lead farmers can be certified but the problem is that they will then stop working as volunteers yet they cannot be accommodated within the MoAFS structure because certificate level positions have been abolished
- As a way of motivating the remaining extension workers, their positions were upgraded to a diploma level even if they did not have hence it is almost impossible to train new extension workers at a certificate level to fill up the massive vacancies in MoAFS
- Extension workers trained up to a diploma level have got different aspirations from those at a certificate level making it difficult for them to deploy in rural areas

Accounting for the Missing Owners Manual?

- ***The folly of the demand driven and pluralistic extension policy***
 - Policy is not working because of the problems with the envisaged structure which makes it difficult for farmers to express let alone for service providers to respond to the demands
 - Functioning of the DAESS depends very much on the existence of a robust local governance system which unfortunately has failed to take root
 - Elected local governments existed between 2000 and 2005 but Local Government Elections (LGEs) have been continually postponed since May 2005 to date
 - ***LGEs supposed to have been held immediately after the founding May 1994 democratic elections but were postponed until November 2000***
 - ***Not ideal for the then governing party to hold LGEs because of the regionally fragmented nature of the polity***
 - ***Only held LGEs after the governing party had made inroads into other regions rather than which was perceived as its stronghold after the June 1999 elections***
 - ***LGEs could not be held in 2005 because of political events that saw the President forming a new party after elections which meant it could win the LGEs were they to be held since it had no grassroots structures***
 - ***President Mutharika's party won landslide victories in May 2009 elections, thanks to the FISP, but could not proceed to hold the LGEs***
 - ***Declared that he did not believe in local governments underlined by overwhelming amendment to the Local Government Act essentially amounting to the reversal of decentralization, and also amended the Electoral Commission Act to empower the President to decide on the date for LGEs***
 - ***New hope since the November 2012 sitting of Parliament has just passed a Bill providing for Tripartite Elections in May 2014***

Accounting for the Missing Owners Manual? Cont'd

- ***The folly of the demand driven and pluralistic extension policy?***
 - A conducive political environment does not therefore exist for the demand driven and pluralistic extension policy to thrive
 - The structures of the DAESS were supposed to interface with structures of the decentralized system of governance
 - Area stakeholder panels were supposed to interface with Area Development Committees (ADCs) whereas the district stakeholder panels were supposed to interface with the District council particularly the sub-committee on agriculture
 - Area stakeholder panels were envisaged as a framework through which farmers express and aggregate their demands for extension services for onward transmission to the district stakeholder panels which should then engage with the subcommittee on agriculture in terms of detailed planning and delivery of extension with technical input from the District Agriculture Extension Coordinating Committee (DAECC)
 - The DAESS structures faulted as being inadequate since they do not extend down to the grassroots level; they end at the ADC level when they should have extended to the Village Development Committee (VDC) levels
 - “The question is whether demand for extension services can be meaningfully be expressed at the ADC or at the farm level?”
 - “The main concern is that there are no mechanisms that link farmers directly to the area stakeholder panels. It is a good idea for farmers to be expressing demand to the extension workers but it is not clear not only to the farmers but also to the experts about how they can do it”

Accounting for the Missing Owners Manual? Cont'd

- ***The folly of the demand driven and pluralistic extension policy Cont'd***
 - Policy emphasizes on demand for extension services but does not provide for the progressive development of community institutions to support its consequent institutionalization
 - Such institutions would be instrumental in promoting the ethos of transparency, accountability, equity and fairness in service provision
 - “Key since a country’s development in any respect does not take place in a vacuum; it is mediated by institutions which play a role in terms of who benefits, how and when...the main challenge for the policy is that it does not pay attention to the question of building community institutions as a platform for collective action”
 - The major concern is that there is no clear idea on how the DAESS structures would work even if the decentralized structures were to be functional
 - “It would be extremely difficult to transcend paper work into action particularly regarding the mechanisms of appropriate interface between DAESS and decentralized governance structures”
 - Furthermore, extension workers have misinterpreted the meaning of demand driven policy as implying that farmers will have to knock on their doors for services, while farmers continue to expect extension workers to come to them
 - “...most stakeholders have assumed that extension workers will sit in their offices and will only work when approached by farmers to underlie the demand driven nature of the policy”

Accounting for the Missing Owners Manual? Cont'd

- ***The folly of the demand driven and pluralistic extension policy Cont'd***
 - There is need to interrogate the notion of demand as employed in the policy itself
 - Is it conceived in the conventional sense as expressed in the market for goods and services where there are suppliers and buyers willing to engage in an exchange exercise?
 - Cannot work in the Malawi case because most farmers cannot be in a position to demand extension services since maize production is very low estimated at 1 to 2 tonnes per hectare due to FISP when normally it could be as high as 5 tonnes per hectare
 - Gross margin analysis would clearly demonstrate that these farmers cannot make any profit hence they cannot demand for extension services in a conventional way...they are locked up in a low maize productivity trap (LMPT) (Dorward and Chirwa, 2011)
 - Demand driven dimension of the policy could make sense for cash crops or horticultural crops since farmers “would be motivated to pay for the value addition of extension services in a conventional way”
 - The pluralism dimension of the policy is working but it has its own challenges
 - The provision of extension services has been extended to other stakeholders such as private sector, NGOs , FBOs, donors and even the media but this is about it
 - Pluralism was based on the assumption that the additional players would add to the overall stock of extension officers which would greatly reduce the extension worker-farmer ratio hence enhancing coverage

Accounting for the Missing Owners Manual? Cont'd

- ***The folly of the demand driven and pluralistic extension policy Cont'd***
 - Apart from NGOs such as NASFAM and ARET, all stakeholders are relying on government extension workers which is putting enormous pressure on extension workers resulting in localized brain drain of extension workers
 - NGOs are engaged in localized brain drain as they attract extension workers to their impact areas
 - For some reason, NGOs tend to concentrate on specific corners of districts which means the provision of extension services tend to be skewed in favour of particular areas
 - Extension workers are motivated to work on NGO assignments because they are often adequately incentivized vis a vis their own working conditions
 - Since most stakeholders use government's extension workers "a market for extension workers has been established with the highest bidder getting priority attention"
 - Coordination of stakeholders is proving to be difficult especially since different stakeholders are using different approaches and methodologies
 - Different stakeholders are taking out different messages which oftentimes are conflicting hence confusing to the farmer
 - "Raises serious questions about whether stakeholders are responding to the same demands or different set of demands"
 - "NGOs are particularly considered culprits since they often want to achieve results as quickly as possible even to the extent of buying farmers' participation in their programmes"

Accounting for the Missing Owners Manual? Cont'd

- ***The folly of the demand driven and pluralistic extension policy Cont'd***
 - Impact of the absence of local councils has been quite enormous for the provision of extension services
 - Some decisions to facilitate the provision of extension services are dependent on by-laws to be made and enforced by the local governments
 - Extension has been disadvantaged compared to other services since there is no organ at the district level to lobby for resources for the agricultural sector
 - It is an enormous challenge because agriculture is not widely taken as development in popular parlance; priority is placed on infrastructural development hence extension entirely relies on funding from the central government
 - There are alternative sources of funding at the district level such as the Constituency Development Fund (CDF) and Local Development (LDF) in which agriculture in general and extension services in particular hardly features
 - In the context of the current experiment, the provision of extension services remains substantively a public good to be provided predominantly by state structures using public resources

Other Extension Challenges

- Incoherent communication strategy which is not framed in line with ASWAp...the activities are carried out on an ad hoc basis, not adequately resourced and lack strategic focus
- The Department of Agricultural Extension Services does not function as an agency for the entire MoAFS since there is no proper planning informed by a common approach or strategy which creates serious problems
 - Various MoAFS departments run numerous donor sponsored projects which at the time of the fieldwork staggered at 83 creating enormous coordination problems
 - The problem of lack of planning, coherence and strategic planning about the extension agenda runs downs from the MoAFS headquarters down to the districts
- New extension workers are not offered appropriate support hence they are unable to get really started leading to their departure for greener pastures
 - FICA experimented supporting up to 55 students at NRC from underprivileged backgrounds; they ended up leaving because they did not get the support they required
 - Extension workers are demotivated because of poor working conditions; for instance, their accommodation leaves a lot to be desired making it less attractive especially for the modern age extension worker from NRC
- State of infrastructure for training both farmers and extension workers is not good
 - Farmers no longer have the opportunity for residential training programmes that enhanced their proficiency in different areas
 - Staff do not have the opportunity to refresh or keep up with developments in as far as farming techniques are concerned

Tentative Concluding Remarks

- Extension system in Malawi is in a total state of flux, and coupled with particular underlying political economy interests it is not surprising that extension in the FISP's success story is marginalized
- Despite changes in approaches to extension the technology transfer modality has dominated strategies for delivering extension in the country
- The structure for demand driven and pluralistic extension policy has not been fully operationalized but even if it were in the context of decentralized governance it has several deficiencies
 - Structures that were supposed to support the policy have not been equally operationally across the country; they either do not exist or they do not have capacity or they are simply not active
 - MoAFs staff are obsessed with the policy without being critical about it... they are obsessed with because it is a policy and there is hardly any initiative to assess whether it working or not
- The policy lacks traction as envisaged because it is not a money spinner for the other stakeholders due to Malawi's predominantly subsistence agriculture; it is can work for cash crops as demonstrated in the case of tobacco through the Agriculture Research and Extension Trust (ARET) and farmers that are organized as demonstrated in the case of NASFAM

Tentative Concluding Remarks Cont'd

- “Pluralistic dimension of the policy is working if one considers specific crops, especially cash crops....it is very clear that the private sector is organizing around commodities of interest”
- “Non-state actors are focusing the provision of extension services on commodities around which farmers are organized”
- “The more crop orientated a farming system is the more likely the farmers are likely to express demand for extension services”
- These developments imply that the poor subsistence farmers who are not organized are not benefiting from the existing extension services
- There is great expectation among stakeholders of government's leadership in the provision of extension services even in the context of the demand driven and pluralistic extension policy

THANKS