

Agricultural policy frameworks and the agricultural sector in Uganda: Analysis of the plan for modernisation of agriculture

*International Journal of Pure
Agricultural Advances*
Vol. 7, No. 1, 1-12, 2023
e-ISSN: 2523-9538



Corresponding Author

David Mwesigwa¹

James Oguta²

Alfred Acanga³

^{1,2,3} Faculty of Management Sciences, Lira University, Uganda.

¹ Email: dmwesigwa@lirauni.ac.ug

² Email: ogutajames4@gmail.com

³ Email: aacanga@lirauni.ac.ug

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to evaluate the Plan for Modernization of Agriculture's effectiveness and offered suggestions. Accessible literature has chosen to deliberately modernize agriculture and acknowledged the necessity to emphasize poverty reduction as a key component. The method for this paper was a review of secondary data on accessible empirical as well as conceptual resources on the agricultural policy frameworks in Uganda encompassing the gathering of information from obtainable resources. The findings suggest that agricultural policy frameworks are essential for fostering transformation in the industry. Prior efforts to combat poverty have concentrated on the policy content and disregarded other factors, such as community livelihoods. The study assumes collaborative arrangement between local stakeholders, including those who might otherwise be targeted, in determining the success (or failure) of prior interventions and training them to deal with the problems that have hampered their effectiveness. It can be noted that for Uganda's agricultural transformation to be successful, a thorough study should be made of all the policies that have been put in place since 2000.

Keywords: *Agricultural policy, Agricultural sector, Agricultural transformation, Poverty reduction.*

DOI: 10.55284/ijpaa.v7i1.893

Citation | Mwesigwa, D., Oguta, J., & Acanga, A. (2023). Agricultural policy frameworks and the agricultural sector in Uganda: Analysis of the plan for modernisation of agriculture. *International Journal of Pure Agricultural Advances*, 7(1), 1-12.

Copyright: © 2023 by the authors. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Funding: This study received no specific financial support.

Competing Interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

History: Received: 3 January 2023/ Revised: 22 February 2023/ Accepted: 6 March 2023/ Published: 20 March 2023

Publisher: Online Science Publishing

Highlights of this paper

- The choice of particular agricultural policies has led to rapid transformation the world over due, in part, to present-day fluctuations as well as projected changes occasioning from both rapid climate change as well as population explosion.
- Effective agricultural policy frameworks are likely to play a fundamental role in promoting the transformation of the agricultural sector in a developing nation such as Uganda.
- In Uganda, it is crucial for agricultural policy frameworks to effectively support the development of the agricultural sector.

1. INTRODUCTION

The choice of particular agricultural policies has led to rapid transformation the world over due, in part, to present-day fluctuations as well as projected changes occasioning from both rapid climate change as well as population explosion (Filippo, Samuele, & Enrico, 2022). Different policies not only remain key to the development of the agricultural sector in a number of developing nations (Buchana & Sithole, 2022) but are also believed to be key determinants to the success of agriculture at all levels for much of Sub-Saharan Africa. Consequently, studies, such as Osabohien, Mordi, and Ogundipe (2022) underscore the performance of agricultural sector from the perspective of agro-credit intervention. This is not the only means to transforming agriculture as different nations have advanced different policies. This view presupposes the essence of assessing the efficacy of agricultural policy frameworks in promoting transformation of the agricultural sector. In the case of Uganda, the Plan for the Modernization of Agriculture (PMA), which was adopted at the beginning of 2000, cannot be underestimated given its influence on other proceeding policies such as the National Agricultural Advisory Services. The PMA was considered as a comprehensive policy that would correct challenges faced by previous policies that were introduced between 1960 and 1980s by regimes earlier than the National Resistance Movement (NRM).

The significance of agriculture in the overall global economy is insurmountable given its sustenance to human populations. Recent studies (such as Kitenge and Bashir (2022)) have stated that one of the 21st century's most persistently changing sectors is still agriculture. China, the country with the largest population, feeds 22% of the world's population using just 9% of the world's arable land, but continuing to be the world's largest single supplier of food (Shaofeng, Shijun, & Aifeng, 2010). Unfortunately, the rising cost of food and the estimated one billion underfed people (15% of the world's population) force millions of households to experience or continue to experience absolute hunger and poverty (Sumner, Ortiz-Juarez, & Hoy, 2022). The issues facing the agricultural sector in both developed and developing worlds have been extensively discussed by the international community for more than ten years, namely "interruption in supply chain and market, scarcity of frameworks and their safety issues, dearth of cooperation and collaboration, and wastage of farm produces". Pillar one of Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) notes that the United Nations gave emphasis to ending both poverty and hunger. The same concern was reiterated in the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG-2) in which the UN underscored ending hunger, achieving food security and improving nutrition and promoting sustainable agriculture. From the emphases, food and nutrition seem to be significant elements at every level (from the global to the household) of development.

In its organisation, section one of this paper gives an overview followed by sections two and three dealing with literature and theoretical framework respectively. Section four deals with the perceived relationship between agricultural policy frameworks and the agricultural sector. This is followed by section five dealing with the methodology preceding section six on the outcomes: the efficacy of the agricultural policy frameworks in the promotion of the agricultural sector. This is followed by the limitations and the conclusion.

1.1. Review of Related Literature

According to the [United Nations \(2015\)](#) significant progress has been made in terms of ecological sustainability since the year 2000; however, by 2015, it was estimated that 825 million people lived in absolute food insecurity and 800 million people were at risk of starvation, which was indicative of the persistence of a number of threats to the agricultural sector. Global food prices have fluctuated since 2007, in part due to the agricultural sector's sluggish growth ([Sosoo, Okorie, & Chen, 2021](#)). Although to varied degrees, this issue has had an impact on the rate of total global development in a number of countries and areas. For example, a study by [Besada and Werner \(2015\)](#) discovered that the majority of vulnerable populations were regularly found on the African continent, with Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) being the only place where persistent food shortages and under nourishment are still common. According to recent studies, the risk of a food crisis is grater in some African countries and is worse among rural households who depend on traditional farming methods ([Dixon, 2021; Mohammed, Batung, Kansanga, Nyantakyi-Frimpong, & Luginaah, 2022; Saha, Behnke, Oldewage-Theron, Muhtasim, & Miller, 2021](#)).

A number of countries in SSA rely on agriculture despite the fact that over 90% of agricultural production is based on rain-fed agriculture; rainfall instability has become more pronounced in the region. As a consequence, a study by Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO) gave impetus to the significance of irrigation to food production revealing that approximately 40% of the global food comes from the irrigated 16% of the total cultivated land. Despite that statistic, there are severe regional disparities of irrigated agriculture demonstrating about 38% in Asia, 15% in Latin America, and only 4% in Africa. The statistics above appear to suggest that in the East African region, unreliable agricultural production has led to millions of new rural-urban migrations and has already had unsettling effects on a number of urban citizens and municipal authorities. However, the aforementioned perspective appears to be at odds with [Broadway and Stull \(2010\)](#) study, which discovered that American farmers changed from an agricultural tradition to a business tradition, leading some rural Americans to choose to leave the rural communities in order to find employment in urban centres, leaving less than 0.02 of active Americans employed on farms and smallholdings.

Due to a lack of rain, more and more Karamojong children and women are fleeing hunger and poverty in the rural areas and heading to Kampala, Uganda, and their number rises daily ([Ngwomoya, 2021](#)). Unfortunately, the national government, the Kampala Capital City Authority (KCCA), and the police seen to have a bad attitude towards these in-migrants by making unfounded assumptions about their plight. Sadly, the FAO does not include lower crop yields resulting from weather shocks as a historical contributor to volatility in crop prices ([Ba & Mughal, 2022; Chamdimba, Ortmann, & Wale, 2021; Wouterse & Odjo, 2021](#)). The agriculture sector is anticipated to continue playing a vital role in global food supply chains as the human population continues to rise at an average estimated rate of 80 million people per annum. According to projections by [Besada and Werner \(2015\)](#) the world's population would increase by three billion by 2025. Necessitating about 25% more food than I currently available. Considering additional shocks brought on by interstate wars, such as Ukraine-Russia ([Koval, Kulyk, Riabchuk, Zarembo, & Fakhurdinova, 2022](#)) the agricultural sector will call for deeper efforts from every stakeholder.

1.2. The Theoretical Framework

This study is motivated by the Agricultural, Rural and Structural Transformation (ARST) framework, which presents agricultural transformation as a dominant element of economic transformation processes ([Jayne, Chamberlin, & Benfica, 2018](#)). The ARST framework perceives agricultural transformation to be the process by which an agri-food structure transforms, over time, from subsistence-oriented and farm centred to a more profitable, dynamic, and off-the-farm one. This process is embedded in the broader processes of both structural and countryside transformation, which involves better expansion of incomes and stronger connections between the rural and the

urban, thus, changing the position of agriculture and widening evolving prospects outside agriculture (Masters, Rosenblum, & Alemu, 2018). The ARST framework focuses on the significance of agriculture to rotate around progress in agricultural production, mounting demand attributable to surplus output, a drop in the percentage of agriculture to the overall gross domestic product (GDP), as well as an increase in total output owing to both increases between and among sectors (Amanor & Iddrisu, 2022; Sánchez & Cicowiez, 2022). On the whole, the ARST framework relates agricultural transformation to seven trends, namely; (i) improved off-farm commercial openings (ii) regional relative gain in particular enterprises as a result of evolution of farms from generating a range of produce to more specific production (Wang, Fidrmuc, Luo, & Luo, 2020) (iii) the consistent proportion of agricultural business value-added to farm value-added growths (iv) economies of scale in both production and promotion (v) progress in expertise on the farm (vi) a shift from unstable agriculture to a more concentrated, viable and management-concentrated agriculture and (vii) incorporation of the agro-food structure into the broader economy (Mdee, Ofori, Chasukwa, & Manda, 2021; Ndhlovu, 2019).

The ARST framework is relevant since Uganda is in its early stages of agricultural transformation where dynamism in the non-farm economy has not risen spontaneously. Seeing that a greater percentage of the country's population begins in farming, agricultural productivity growth is necessary to generate transformative growth in income circulating in rural areas to stimulate and sustain the growth of non-farm goods and services (Nwozor & Olanrewaju, 2020). Therefore, it was projected that PMA would gradually bring about structural change in the economy as labour continues to move to more productive non-farm sectors and became more urbanised. Further, raising wages were projected to alter dietary habits so as to favour more processed foods, which increase job prospects in agro-food value chains further down the supply chain. But since agricultural productivity growth is still seen as a major catalyst for structural transformation processes within the country that is still in its early stages of development, agriculture and rural transformation are often viewed (under the ARST framework) as components of broader structural transformation processes.

1.3. Perceived Relationship Between Agricultural Policy Frameworks and the Agricultural Sector

From both literature and the ARST framework, it can be noted that effective agricultural policy frameworks are likely to play a fundamental role in promoting the transformation of the agricultural sector in a developing nation such as Uganda. This is so since both the implementation agencies as well as the funding and/ or monitoring agencies would ensure that objectives are achieved and the appropriate target group is reached. As a consequence, agricultural transformation is perceived to be key in the achievement of the popular PMA that was experimented in Uganda two decades past. This is true because both the policy goals and objectives ideally targeted the most vulnerable and aimed to alleviate mass poverty as a way to realising household prosperity.

The central thesis of this paper is the prevalent situation of poor agricultural production in Uganda; yet, the agricultural sector remains one of the largescale employers for majority of households in the countryside. For instance, there are suggestions that the constant poor agricultural production experienced in Uganda is structural, that is, a good number of previous agricultural policy frameworks have not been successful in promoting transformation due to organisational and implementation impediments (Monitor, 2021). This situation is a huge contest to the relevance of annual budgetary allocations to the agricultural sector, and as a consequence, desires unswerving consideration. Given this contest, this paper examines the efficacy of the agricultural policy frameworks in promoting the transformation of the agricultural sector in Uganda by focusing on the PMA.

2. METHODOLOGY

The core method for this paper was a review of secondary data on accessible empirical as well as conceptual resources on the agricultural policy frameworks in Uganda (as the case study) as well as other nations in Africa and beyond. Review of secondary data encompasses the gathering of information from obtainable resources, for example, the internet, analytical reports, academic journals and statistical magazines. This is then interspersed with cross-references in addition to organising the collected information. This method is cherished for being very effective at any phase of a research project, be they starting phase, data collection, processing and/or analysis of the findings given that much of the elementary material can effortlessly be gathered and then used as a bar in the study process. The major objective of this paper was to examine the efficacy of the agricultural policy frameworks in promoting the transformation of the agricultural sector in Uganda. In achieving this objective, four research questions, were answered, namely: [a] what global efforts are aimed to enhance the agricultural sector? [b] What is the basis of PMA formation in Uganda? [c] What are the goals and objectives of PMA? And [d] what are the achievements of and challenges to PMA intervention in Uganda?

2.1. The Efficacy of the Agricultural Policy Frameworks in Enhancing Transformation of the Agricultural Sector in Uganda

Since the early 1980s, a number of international declarations have been made regarding agriculture. Cases in point are: [Joint Declaration of the Second Meeting of BRICS Ministers of Agriculture and Agrarian Development \(2011\)](#); [The Rome Declaration on World Food Security \(1996\)](#); [The Florence Sustainability Charter \(2021\)](#) aimed to increase knowledge sharing and support the internal production capabilities best suited to local needs between G20 member states and developing countries; the OECD Committee of Ministers' Declaration on better policies to achieve a productive, sustainable, and resilient global food system similarly places a high priority on developing policies to support cooperative, sustainable, productive, and resilient food and agriculture systems. In addition to the aforementioned Declarations, the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG-2) emphasizes the importance of agriculture in terms of eradication of hunger, achieving food security, and improving nutrition as well as advancing sustainable agriculture by recognizing the connections between supportive viable agriculture, empowering smallholder agriculturalists, endorsing gender equality, eradicating poverty, ensuring healthy lives, and addressing climate change.

In Africa, particularly member states have made a number of declarations focused on agriculture at both the continental and regional levels. The following Declarations at the continental level are noteworthy; [The Malabo Declaration \(2014\)](#) signed in Equatorial Guinea on accelerated agricultural growth and transformation for shared prosperity and improved livelihoods is a set of new objectives that demonstrate a more targeted approach to achieve the agricultural vision for the continent, which shares prosperity and improved livelihoods by 2025. And the Maputo Declaration on agriculture and food security, which made a commitment to accelerating agricultural growth and transformation for shared prosperity and improved livelihoods through the "commitment to the allocation of at least 10% of national budgetary resources to agriculture and rural development policy implementation within five years".

The Southern African Development Community (SADC) has made a number of declarations regarding agriculture at the regional level. Of particular interest is the 2004 Declaration on Agriculture and Food Security, which outlines the member states' commitment to advancing agriculture as a means to enhancing regional residents' access to food. Similar to this, the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) had increased its efforts to improve agriculture given that, by 2011, SSA was home to 10 of the member nations with acute food scarcity proportions affecting over 35% of their populations ([Besada & Werner, 2015](#)). The principal nations that had severe malnutrition of 35% and more included Eritrea, Democratic Republic of Congo, Zambia, Sierra Leone, Central African

Republic, Ethiopia, Angola, Mozambique, and Malawi. As a result, many authorities have noted that regional food production has grown at a slower rate than earlier projected ([Vercillo, Kuuire, Armah, & Luginaah, 2015](#)).

Many nations have realized the importance of agriculture and, as a result, have established a full ministry in charge of all associated matters. Although the nomenclature to the ministerial docket of agriculture varies across nations on the continent, they highlight the view that this sector is pivotal for local, national and international growth. For example, in the United Kingdom, it is known as the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. In the United States, it is known as the US Department of Agriculture. In Australia, it is called the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and the Environment. In Brazil, the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Supply. In China, it is known as the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs. In France, the Ministry of Agriculture, Food, Fisheries, Rural Affairs and Regional Planning. In Germany, it is known as the Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture. And in India, the Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers' Welfare. Within Africa. In Egypt, it is called the Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation. In Ethiopia, the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development. In Nigeria, it is known as the Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development; in South Africa, the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries; in Tanzania, it is known as the Ministry of Agriculture; and in Uganda, it is known as the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Husbandry and Fisheries (MAAIF).

The notion that agriculture is a key sector in the global, continental, regional and national economy appears to be shared across the many titles. The Ugandan government has been experimenting with a variety of direct interventions since the 1980s in order to strengthen and consolidate its progress. Among them are, Plan for Modernization of Agriculture (PMA), Entandikwa, the National Agricultural Advisory Services ([NAADS Secretariat, 2020](#)); Prosperity-for-All ([Mwesigwa, 2016](#)); Emyooga ([Kazibwe, 2022](#)) to name just a few. It is abundantly obvious that the ongoing transition from one intervention to the next has not been the outcome of a mutational plan but rather of disappointments brought on by the present intervention. Additionally, it appears that there has been a lack of rigor in thoroughly auditing one intervention before switching to another. According to the study, this has resulted in what some analysts prefer to refer to as a “ping-pong” game, which is extremely risky for both the agriculture industry and the entire government apparatus. This is due to the fact that it has frequently taken less than ten years to switch from one intervention to another.

There is undoubtedly a fundamental issue with the functioning of the government if an intervention cannot be given at least ten years to allow for a complete review of its Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT). As stated by the [Africa Research Institute \(2016\)](#) the scale of the fiscal deficit, ineffective sector working groups, the creation of vertical funds, and the failure to include donor projects into the budget process are the four concerns that form the basis of the issue. The PMA, which lasted in Uganda for almost eight years, was the longest intervention; others barely lasted a few years! Evaluating the effectiveness of the PMA, one of those therapies, is one method to contribute to this discussion.

2.2. The Plan for Modernization of Agriculture (PMA)

One of the most important instruments for reducing widespread poverty among the large majority of impoverished rural households in Uganda was formed in 2000 with the PMA. Its implementation began in 2001, and the program gradually came to an end in 2009. The Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Project's (UPPAP) findings on how people perceived their own poverty are considered to have had a significant impact on the creation of PMA ([Bahigwa, Rigby, & Woodhouse, 2005](#)). Its implementation started in 2001 and the programme phased out in 2009. The formation of the PMA is said to have been largely influenced by the findings of the Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Project (UPPAP) regarding what poor people thought about their own poverty ([MAAIF, 2000](#)).

Currently, 80% of the population of the nation lives in rural areas and is dependent on agriculture for a living. Despite this fact, recent statistics show that 38% of Ugandans still live in poverty. As a result, both the macro and micro socio well-being of Uganda's society depend heavily on the agricultural sector for economic growth. Agriculture sector produces over 60% of the nation's entire economic output. This is in good comparison to a number of nations, including Nigeria, Egypt, Ethiopia, Botswana, South Africa, and Rwanda.

Modernizing the industry was one method to increase its enormous contribution and provide further stimulus in a nation with a young and rapidly expanding population. As a result, it was anticipated that modernizing the entire agricultural sector would increase both direct and indirect job prospects, particularly for those in rural and urban areas who work in sectors dependent on direct agricultural inputs, increasing total household earnings. A number of households would be able to improve their quality of life, maintain food security, and utilize natural resources in a more sustainable manner thanks to this expectation (MAAIF, 2000).

The PMA was created with the intention of reducing and / or eradicating chronic household poverty in the context of Uganda's ongoing institutional and policy developments. In any case, according to the government data, the proportions of Ugandans living below the poverty line decreased from 56.0% in 1993 to 21.4% in 2016. With the exception of the northern region, where it decreased from 43.7% to 32.5% between 2012-13 and 2016-17, household poverty appears to have increased throughout (Owori, 2020).

Relatively, this statistic was lower than that of other East African Community (EAC) members like Kenya, where 15.9 million out of 42 million people live in poverty. Tanzania, where 50% of the population lives on less than \$1.90 per day, and Rwanda, where 56,5% of people live in poverty. Despite this, it is necessary to promote the adoption of PMA's long-term vision and principles as well as its medium-term priority areas for action in every sector that affects the livelihoods of people who work in agriculture (MAAIF, 2000). Thus, the goal of the PMA was to decrease poverty by fostering an agricultural and agro-industrial sector that was profitable, competitive, sustainable and dynamic. "Transitioning subsistence agriculture to commercial agriculture" was its stated goal. Therefore, PMA's initiatives were guided by the importance of widespread stakeholder involvement, with the underlying idea being that a nation's strategy for reducing poverty would be accomplished through a deliberate stakeholder participative approach. Both sectoral and cross-sectoral program performance was assessed to depend on ownership (Mette & Joughin, 2012).

2.3. Goals, Objectives and Intervention Areas of PMA

Two of the four overarching goals of the National Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP), namely (a) Rapid and sustainable economic growth and structural transformation and (b) Increased ability of the poor to raise their incomes, were directly impacted by the PMA, which was a key component of the PEAP's strategies (Denmark Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2005). The precise goals were to:

- i. Provide gainful employment through the secondary benefits of PMA implementation, such as agro-processing factories and services.
- ii. Improve household food security through the market rather than emphasizing self-sufficiency.
- iii. Increase incomes and improve the quality of life for poor subsistence farmers.
- iv. Promote sustainable use of natural resources by developing a land bank (Bahigwa et al., 2005)

Seven intervention areas (often referred to as "pillars"), including research and technology development, agricultural advisory services, rural finance, agro-processing and marketing, agricultural education, supportive infrastructure and sustainable natural resource use and management were identified in order to achieve the aforementioned objectives.

2.4. Achievements of the PMA

The PMA intervention has been recognised for the following successes:

- i. The Ugandan Parliament passed the Agricultural Bill, and as stated by [Bahiigwa et al. \(2005\)](#) execution of the Act made it possible for farmers to acquire better technology, which were essential for revolutionizing the agricultural sector. The National Agricultural Research System (NARS), which would manage institutes for agricultural research in both the public and private sectors, was intended to be established as a result of the act.
- ii. The National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAAS), which offered advisory services to farmers to take agriculture as a business, was also established by the Uganda government through PMA. According to [Kwamong and Korugyendo \(2010\)](#) NAAS sponsored 40 farmer-selected businesses for the benefit of 13,000 registered farmer organizations and associations. NAAS worked in all of Uganda's sub-counties.
- iii. The Ugandan government has also made it easier for people to access financial services, and it has promoted the establishment of community banks. The government reduced taxes from commercial bank loans advanced to farmers in the national budget of 2005-06. This gave farmers access to discounted loans, allowing them to acquire high-quality agricultural supplies that raised production

2.5. Challenges that Impacted on the Success of PMA

Despite the gains the Ugandan government had achieved in modernizing agriculture with a view of reducing poverty, PMA faced a number of challenges, including:

- i. Agriculture provision was impeded by the country's physical infrastructure, especially in rural areas. The nation's road network lacked sufficient capacity. Due to the poor condition of rural roads, farmers had trouble getting their goods, especially perishables, to the markets. Despite the fact that the country's food production was growing in many areas, other regions were suffering from severe food shortages as a result of inadequate transportation infrastructure. Inadequate marketing strategies go hand-in-hand with a poor road network.
- ii. Despite government efforts, brokers who bought inexpensively and sold expensively took advantage of farmers ([Nabwire, 2015](#)).
- iii. Only 5% of the population now have access to power, which has hampered the nation's attempt to build rural agro-processing enterprises. The country must boost rural energy sources.
- iv. The performance of PMA was negatively impacted by the scarcity of nearby water supplies, which led herds of cattle to migrate throughout the dry season in search of water and pasture.
- v. Due to the concentration of credit services in metropolitan areas, limited access to financial services, a lack of funding, inadequate financial management skills, and a short and irregular loan payback schedule were further obstacles to its adoption.
- vi. The PMA's success was hindered by limited access to agro-inputs such as hoes, ploughs, boats, fertilizers, pesticides, spraying equipment animal treatments, high-yield and resistant seeds, better breeds, and a wide range of enhanced plant cuttings and seeds ([MAAIF, 2000](#)).
- vii. Cassava, coffee, bananas, tobacco, groundnuts, and cowpeas were harmed by illness and pests.
- viii. Additionally, major setbacks were caused by animal diseases, particularly those that impair cattle and waterweed, which has an impact on fish harvests.
- ix. People in rural areas were less equipped to combat diseases and pests due to improper government supervision, incompatibilities with regulations and policies, and corruption, particularly among fishing authorities.

- x. The low productivity during the PMA intervention was attributed by the [Denmark Ministry of Foreign Affairs \(2005\)](#) to information, knowledge, and skill gaps in food production (crops, animal husbandry, fishing methods and alternatives), soil conservation (controlling pests and diseases), marketing opportunities (prices and processing), and appropriate government policies.
- xi. Small-holder farmers blamed the critical absence of high-quality extension services like the ones pre-PMA involvement for their dismal performance.
- xii. Farmers were hindered from making a profit while prices were high due to agricultural product supply and demand's seasonal low and variable prices, as well as forced sales to meet necessities (such as food, healthcare, and education).
- xiii. High market dues for product sales, fishing and trade license fees, and expenditures associated with the killing of live animals were thought to reduced market revenues.

2.6. The Way Forward

Numerous strategies were developed at the various levels of intervention from the problems that were presented and they are highlighted hereunder:

One is to raise community understanding of fundamental land management techniques and the district demarcation of plots. The findings of a survey by [Kwapong and Korugyendo \(2010\)](#) which showed that people need to be educated about fundamental land management techniques and setting district boundaries between plots with legitimate land titles, supports this method.

Two, installing wind turbines, routine community water supply maintenance, and building adjacent dams will all help to provide enough water to farmers so they can feed their livestock and irrigate their crops. However, it is suggested offering agri-financing to help farmers overcome seasonal challenges, purchase new inputs, and launch new income generating ventures.

Three, improve agricultural financing to give farmers access to agri-credit. Agri-financing, whether in kind, cash, or both, as well as maintaining user-friendly conditions for receipt of agricultural loans, would ease farmers' access to funds which they would deploy to increase the level of agricultural production, according to [Kwapong and Korugyendo \(2010\)](#). Smallholder farmers also advocate for local supply initiatives, encouraging local stockyards to operate close to the community, and rehabilitating shared equipment like tractors through services like tractor hire

Four, investing in shared spaces to allow farmers to collaborate for greater gain. According to a study by [Nabwire \(2015\)](#) improving market infrastructure, rural marketing networks, developing strategies to end middlemen exploitation, access to marketing information, and reviewing current local market management, dues collection and tendering would all increase agricultural productivity in Uganda. In order to improve the distribution of resistant seeds, plant cuttings, and better breeds, smallholder farmers demand that both the district administrators and the wildlife officials collaborate through services like tractor hire.

2.7. Limitations to the PMA

Although this investigation was carefully planned and carried out, we are aware of potential limitations specific to the secondary study approach used in this work. The key worry with the constraint is the failure to question well-chosen people in order to increase reliability. One drawback of this study is the scarcity of original data. Engaging key informants at the local government levels would be necessary to increase reliability, but doing so would take significant resources that the authors at the time did not have. However, the study was able to realise reliability and

draw findings that can help one understand the intervention and provide a consistent agenda for decision makers by making reference to current studies.

3. CONCLUSION

In Uganda, it is crucial for agricultural policy frameworks to effectively support the development of the agricultural sector. The PMA was created in 2000 with the intention of being one of the most important measures for reducing widespread poverty among the vast majority of the country's poor, however, it fell short of its goal. Rapid and enduring economic growth, structural change, and improved ability of the poor to enhance their earnings were all among PMA's highly encouraging goals. However, a variety of issues have had an adverse impact on PMA's effectiveness. The specific goals were to strengthen household food security, create gainful employment, promote sustainable use and management of natural resources, and improve the incomes and quality of life of poor subsistence farmers. If these goals had been accomplished, agriculture as well as the condition of rural farmers would have undergone significant change.

REFERENCES

- Africa Research Institute. (2016). *Why implementation fails in Uganda?* Retrieved from www.africaresearchinstitute.org/newsite/blog/why-implementation-fails-in-uganda
- Amanor, K. S., & Iddrisu, A. (2022). Old tractors, new policies and induced technological transformation: Agricultural mechanisation, class formation, and market liberalisation in Ghana. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 49(1), 158-178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2020.1867539>
- Ba, M., & Mughal, M. (2022). Weather shocks, coping strategies and household well-being: Evidence from rural Mauritania. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 58(3), 482-502. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2021.1983168>
- Bahigwa, G., Rigby, D., & Woodhouse, P. (2005). Right target, wrong mechanism? Agricultural modernization and poverty reduction in Uganda. *World Development*, 33(3), 481-496. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2004.09.008>
- Besada, H., & Werner, K. (2015). An assessment of the effects of Africa's water crisis on food security and management. *International Journal of Water Resources Development*, 31(1), 120-133. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07900627.2014.905124>
- Broadway, M. J., & Stull, D. D. (2010). The wages of food factories. *Food and Foodways*, 18(1-2), 43-65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07409711003708413>
- Buchana, Y., & Sithole, M. M. (2022). Towards a conceptual framework for measuring innovation in the agricultural sector in Sub-Saharan developing countries. *African Journal of Science, Technology, Innovation and Development*, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20421338.2022.2072794>
- Chamdimba, O. Y., Ortmann, G. F., & Wale, E. (2021). Resilience to shocks and food insecurity: Determinants, and the impact of smallholder jatropha curcas cultivation in Southern Malawi. *African Journal of Science, Technology, Innovation and Development*, 13(5), 619-633. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20421338.2020.1774962>
- Denmark Ministry of Foreign Affairs. (2005). *A joint evaluation: Uganda's PMA*. Kampala: Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Husbandry and Fisheries.
- Dixon, W. M. (2021). Food insecurity and revolution in the Middle East and North Africa: Agrarian questions in Egypt and Tunisia. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 57(12), 2177-2178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2021.1964722>
- Filippo, S., Samuele, D. P., & Enrico, B.-M. (2022). Detection and counting of meadow cuts by copernicus sentinel-2 imagery in the framework of the common agricultural policy (CAP). *European Journal of Remote Sensing*, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/22797254.2022.2129094>

- Florence Sustainability Charter. (2021). Retrieved from <https://www.g20.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/G20-Agriculture-Ministers-Communique-Final.pdf>
- Jayne, T. S., Chamberlin, J., & Benfica, R. (2018). Africa's unfolding economic transformation. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 54(5), 777-787. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2018.1430774>
- Joint Declaration of the Second Meeting of BRICS Ministers of Agriculture and Agrarian Development. (2011). *Chengdu, China, October 30*. Retrieved from <http://www.mid.ru/brics.nsf/WEBdocBric/A1E63944A6B7297444257950002E0C75>
- Kazibwe, K. (2022). *Uganda: Minister Kasolo asks Ugandans to own Emyooga program*. Retrieved from <https://allafrica.com/stories/202202110497.html>
- Kitenge, E., & Bashir, S. (2022). The effect of financial access on convergence: Evidence from the US agricultural sector. *Applied Economics*, 54(15), 1715-1726. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2021.1980495>
- Koval, N., Kulyk, V., Riabchuk, M., Zarembo, K., & Fakhurdinova, M. (2022). Morphological analysis of narratives of the Russian-Ukrainian conflict in western academia and think-tank community. *Problems of Post-Communism*, 69(2), 166-178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10758216.2021.2009348>
- Kwapong, N., & Korugyendo, P. (2010). *Revival of agricultural cooperatives in Uganda*. *International food policy research*. Retrieved from <http://www.helsinki.fi/ruralia/ica2011/presentations/Kwapong.pdf>
- MAAIF, M. (2000). *Plan for modernization of agriculture: Eradicating poverty in Uganda. Government strategy and operational framework*. Kampala: Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industry and Fisheries.
- Masters, A. W., Rosenblum, N. Z., & Alemu, R. G. (2018). Agricultural transformation, nutrition transition and food policy in Africa. Preston curves reveal new stylised facts. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 54(5), 788-802.
- Mdee, A., Ofori, A., Chasukwa, M., & Manda, S. (2021). Neither sustainable nor inclusive: A political economy of agricultural policy and livelihoods in Malawi, Tanzania and Zambia. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 48(6), 1260-1283. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2019.1708724>
- Mette, A., & Joughin, J. (2012). The reversal of agricultural reform in Uganda: Ownership and values. *Policy and Society*, 31(4), 319-330. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polsoc.2012.09.004>
- Mohammed, K., Batung, E., Kansanga, M., Nyantakyi-Frimpong, H., & Luginaah, I. (2022). Does joint agricultural decision-making improve food security among smallholder farmers? *African Geographical Review*, 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19376812.2022.2063140>
- Monitor. (2021). *Farmers blame government for soaring poor proceeds*. Retrieved from www.monitor.co.ug/uganda
- Mwesigwa, D. (2016). Household food security in Uganda: reflections on the prosperity-for-all programme. *Loyola Journal of Social Sciences*, 30(2), 229-246.
- NAADS Secretariat. (2020). *Statistics of inputs distributed*. Retrieved from <https://naads.or.ug/>
- Nabwire, L. (2015). *Uganda's dilemmas in the transition to modern commercial agriculture: Implications for the poverty reduction agenda*. Paper presented at the Research Paper Produced under the Future Agricultures' Early Career Fellowship Program.
- Ndhlovu, F. (2019). South Africa's social transformation policies: Raciolinguistic ideologies and neoliberal rhetoric. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 14(2), 131-151. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2019.1592177>
- Ngwomoya, A. (2021). *Uganda: KCCA starts fresh eviction of street children*. Retrieved from <https://www.monitor.co.ug/uganda/news/national/-kcca-starts-fresh-eviction-of-street-children-3325534>
- Nwozor, A., & Olanrewaju, J. S. (2020). The ECOWAS agricultural policy and the quest for food security: Assessing Nigeria's implementation strategies. *Development Studies Research*, 7(1), 59-71. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21665095.2020.1785904>
- Osabohien, R., Mordi, A., & Ogunlape, A. (2022). Access to credit and agricultural sector performance in Nigeria. *African Journal of Science, Technology, Innovation and Development*, 14(1), 247-255. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20421338.2020.1799537>

- Owori, M. (2020). *Poverty in Uganda: National and regional data and trends. Development initiatives*. Retrieved from <https://devinit.org/resources/poverty-uganda-national-and-regional-data-and-trends>
- Saha, S., Behnke, A., Oldewage-Theron, W., Mubtasim, N., & Miller, M. (2021). Prevalence and factors associated with food insecurity among older adults in Sub-Saharan Africa: A systematic review. *Journal of Nutrition in Gerontology and Geriatrics*, 40(4), 171-196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21551197.2021.1988027>
- Sánchez, M. V., & Cicowiez, M. (2022). Optimising policies to achieve agricultural transformation objectives: An application for Ethiopia. *Journal of Applied Economics*, 25(1), 765-783. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15140326.2022.2056407>
- Shaofeng, J., Shijun, L., & Aifeng, L. (2010). Will China's water shortage shake the world's food security? *Water International*, 35(1), 6-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508060903513874>
- Sosoo, V. E., Okorie, D. I., & Chen, H. (2021). Roles of commodity futures derivatives and financial crises in global food security. *Economic and Political Studies*, 9(3), 336-357. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20954816.2021.1872854>
- Sumner, A., Ortiz-Juarez, E., & Hoy, C. (2022). Measuring global poverty before and during the pandemic: A political economy of overoptimism. *Third World Quarterly*, 43(1), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2021.1995712>
- The Malabo Declaration. (2014). *Malabo declaration on accelerated agricultural growth and transformation for shared prosperity and improved livelihoods*. Retrieved from https://www.resakss.org/sites/default/files/Malabo%20Declaration%20on%20Agriculture_2014_11%2026-.pdf
- The Rome Declaration on World Food Security. (1996). *Population and development review*, 22(4), 807-809. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2137827>
- United Nations. (2015). *The millennium development goals report. UN department of public information – DPI/2594/6E*. Retrieved from <https://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/>
- Vercillo, S., Kuuire, V. Z., Armah, F. A., & Luginaah, I. (2015). Does the New alliance for food security and nutrition impose biotechnology on smallholder farmers in Africa? *Global Bioethics*, 26(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/11287462.2014.1002294>
- Wang, H., Fidrmuc, J., Luo, Q., & Luo, M. (2020). Exploring the determinants of on-farm transitions: Evidence from rural China. *Applied Economics*, 52(52), 5667-5686. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2020.1770194>
- Wouterse, F., & Odjo, S. (2021). Weather shocks and planting stage investments: evidence from Niger. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 57(12), 2027-2044. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2021.1939865>

Online Science Publishing is not responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability, etc. caused in relation to/arising out of the use of the content. Any queries should be directed to the corresponding author of the article.