WORLD BANK-SDN / EU-AAACP

SMALL FARMER PRODUCTIVE ALLIANCE PILOT

(St. Elizabeth)

FINAL REPORT

MAY 2009

PREPARED

BY

JAMAICA GREENHOUSE GROWERS ASSOCIATION CONSULTANTS

RADA BUILDING
CALEDONIA ROAD
MANDEVILLE, MANCHESTER
JAMAICA W.I.

CONTENTS

WORLD BANK-SDN / EU-AAACP
SMALL FARMER PRODUCTIVE ALLIANCE PILOT
SECOND REPORT

Introduction

As a follow up to the National Community Development Project (NCDP), the Government of Jamaica has decided to prepare and implement a Regional Economic Development Initiative (REDI) with financial support from the World Bank. REDI will focus on strengthening the linkage of small producers (farmers) with external partners along key value chains, particularly those catering to the needs of the hospitality industry and those supplying the primary produce trade, domestic, export and processors. The Jamaica Social Investment Fund (JSIF) has been entrusted with the responsibility to prepare and implement REDI locally.

The Small Farmers Productive Alliance Pilot (The Pilot) is an integral part of the preparation of REDI and was designed to collect, analyse and present baseline information on small farmers to inform the project (REDI).

The scope of the Pilot covers the conduct of surveys in three parishes of the island and to prepare reports to be used in the preparation of the larger REDI. The parishes covered are St. Ann, St. James and St. Elizabeth. Local operators were selected to conduct the Pilot in each parish. Consultants from the Jamaica Greenhouse Growers Association were selected to do the Pilot in the parish of St. Elizabeth.

Objectives of the Pilot

The main objectives of the Pilot may be summarized as:

(1) Test, under real conditions, the key hypotheses concerning the linkage of small producers (farmers) to the market in order to inform the REDI project.
(2) Generate data to inform REDI's investment in small farmers
(3) Serve as a basis for the development of farmer capacity building under REDI.

The Hypotheses

The Pilot is designed to test the following hypotheses

(1) If Post harvest/Pre-Market operations are improved, based on adequate market information, in particular information secured directly from partners in the value

chain, small farmers will be able both to increase quantities marketed and obtain high unit prices; and

(2) Farmers need to enter predefined partnership arrangements with the other players along the value chain, based on concrete business plans, if they are to have secure sustainable development opportunities.

The Focus

The focus of the Pilot will be on the following value chains determined by the comparative advantage of each Parish in the Pilot:

(1) St. Ann: Value chains supplying export businesses (both fresh and processed).
(2) St. James: value chains catering to the needs of the hospitality industry; and
(3) St. Elizabeth: Value chains supplying the domestic retail trade (supermarkets and other outlets).

Survey First Phase

The first phase consists of administering a survey to a sample of (70 to 90) small farmers each or the parish selected with an aim to identify the target farmer population dealing with the value chains of interest (mainly fresh fruits and vegetables). The first phase also includes some additional activities (particularly training). The data will be collected, analyzed is to analyzed, conclusions drawn and articulated herein (second progress report).

Deliverables

(1) First progress report presenting sample selection and a detailed description of the methodology and arrangements which will be used to administer the survey and collect the data.
(2) Capacity-building workshop to be organized in collaboration with JSIF.
(3) Second progress report presenting the combined results of the survey and an analysis of the hypotheses, and a description of the capacity building workshops, with all the related documents and annexes.

Survey Second Phase

The second phase of the survey will examine the linkages and partnerships throughout the value chains with a focus on post harvest and pre-market activities. A framework known as SWOT

Analysis (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) will be applied. The results should be of use for the design of the REDI, including the types of productive alliances to be financed under the project as well as the selection process for these alliances.

The objective of the second phase of the survey is to build on the quantitative data collected under Phase 1 in order to deepen the quality of the information on certain key aspects. The following questions will be considered:

(1) what additional data is required in order to obtain clarification on crucial aspects of the first survey

(2) what are the major constraints in the value chains;

(3) what are the partnerships at each stage of the value chains;

(4) what do the farmers' "business plans" include (even if the business plans are informal simple ideas) with seasonal and long term perspectives; and

(5) how are business plans financed (own contribution, commercial credit, grants and other financial assistance, etc.).

A final aim will be to assemble sufficient data to prepare a value budget to determine what is the farm gate price, and, on that basis, whether production is viable or not. One or two productive alliance proposals should be developed as examples for REDI.

One focus group consisting of 10 – 15 respondents (coming from one or several farmer groups) should be organized for the parish. Complimentary information should be collected as required from resource persons/expert informants and from secondary sources.

Deliverables

(1) The facilitator JGGA) should organize a small workshop with parish stakeholders in order to validate and disseminate the conclusions of the pilot at the parish level.

(2) JSIF will organize a national level workshop to present, validate and disseminate the results of the Pilot.

(3) A third progress report should be prepared to include:

(a) A summary of the two previous reports

(b) A presentation of the focus group process (calendar, difficulties encountered and information collected, summarized in an appropriate fashion.

(c) The proceedings of the final workshops; and

(d) Final summaries and analyses.

proceedings of the

The Parish

St. Elizabeth is located on the south coast of the island and is described as the *"food basket parish of Jamaica"*. This is so because of the wide array of crops produced in the parish. Production range form estate crops, such as sugar cane, food staples, fruits and vegetables to condiments (herbs and spices).

The parish is therefore ideal for studying food value chains as well as the activities and needs of small farmers. There is a large number of small farmers' groups and a wide range of terrain and farming practices adapted for these areas. It was therefore not difficult to identify the sample of farmers required and a farmers' group to work with for implementing the Pilot.

The Sample

A sample of 70 farmers, mostly small farmers, was selected from areas of the parish where a range of fruits and vegetable food crops are produced. This sample of farmers was interviewed to provide the bulk of the information for the Pilot Survey. The selection of farmers conformed to the criteria provided by the terms of reference of the Pilot survey.

The Farmers' Group

With the aid of the rural Agricultural Development Authority (RADA), the government agricultural extension agency, and the Jamaica Agricultural Society (JAS), to a lesser extent, the Brighton Productive Alliance was chosen. This is a group of small farmers, consisting of male and female operatives, each operating farms of 5 acres or less. Members of the group conformed to the criteria of the Terms of reference for the Pilot Survey. All farmers were registered with RADA, and some with the JAS, but had formed themselves into a smaller splinter group for the purposes of acquiring resources (farming inputs) and marketing farm produce.

This group formed the focus group for the detailed study of farmers and value chains.

JGGA

The Jamaica Greenhouse Growers Association (JGGA), as the name suggests, is a group of farmers and professionals who are presently practicing or share an interest in greenhouse production. The association comprises of individuals having a wide range of disciplines. The consulting arm of the association therefore deals with a range of consulting assignments both at home and in the wider Caribbean.

Clients include: Government of the Bahamas, Government of the Cayman Islands, The European Union, USAID, Government of Jamaica, Local and Caribbean based private sector organizations, Schools and Colleges and a wide range of local and foreign enthusiasts. Presently the JGGA consultants are employed to the World Bank
for the implementation of this Pilot Survey.

Figure 1

Figures 1 & 2 show enumerators in training for the Pilot survey

Figure 2

The Survey

Methodology

JGGA consultants will arrange meetings with farmers through RADA, JAS etc. to apprise all concerned of the Pilot study to be undertaken, the purpose and implications of same, the persons to be affected and the goal of the survey. Everyone will be sensitized to the activities to be carried out in farmer selection and data collection as well as any other day to day interface with the farming community.

The Field Operations Supervisor (FOS), enumerators and field assistants will be selected at this stage and will form part of the general audience to be sensitized. This group will then be given specific training for the conduct of the field activities, understanding and using the questionnaire and other recoding instruments, enumeration techniques and the importance of accurate data collection.

Farmers will be interviewed individually by enumerators visiting with them, on their farms or at home, using a structured questionnaire and the information recorded. Enumerators will be in the field for three weeks. All the Field activities will be supervised by the Field Operations Supervisor (FOS) who will make sure that activities are running smoothly. Questionnaires will be checked randomly in this period, by FOS or other personnel, in order to ensure that there is clear understanding of the task at hand.

Analysis and collation of data will commence the moment questionnaires start coming into the office. The Pilot Implementing Officer (PIO) will do this analysis and generate a list of agents along the value chain who will be interviewed in a less structured manner (discussions) to garner more specific and less quantitative data. The PIO will also highlight and evaluate the problems faced by small producers and their relationship with agents along the value chain and commence to put interventions into place to foster a plan for capacity building.

All forces of the consulting team (JGGA) will then start preparation for the workshop to be staged in January 2009, in accordance with the timetable presented in the TOR.

JGGA will acquire a venue (conference room perhaps) outfitted with the necessary pops to stage a workshop, as one of the key deliverables of the Pilot, for the presentation and discussion of all the findings of the Pilot. The proceedings of this workshop will be documented to form the basis of the third progress report as stated in the TOR.

Technical Approach

The data collected under the pilot project will form the baseline platform to supply the information for the way forward in the formulation and implementation of the Regional Economic Development Initiative (REDI) to be implemented in mid 2009.

On this background, the approach to be adopted for this pilot revolves around the following activities:

(a) The design of a survey geared to collect the required data to supply the information required to evaluate the existing situation (testing the hypotheses).

(b) Design questionnaires to accurately capture key information including a questionnaire to collect detailed information from the farmers' sample group of 70 to90 farmers.

(c) Carefully select a sample of farmers from the most affected stratum of the farming community (framers, males and females, most in need of assistance). This will be done with the assistance of RADA, the JAS and any other organizations in contact with small farming producers.

(d) Conduct a more detailed focus group study of the selected sub-group of 15 to 20 farmers in order to obtain more detailed value chain information.

(e) Analyse and interpret data to inform the extent and type of capacity building required and the associated cost. Clearly identify problems associated with post harvest/pre market activities.

(f) Apprise farmers (selected group of 15/20 farmers) of capacity building possibilities, keep training sessions and design facilities to be implemented in this regard.

(g) Prepare reports on all activities of the Pilot as outlined in the TOR.

The age distribution of farmers corresponds to a normal distribution having the ages of farmers falling mostly in the category 30 to 60 years of age. In the sample, there were no farmers recorded in the age category 20 years and younger while there were only 6 in the category 60 to 70 years and another 6 being over 70 years.

The pattern seems to be similar for both males and females.

SURVEY DATA

HOUSEHOLD INFORMATION

(All information published at Appendix 1.)

Years in farming

The distribution of years in farming shows a high correlation with the age group distribution of farmers. Farmers in farming for over 20 years amount for the highest category of all farmers in sample. Similarly farmers of age group 30 to 60 years account for the largest category of all farmers in the sample (tables 1 and 3).

Highest level of schooling

Most farmers report primary education as the highest level of schooling received, 40 of 70 farmers in sample (table 3). Similarly education received in pertaining to farming or agriculture shows only one person in sample having received a university education (table 4). Most farmers learnt their craft from other farmers, family and others.

Most farmers' households contain family members (extended family) only 17 farmers reported non-family members in households (table 6).

Investments (last 12 months)

Less than 50% of farmers in sample, (30 farmers), made any significant financial investments in farming during the last 12 months. Of the 30 farmers investing, 12 invested less than $50,000, while 11 invested $50,000 - $100,000, and 7 invested more than $100,000 (table 8).

Labour force

Some 34% of farmers in sample operate their farms utilizing self and family labour while the remaining 66% utilize self and hired workers. Hired workers (part-time help) vary from one to more than 4 at planting and reaping times (table 9).

Eighty four percent of farmers spend more than 50% of their time in on-farm activities, and of these, 21% spend 100% of their time on the farm (table 10).

Household income

The sample showed that 80% of farmers in the pilot obtain over 50% of household revenue from farming activities and of these, 44% obtain 100% of household revenues from the farm(table 14).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Total size of farming operation

The survey showed that 61% of farmers in sample operate holdings with sizes ranging from one to five acres (Table 15).

Land tenure

This seems to be an area of weakness as demonstrated by the pilot results where the majority of farmers occupy land leased, rented or on other tenure arrangements i.e. 61% (table 16).

Farm equipment

The most popular farm equipment reported by farmers seems to be spray pans of some sort. Over 91% percent of farmers in sample reported owning spray pans ranging from mist blowers to simple manual spray cans. All farmers reported having hand tools and 12 were in possession of small tractors (table 17).

Access to water

More than half the number of farmers, in the sample, (37), reported as having no access to water for farming and are mostly dependent on timing and planting in the rainy season. Others obtain water from a variety of sources as shown in table 19. Most of the farmers transporting water to their farms do so from sources more than half a mile away (table 20).

Source of farm inputs

All farmers reported buying farm inputs from farm stores. Some 21% of farmers reported obtaining some inputs from other sources (table 22).

Plots farmed

The pilot results indicate that most farmers operate more than one plot. Majority of farmers operate from 2 plots to even more than 5 plots (tables 23 & 24). There is a possible correlation between this haphazard type of farming and the land tenure arrangements existing in these areas. Another factor is the predominance of marginal lands in these areas where only the small arable pockets of land are farmed.

Most farmers are reported to be satisfied with the size of the plots presently farmed and are not particularly anxious to obtain more land (table 25).

Crop Cycles

Crop cycles are becoming less well defined and conforming more with the occurrence of rainfall and the changing weather pattern. Farmers reported more that one cropping cycle but with no consistency from year to year.

Awareness and members of Farming Organizations

Most farmers are aware of the existence of more than one farmer's organizations operating in the parish. RADA was the most popular organization quoted.

All farmers reported as members of one or sometimes more than one farmers' Organizations (tables 26 & 27).

Source of Technical Assistance

Fifty farmers polled indicated that they look to RADA for technical assistance. Thirty one farmer sought help from other sources while six farmers indicated "no source" (table 29).

Sale of Crops

All farmers reported a resounding preference to sell their produce individually, (table 30).

Price Setting

The market seems to dominate price setting for these farmers, followed by buyers then farmers and buyers together. The lowest number of farmers reported that they peg prices to the cost of production to the price asked, (table 30).

Competition among buyers

More farmers recognize that there is competition among buyers than otherwise (table 31).

Method of Payment for produce

Credit seems to be the most popular way of paying for goods by buyers among the farmers polled, cash ranked second and strangely, non payment is quite prominent (table 32).

Price range of popular crops

Table 33 shows the highs, lows and average prices for the most popular crops grown in the area surveyed.

Problems encountered in getting produce marketed

Forty one of the seventy farmers in the sample reported the greatest problem in getting produce sold as "lack of market". Of this group sixteen narrowed down the problem to oversupply. "Bad roads" is the next most significant problem faced by farmers. Other less significant problems include: fluctuating prices, transport cost and non-payment (table 34).

Benefits of selling as an individual

The most popular benefit was stated as the act of getting cash in hand at the point of sale, 21 farmers responding. Farmers also reported: getting better prices, greater satisfaction and getting more publicity as a farmer (table 35). Three farmers reported "no problem".

Challenges faced selling through farmers' organization

As opposed to individual selling, most farmers report "delay in payment "as the chief challenge faced. Similarly "lower prices" ranked second followed by factors such as: Selection of produce taken, cheque (non-cash) payment and other reasons (table 36). A significant number of farmers, 13, reported "no knowledge" of the system and 14 farmers reported "no problem".

Benefit of selling through farmers' Organization

Although farmers presently prefer to market produce themselves they still recognize the benefits of selling through a farmers' marketing organization. Some 47 farmers reported that this is a more stable market for their produce. Some also recognized the availability of proper storage for produce and less work for the farmer (table 37).

Most profitable crops and opportunity for selling more

Table 38 shows a summary of the farmers' idea of the most profitable crops grown in their area.

Opportunity to sell more produce

Most farmers, in the sample (73%), think that there is the opportunity to sell more produce at present (table 39).

Increasing profitability of less profitable crops

Farmers believe that they can improve the profitability of the least profitable produce by obtaining lower cost inputs, improving crop care/storage and obtaining better prices at the point of sale (table 40).

How produce is transported

Farmers reported a variety of methods for transporting produce from field to point of sale. The most popular method being the use of hired transport (taxis, vans, pick up trucks etc). The next most popular category is by head followed by other means. Some farmers (16) reported no transport as produce is sold directly from the field (table 41).

Produce lot size (weight) per trip

Produce is packaged and transported in various size lots; the most popular being used feed bags containing less than 50lb. of products at a time. *Table 42* shows the average distribution of package sizes (weight) and table 43 shows the related costs for transporting these lot sizes.

Challenges faced in transporting produce

Twenty farmers in the sample reported "no challenges" in transporting produce. The other 50 farmers reported bad roads, unavailability of transport and high transport costs (all related) as the other outstanding challenges (table 44).

Type and size of packaging

Fifty percent of farmers in sample reported "no packaging" and the related "no packaging cost" (table 45). The usual practice is for farmers to sell in lots or bundles of specified size or weight. Packaging is usually done in used carton boxes of various weights and or used 50 lb rice or flour bags.

Type of Storage

Farmers surveyed mainly store produce at home in make-shift barns or leave produce in the field until buyers arrive. The latter often leads to rotting, rodent damage, over maturity and other spoilage (table 46).

OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS

The following section deals with open ended questions asked of the farmers to get some feedback as to their impression of the present status of small farming in their area. Questions asked also tried to evaluate their beliefs as well as their willingness to change their way of doing business

Solutions to Production Problems (requirements)

The resounding majority of farmers believe that the solution to their production problems reside with the acquisition of cheaper inputs. Working capital, irrigation facilities and technical assistance complete the top four solutions (table 47).

Suggested solutions to marketing problems

Market availability rank as the number 1 suggested solution to the problem. Other suggested solutions are listed at table 48.

Partnership with other members of the value chain

Most farmers, 46 in all, stated that they share a good relationship with players along the value chain of their produce (table 49).

Can people change things?

Sixty six of the seventy farmers surveyed believe that people can change things (table 50). This is good for the change in attitude that REDI hopes to instill in them. A mere 3 farmers don't believe and 1farmer does not know.

Type of inputs required (production, pre-harvest and post-harvest)

Tools and equipment, farm credit, packaging material and chemicals and fertilizers are the most important inputs reported by farmers as reported by the pilot (table 51).

Type of technical assistance/training required

The main technical assistance required by farmers are: production techniques and post harvest management techniques (table 52). Thirteen farmers reported that they were not in need of any technical assistance at this time.

Access to credit

Sixty eight of seventy farmers reported the need for agricultural credit as outlined (table 53). Only two farmers did not show any need for any credit.

Type of credit

Sixty five farmers reporting credit needs opted for short term credit (possible crop lien) while 3 farmers preferred credit. Table 54 records.

FARMER'S COMMENTS

Farmers got varied impressions of the purpose of the survey questionnaire and asked a number of questions mainly pertaining to their needs. Table 55 records the main questions.

OBSERVATIONS ON HOUSING

This section records the enumerator's observation of the farmer's dwelling, as well as, answers to some questions to the farmer seeking to highlight the less visible aspects of his/her living conditions.

Type of dwelling by farmer household

Most farmers live in detached houses i.e. 59, while 8 live in multi-family dwellings and 3 in makeshift housing or farm huts (table 56).

Number of rooms in house

Seventy nine percent of farmers polled (55) live in two, three or four bedroom dwellings. Ten percent (7farmers) live in one bedroom dwellings and 0.2% or 2farmers live in dwellings of more than 5 bedrooms (table 57).

Length of time in dwelling

Most farmers reported occupying their dwellings for 25 years or more. The distribution of other categories is listed at table 58.

Main construction material

Steel reinforced concrete block construction account for the most popular building material for farmer's dwellings (50 farmers). Other materials are listed at table 59.

Other building materials

Tables 60 & 61 show the types of building materials for roofing and flooring used by farmers.

Ownership of dwelling

The majority of farmers (43 0f 70) reported owning their dwellings (table 62).

Other information

Tables 63 to 66 give other information on the farmers such as ownership/tenure of dwellings, possession of cell phones, presence of electricity and tap water in dwellings.

CONCLUSION

The Pilot provided an important collection of baseline data for the small farming communities in the fruit and vegetable growing belt of St. Elizabeth. The information gathered, collated and analyzed gives an insight into the lifestyles, resource needs and ways of conducting business.

HYPOTHESE TESTING

The two hypotheses to be tested by the pilot were tested and proven true in qualitative terms in that, in the first place, the farmers overwhelmingly agree that a greater portion of their produce could be saleable if proper post harvest practices were put in place. In table 52, the responses of farmers as to the most urgent technical assistance required are listed in priority as production techniques and post-harvest techniques. There is also the call among the farmers for the establishment of proper storage facilities.

For the second hypothesis, farmers, although now selling produce on their own, do recognize the need for a more organized system of marketing; one applying the formation of linkages and arrangements with other players along value chains for key produce. The farmers recognize the strengths to be developed in the market place securing safer marketing arrangements as the bases for enabling farmers to develop proper business plans and trading relationships. Table 49 shows that the vast majority of farmers in the sample are desirous of forging greater links with other members of the respective value chains.

PILOT STATUS

ACTIVITIES COMPLETED

To date most of the activities relating to the collection and analysis of data from farmers and value chain members have been completed. This report deals mainly with the detailed investigation of the selected farmers sub-group and the selected value chain members. The investigations of these two groups, in the interest of time, were done in the form of *focus group* discussions. This process provided the necessary information to indicate the most pressing needs of the farmers and the weaknesses of their farming and produce marketing activities. The demands and expectations of value chain members were also unearthed and the way forward made clear.

From these findings, the capacity building exercises were developed and executed. Our team is now in the process of setting up a mini project as part of the capacity building exercises. This project will help to bear out the sustainable impact of the training and materials provided for the group and will provide benefits into the future.

Further information will be gathered for use in the staging of the workshop for which we are now preparing.

FOCUS GROUP FINDINGS (FARMERS)

The farmers groups of 16 members drawn from the Brighton Farmers Productive Alliance were very receptive and eager to talk to our team and to say their part. Most members were very outspoken and were grateful for the opportunity to speak and have someone (of influence) listen.

As a result, they told it all, the chief cries being the high cost of farm inputs, lack of markets and the resulting poor prices received for farm produce. Farmers agreed to close ranks and keep their group together in order to benefit from group purchases, technical assistance, group marketing, strengthening their productive capacity, qualification for assistance, and above all, having a stronger voice in the agricultural sector.

The immediate needs stated by the farmers are:

(a) Assistance with farm inputs such as:

- Improved planting materials (seeds)
- Lower priced fertilizers and chemicals
- Hand tractor
- Hand tools
- Mist blower/spray pan

(b) Training and other technical assistance

c) Sustainable markets

(d) Farm credit

(e) Storage and/or Processing facilities

The information gathered from the farmers group was carefully studied and served to fashion the immediate capacity building activities to be undertaken under this pilot.

It was decided that a split of training and the provision of some small farm implements and materials would be provided.

CAPACITY BUILDING TRAINING

Training took the form of four one-day presentations and demonstrations and a one day farm tour to the Walkers wood farmers group in St. Ann, covering the areas of: (see appendices for outlines)

- General agricultural Practices
- Post-harvest practices
- The Farm as a Business
- One-day on farm tour

The first two areas were conducted on-farm while the third was done at a nearby facility (church hall) to facilitate the use of multimedia projector and other props.

The first training workshop was held on Tuesday, January 20, 2009 at Springvale, near Brighton, in the parish of St. Elizabeth. The presentation was on best practices in **"General Agricultural Practices".** There were 18 farmers in attendance, most being members of the group or relatives representing members who were unavoidably absent.

Figure 1

At left (***Figure 1***) Presenter Leslie Orr conducting training session with farmers at Springvale, St. Elizabeth.

Figure 2

At left is a section of group attending training session at Springvale (***Figure 2***).

The all day training was complete with presentation, lunch, question and answer session and an evaluation exercise by the participants.

The following day (Wednesday, January 21, 2009) the training session was held at another farm location in the same district (Springvale) but this time the topic was ***"Post-Harvest Practices".*** Again, an all day training session complete with evaluation exercise at the end.

Figure 3

Figure 3 at right shows presenter Errol Reid explaining the application of proper post-harvest practices.

The third area of training, ***"The Farm as a Business***" was divided into two one-day sessions conducted at the Brighton Church of God hall on January 23 and 30, 2009.

There were some 16 farmers in attendance and the presentation was well received, issues thoroughly ventilated and the usual evaluation done.

Figure 4

Figure v shows presenter Betty Davis making a point in Part 1 of her presentation on operating the farm as a business at the Brighton *Church of God* Church hall.

Part two of this session was conducted on January 30, 2009 at the same venue.

FARMERS' GROUP PROJECT

The training session on ***General agricultural Practices,*** delivered some useful information to the farmers in attendance. It became clear however, that most farmers were reluctant to change to some of the suggested ways (new ways) of carrying out some of the production techniques. Some farmers insisted that they have been doing business the same way for all their lives and did not wish to change now.

The main area of disagreement was to get farmers to start producing seedlings in proper nursery designated areas (protected areas) and using germination trays as against scattering

(broadcasting) the seeds in selected areas of the open field. The controversy was only settled the following day when farmers were shown an example of a germination tray with established seedlings.

Farmers were overwhelmed with the appearance and quality of the seedlings produced under proper nursery conditions. The group was urged to get involved in this method of seedling production and readily complied having seen it in action.

Figure 5

Figure 5 shows enthusiastic farmers examining a tray of 5-week old scotch bonnet pepper seedlings.

So great was the interest that it was decided to get the farmers to construct a nursery project as the tangible sustainable part of the capacity building exercises.

PROJECT DETAILS

The project consists primarily of constructing and equipping a nursery facility in the community by the farmers of the group. The farmers will be supplied a selection of improved quality seeds to generate seedlings for the project. It is envisaged that this nursery will not only satisfy the needs of the group but that of the wider community.

The seedlings to be produced by the nursery will be sold to farmers in order to generate income for the sustenance of the project. This nursery will be the first of its kind in the area and, from the reaction of the farmers, should be a welcome feature for farmers around.

The nursery building will be constructed of wooden structures and will measure 20 ft by 30ft. The top will be covered with transparent ultra violet filtering plastic and the sides fitted with shade cloth. Construction will include stands for holding seedling trays and appropriate walkways to allow easy access to same. Appurtenances will include seedling trays, and chemicals for medium mixture, watering can, seeds, and water tanks.

Technical assistance will also be required to guide the construction of the nursery as well as to train farmers and get production going.

Figure 6

*M*embers of the Brighton Farmers Productive Alliance showed here with presenter Errol Reid (right).

The project will be operated by a team to be selected by the group under the guidance of the consultant to be provided to the group.

The team will be responsible for all the nursery activities and will be required to keep records of all activities including financial statements. The overseeing consultant will get a monthly report from the nursery management team and will be required to do periodic evaluation of the project.

This arrangement will run for a period of three months after which the project should be managed fully by the group and function as a commercial entity fully sustainable.

Field Tour to Walkers Wood

A one-day visit and farm tour was undertaken on Tuesday March 3, 2009 as part our capacity building training exercises for the Brighton Farmers group. The touring team consisted of 15 farmers from the group, 2 RADA officers, members of the JGGA consulting team, and a few other interested parties. The team was hosted by the St. Ann parish operators (Walkers Wood Community Foundation) and the Walkers Wood Farmers group participating in the pilot.

Walkers Wood farmer, Wayne, making presentation to the visiting team from the St. Elizabeth Pilot

A member of the Walkers wood farmers group led us through a slide presentation of farming

activity in their area, including the use of their improvised version of greenhouses. The visiting farmers were pleased to know that low cost green houses could be constructed by the farmers themselves, at affordable costs using indigenous materials, and used to increase vegetable production.

Framers engaged in discussions on farming techniques and cost of production among other things, during and after the slide show presentation.

After the lunch break the farm tours were done and the spontaneous discussion sessions held at the various farm locations.

Demonstration of farming technique used in "improvised" green house at Walkers Wood.

In-field growing of lettuce, with application of plastic mulch, at Walkers Wood, St. Ann.

JGGA's Derrick Smith explains mite infestation in hot peppers at Walkers Wood.

VALUE CHAIN FOCUS GROUP

Most members of the value echoed the call for timely supplies of good quality products. Hotels, restaurant operators, exporters and processors expressed concerns as to whether farmers are complying with the requirements of HCCAP. Higglers and some supermarket operators were less concerned about this but, when asked, agreed that farmers should adhere to the rules.

The group all believe that farmers could be organized in a way as to reduce the incidence of gluts and scarcity although they are aware that the weather pattern, to a great extent, determines the cropping cycle.

Supermarket operators are concerned that some times the cream of the crop is sold to exporters and hotels thus only second rate products are offered to them.

Higglers are concerned that they have to select their product carefully if they are not able to attend the farm to have first take of the crop.

Hoteliers have to make firm contracts for supplies and are concerned that supplies are not always as expected. In the absence of adequate supplies hotels have to make arrangements to have the stuff imported and this res adequate lead time.

Processors are concerned about the erratic supplies of products and the long delay in obtaining licences for importation of raw materials.

Workshop Presentation

A parish workshop was held on Thursday February 18, 2009 in Black River, in the parish. All interested parties were invited to the presentations dealing with the purpose of the survey, persons affected by same, conduct of the survey, present status and the way forward. Persons invited included: Brighton's farmers group, JSIF personnel, RADA parish personnel, JAS parish personnel, JGGA president, survey implementation team, Members of Parliament for the parish (including the Minister of agriculture), St. Ann parish operators, public observers among other people.

The workshop was held at the River View Hotel on the outskirts of the town of Black River. The venue was fitted with adequate seating capacity and multimedia equipment for the presentation. The main presentation was done by the parish operators (JGGA consultants). JSIF project manager, Stephannie Hutchinson-Ffrench, presented the overview of the Pilot and the sponsors' involvement as well as the imminent implementation of REDI and its impact on the farming community.

Picture at left shows a section of the audience, at the workshop being addressed by Derrick Smith of the JGGA consultants.

Members of the audience were allowed adequate time to air their questions and voice their views on all aspects of the Pilot and the possible impact of same.

Picture shows a member of the Brighton's farmers Productive Alliance addressing the workshop. Seated at table are JGGA president, Len Blake and JSIF project Manager, Stephannie Hutchinson-Ffrench.

Picture at right shows a section of workshop audience showing Walkers Wood operators in the foreground

APPENDICES

Appendix 1

SURVEY DATA

Household Income

The majority of farmers in sample obtain 100% of their household revenue form farming their activities as shown in *Table 14.*

Table 14

Percentage of Household Revenue from Farm	Number of farms
<50	11
50	3
>50	25
100	31
Total	70

Farm Land & Inputs

Total size of farming operation

The survey showed that 61% of farmers in sample operate holdings with sizes ranging from one to five acres (Table 15).

Table 15

Farm Size	Number of Farms
< 1 acre	17
1 acre	7
1 – 5 acres	43
>5 acres	3
Total	70

Percentage of land Owned/Leased/Rented

Table 16 shows the number of farmers and the percentage of their holdings that is either owned, leased or rented

Table 16

Percentage of land operated	Owned	Leased	Rented	Other	Total
<50	6	2	1	0	9
50	2	2	0	0	4
>50	3	1	2	0	6
100	16	29	4	2	53
Total	27	34	7	2	70

Equipment used on Farm by Number of Farms

Farm equipment used on the farm by the number of farmers using same is tabled at *Table 17.*

Table 17

Equipment	Number of Farmers
Mist Blower	4
Knapsack sprayer	46
Spray pan	14
Hand Tools	70
Tractor	12

Access to Water

Farmers having access

Fifty three percent of farmers surveyed reported that their holdings had access to water for irrigation purposes *(Table 18*)

Table 18

Farmers having access to water at Farm: 37	Farmers with no access : 33

Farmers by Source of water

Table 19

Source of water for irrigation	Number of farmers
Tank	18
Spring	4
River	8
Piped water	13
Other source	2
Rainfall	37

Table 19 records the sources of irrigation water available to those farms reporting access to water.

Farmers by Distance from water source

Farmers not having access to water on or near their farms are recorded at Table 20 indicating the distance of their closest source of water to the farm.

Table 20

Distance from source	Number of Farmers
On Farm	4
< 0.5 mile	25
>0.5 mile	4

Farmers by irrigation system used

Table 21 lists the method of irrigation applied by farmers.

Table 21

Type of irrigation used	Number of Farmers
Piped Water	3
By hand	15
Rain	52
Total	70

Source of farm Inputs

All farmers reported buying some for of farm inputs from nearby farm stores while 6 farmers obtained some for of inputs from RADA and other organizations. Nine farmers reported getting some inputs from other farmers. *See Table 22.*

Table 22

Source of Inputs	Number of Farmers
Farm store purchases	70
RADA	2
Other Organizations	4
Other Farmers	9

Number of Plots Farmed

Farmers reported having many small plots mainly in an effort to fully utilize the available land on their holdings and also to capture an array of crops for home use and for sale. Table 23 shows the distribution of farmers by number of plots worked.

Table 23

Number of Plots Farmed	Number of Farmers
1	14
2	20
3	16
4	12
5	5
>5	3
Total	70

Plot Size Farmed

Majority of farmers occupy small holdings, one acre of less, while 21 farmers had farm sizes of between 1 to 5 acres (Table 24).

Table 24

Plot Size	Number of Farmers
<1 acre	23
1 acre	26
1 – 5 acres	21
Total	70

Satisfaction with area Occupied

Most farmers reported satisfaction with the size of the farm they presently occupy.

Table 25

Land Farmed	Number of Farmers
Farmers working enough land	69
Farmers working not enough land	11
Total	70

Crop Cycles

Crop cycles are becoming less well defined and conforming more with the occurrence of rainfall and the changing weather pattern. Farmers reported more that one cropping cycle but with no consistency from year to year.

Members of Farming Organizations

All farmers reported as members of one or sometimes more than one farmers' organizations.

Table 26

Organization	Number of Farmers
RADA	43
JAS	16
PMO	31
Other Farmers' Group	20

Awareness of Farmers' Organization in Parish

Most farmers are aware of the existence of more than one farmer's organizations operating the parish. RADA was the most popular organization quoted. See Table 27.

Table 27

Organization Known to Farmers	Number of Farmers
RADA	69
JAS	37
Other Organization (PMO's etc.)	34

Well Organized Farmers' Group

Most farmers reported RADA as the best organized farmers' organization operating in the parish Table 28.

Table 28

Farmers' Group	Number of Farmers
RADA	62
JAS	1
Other (PMO, Farmers' Group)	6
Don't Know	1
Total	70

Source of Technical Assistance

Fifty farmers polled indicated that they look to RADA for technical assistance. Thirty one farmers sought help from other sources while six farmers indicated "no source". See *Table 29.*

Table 29

Source	Number of Farmers
RADA	50
Other Sources (including Farmer Groups, PMO's, and other Farmers).	31
None	6

Sale of Crops

All farmers reported a resounding preference to sell their produce individually, Table 30.

Table 30

Sales Outlet	Marketed by		Marketing preference	
	Self (individual)	Farmers' Organization	Self (individual)	Farmers' Organization
Restaurant	4	0	1	0
Produce Hawker	63	0	63	0
Export agent	3	0	3	0

Price Setting

The market seems to dominate price setting for these farmers, followed by buyers then farmers and buyers together. The lowest number of farmers reported that they peg prices to the cost of production to the price asked, Table 30.

Table 30

Method	Farmers
Buyers	19
Farmers and Buyers	13
Farmers	8
Market	40
Cost of production	5

Competition among buyers

More farmers recognize that is competition among buyers than otherwise. See *Table 31*

Table 31

Yes : 40	No: 29	Don't know :1

Method of Payment for produce

Credit seems to be the most popular way of paying for goods by buyers among the farmers polled, cash ranked second and strangely, non payment is quite prominent.

Table 32

Method of payment	Number of Farmers
Cash	34
Credit (two weeks maximum)	50
Not at all	6

Price range of popular crops

Table 33 shows the highs, lows and average prices for the most popular crops grown in the area surveyed, *Table 33.*

Table 33

Crop	Minimum price paid (J$/lb)	Maximum price paid (J$/lb)	Average price paid (J$/lb)
Banana	250	300	200
Cabbage	20	60	30
Carrot	15	60	30
Cassava	8	10	9
Gungo peas	20	100	60
Peanuts	800/bu	1000/bu	950/bu*
Peppers	20	120	40
Sweet Potato	20	80	40
Yam	25	100	40

* Bushel

Problems encountered in getting produce marketed

Main problems encountered in marketing crops produced are recorded in Table 34 below.

Table 34

Problems encountered	Number of Farmers
Oversupply of produce (glut)	16
No Market	25
Fluctuating prices	5
High cost of transport	7
Bad roads	15
Non-payment for produce	3
None	4

Benefits of selling as an individual

Table 35 shows the farmers account of the benefits derived from individual sale of crops

Table 35

Benefit realized	Number of Farmers
Receive cash in hand	21
Get Better price	15
Better control of the business	10
Greater Satisfaction	11
Get publicity as a Farmer	10
None	3
Total	70

Challenges faced selling through farmers' organization

Table 36

Challenges faced	Number of farmers
Organization selects produce taken	9
Lower prices	18
Delay in payments	21
Cheque payments (cash preferred)	4
Unreliable	4
Non-payment	4
Farmer blamed for spoilage	4
No knowledge	13
None	14

Benefit of selling through farmers' Organization

Although farmers presently prefer to market produce themselves the still recognize the benefits of selling through a farmers' marketing organization. *Table 37* indicates the benefits stated.

Table 37

Benefits realized	Number of Farmers
Secure Market	47
Money sure	4
Proper storage of produce	8
Less work for farmer	6
Better price	2
Advice on production	1
No knowledge	7
No benefit	7

Most profitable crops and opportunity for selling more

Table 38 shows a summary of the farmers' idea of the most profitable crops grown in their area.

Table 38

Most Profitable crops	Number of Farmers
Yams	12
Gungo peas	1
Peanuts	14
Carrots	10
Cabbage	2
Potato	3
Dasheen	15
Peppers	5
Sweet peppers	1
Cucumbers	3
Bananas	2
Escallion	5
Tomato	4
Pineapple	9

Opportunity to sell more produce

Most farmers, in the sample, think that there is the opportunity to sell more produce at present, see Table 39.

Table 39

Opportunity to sell more produce			
Yes	No	Don't know	Total
51	14	5	70

Increasing profitability of less profitable crops

Table 40 gives the farmers' idea of how to increase the profitability of the least profitable crops now traded.

Table 40

Way of increasing profitability	Number of Farmers responding
Cheaper inputs	45
Proper storage facilities	7
Better crop care practices	15
Market availability	7
Access to greater credit facilities	3
More technical support	2
Better Prices	15

Transport

How produce is transported

Farmers mostly transport produce from field to nearest road on their heads or on donkeys to a lesser extent. The trip to market is usually by way of hired motor vehicles. Some farmers sell directly from the field and therefore incur no transport costs. *See Table 41.*

Table 41

Method of transportation	Number of farmers
On head	20
On Donkey	6
Bicycle	1
Motorbike	1
Own vehicle	2
Hired vehicle	24
None (sold in the field)	16

Produce lot size (weight) per trip

Produce is packaged and transported in various size lots; the most popular being used feed bags containing less than 50lb. of products at a time. *Table 42* shows the average distribution of package sizes (weight).

Table 42

Lot size (weight) in lb	Number of Farmers
<50	17
50 – 100	10
100 – 200	9
200 – 500	14
500 – 1,000	6
>1,000	4
N/A	10
Total	70

Transport cost per package handled

Table 43 shows the variation in transport cost according to the weight and size of the lot transported.

Table 43

Average cost per lot (J$)	Number of farmers
<500	23
500 – 1,000	11
>1,000	12
None	24
Total	70

Challenges faced in transporting produce

The main challenges faced in transporting produce to the market are shown in *Table 44.*

Table 44

Challenges faced	Number of farmers
Unavailability of transport	17
High cost of transport	13
Available space on transport	6
Bad Roads	20
Damage to produce	3
None	20

Packaging, Storage and Processing

Type and size of packaging

Weights and cost of packaging materials are recorded in Table 45.

Table 45

Type	Weight	Cost /package	Number of Farmers
Bags	< 50lb	J$ 50	34
Boxes	<50 lb	0	1
Plastic bags	<50 lb	J$120/pk of 100	1
No packaging	lot	0	34
Total			70

Type of Storage

Farmers surveyed mainly store produce at home in make shift barns or leave produce in the field until buyers arrive. The latter often leads to rotting, rodent damage, over maturity and other spoilage. See Table 46.

Table 46

Type of storage	Cost	Number of Farmers
On Farm (Home or in field)	$0	37
None (Crops sold direct from field)	$0	33
Total		70

Open ended questions

The following section deals with open ended questions asked of the farmers to get some feedback as to their thinking of the present status of small farming in their area. Questions asked also tried to evaluate their beliefs as well as their willingness to change their way of doing business

Solutions to Production Problems (requirements)

Table 47 lists the farmers' suggestions of possible solutions to production problems faced.

Table 47

Solution Required	Number of farmers
Cheaper Inputs	65
Proper Storage	1
Technical Assistance	4
Irrigation System	8
Working Capital	6
Assistance with Land Preparation	3
Assistance with Labour	4
None	1

Suggested solutions to marketing problems

Suggested solutions to marketing problems are shown at Table 48

Table 48

Solutions	Number of Farmers reporting
Market availability	65
Better prices	4
Better transportation system	5
Better Roads	8
Proper market intelligence	2
Group Marketing	1

Partnership with other members of the value chain

Table 49 indicates the status of the partnership existing between farmers and value chain members.

Table 49

Status of partnership	Number of Farmers reporting
Good	65
Poor	4
Fair	1
Total	70

Can people change things?

Farmer' impressions of whether or not they can change things are recorded at Table 50 below.

Can people change things	Number of farmers
Yes	66
No	3
Don't Know	1
Total	70

Type of inputs required (production, pre-harvest and post-harvest)

Farmers made suggestions of inputs required to support agricultural production as recorded at Table 51.

Table 51

Inputs	Number of farmers
Agricultural credit	19
Tools and equipment	39
Packaging material	25
Fertilizer and chemicals	14
Seeds and planting material	8
Storage	7
Tractor Service	7
Own vehicle	4
Processing plant	3
Donkey	2
Small harvester	1
None	2

Type of technical assistance/training required

Table 52 records the main type of technical assistance required by farmers.

Table 52

Type	Number of Farmers
Production techniques	54
Post harvest techniques	32
Marketing techniques	3
Farm management techniques	1
None	13

Access to credit

Most farmers reported the need for agricultural credit as outlined at Table 53. Only two farmers did not show any need for any credit.

Table 53

Do you need credit	Number f farmers
Yes	68
No	2
Total	70

Type of credit

Most farmers reporting credit needs opted for short term credit (possible crop lien) while 3 farmers preferred grants. Table 54 records.

Table 54

Type of credit	Number of farmers
Short term	65
Grant	3
Total needing credit facilities	68

Farmers' comments

Farmers got varied impressions of the purpose of the survey questionnaire and asked a number of questions mainly pertaining to their needs. Table 55 records the main questions.

Table 55

Comments	Number of farmers
When is assistance expected?	5
Am I qualified for a loan?	4
Are we getting some technical assistance?	
How do I apply for a loan?	4
Can I get a crop lien loan?	6
Are we getting some form of irrigation?	2
Can we get some storage facilities?	2
What about a processing facility?	1
No Response	1
	45
Total	70

Observations on housing

This section records the enumerator's observation of the farmer's dwelling, as well as, some questions to the farmer seeking to highlight the less visible aspects of his/her living conditions.

Type of dwelling by farmer household

Table 56

Type of dwelling	Number of farmers
Detached house	59
Multi-family house	8
Separate apartment	0
Improvised/temporary housing unit	0
Other (Farm huts)	3

Number of rooms in house

Table 57

Number of rooms	Number of farmers
1.	7
2	19
3	20
4	16
5	6
>5	2
Total	70

Length of time in dwelling

Table 58

Length of time in dwelling (years)	Number of farmers
<5	6
5 – 10	6
10 – 15	8
15 – 20	6
20 – 25	12
25 – 30	7
>30	25
Total	70

Main construction material

Table 59

Main material	Number of farmers
Brick	0
Concrete blocks	50
Unbaked brick, adobe	0
Wood/bamboo	16
Metal sheeting	1
Other (card board, hardboard, fibreboard etc.)	3
Total	70

Major roofing material

Table 60

Major roof material	Number of framers
Concrete	22
Metal Sheets	44
Tile	1
Other (thatch and other material)	3
Total	70

Primary material of the floor

Table 61

Primary floor material	Number of farmers
Wood	11
Tile	17
Linoleum	0
Concrete	40
Other (earth and improvised flooring)	2

Ownership of dwelling

Table 62

Owned by farmer	Number of farmers
Yes	43
No	27
Total	70

If no, who owns dwelling?

Table 63

Owner of dwelling	Number of farmers
Family member	10
Other persons (rented, leased etc.)	17
Total	27

Cell phone ownership

Table 64

Does H/H member owns cell phone	Number of farmers
Yes	68
No	2
Total	70

Does house have electricity?

Table 65

Electricity present	Number of farmers
Yes	55
No	15
Total	70

Does house have tap water?

Table 66

Tap water present	Number of farmers
Yes	46
No	23
No response	1
Total	70

Appendix 2 (Survrey questionnaire)

Jamaica Social Investment Fund (JSIF)/ World Bank

Agriculture Productive Alliance and Community Tourism (PACT) Project

SMALL FARMER PRODUCTIVE ALLIANCE PILOT PROJECT

PRODUCER QUESTIONNAIRE

GENERAL INFORMATION

HOUSEHOLD DATA

HOUSING

LABOR

FARM LAND & INPUTS

FARM PRODUCTION

ORGANIZATION OF PRODUCTION

MARKETING AND PRICES

TRANSPORT

PACKAGING, STORAGE AND PROCESSING

WRAP-UP OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS OR OBSERVATIONS ON HOUSING

GENERAL INFORMATION

Questionnaire completed by.....

Date.....

Name of respondent.....

Date of birth…….....

Gender: Male Female

Occupation.....
.....

Location of farm.....

Brief description of the farm
.....
.....
.....
.....

HOUSEHOLD DATA

How long have you been a farmer?

- Less than 5 years
- 5 - 9 years
- 10 - 19 years
- More than 20 years

What is the highest level of schooling completed?

- Primary
- Secondary
- Tertiary - College
- University
- None
- Other

What type of training or education have you completed to learn about farming or agriculture?

- University degree
- Academic courses (university, college)
- Courses sponsored by Ministry of Agriculture, farming organizations
- Formal apprenticeship

- Other (please specify)

Who lives in the household? What are the relationships among you?
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Have you made any investments in your agricultural business in the last 12 months?
- Yes
- No
- If yes, what were they - describe the nature of investment and how much you spent

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

LABOR

How many people work on the farm? (Self, family and any hired workers)
.....
.....
.....
.....

On average how much time do you and your family members spend working on farm production? (%)

Do you employ other people to help out in your operations?
- no (skip the next question)
- yes

If yes
- Number of full-time workers: for weeks / year during hours / week
- Number of part-time workers: for weeks / year during hours / week

How much of your time is spent on off-farm employment? (%)

What proportion of your household revenue is based on farming? (%)

FARM LAND & INPUTS

What is the total size of your farm? (Hectares or other, specify unit)
.....
.....

What percentage of your land is owned by you, or rented, or leased?

.....
.....

List the main pieces of equipment used on your farm?
.....
.....

Do you have access to water? Please explain (distance from farm, irrigation techniques)
.....
.....

Where do you get your inputs (seed, fertilizer, herbicides)?
.....
.....
.....

How many plots to do you farm? What is the size (ha) of each plot?

- Plot 1
- Plot 2
- Plot 3
- Plot 4
- Other plot(s)

Do you have enough land?

FARM PRODUCTION

Planting cycles? (Please indicate the approximate date of planting cycles)

- 1st cycle
- 2nd cycle
- 3rd cycle

Crops planted? (Please specify whether this is sole or mixed cropping)

	1st cycle	2nd cycle	3rd cycle
• Plot 1 Crop 1 Crop 2			
• Plot 2 Crop 1 Crop 2			
• Plot 3 Crop 1 Crop 2			
• Plot 4 Crop 1 Crop 2			
• Other plot(s) Crop 1 Crop 2 Crop 3			

What is the total production you get? (Per crop)

	1st cycle	2nd cycle	3rd cycle
• Plot 1 Crop 1 Crop 2			
• Plot 2 Crop 1 Crop 2			
• Plot 3 Crop 1 Crop 2			
• Plot 4 Crop 1 Crop 2			
• Other plot(s) Crop 1 Crop 2 Crop 3			

What are the crops that you sell and what are those you keep for yourself?

- Crops sold (type and quantities)
  .....
  .....
  .....
  .....
- Crops kept (type and quantities)
  ……
  ……
  ……
  ……

What is the cost of production for any two of the crops you just mentioned? Do you have an idea of the breakdown of these costs?
.....
.....
.....
.....

(Cultivation, seeds, fertilizer, irrigation, weeding and herbicides, pests and disease control, labour for seeding/planting, crop management, spraying, irrigation, harvesting, grading, packing)

ORGANIZATION OF PRODUCTION

Are you a member (or have you been in the past) of a farmers' organization?

- Yes
- No

- If yes, which one?
  .....
  .....
  .....

- If no, why not?
  .....
  .....
  .....

Name two farmers' organizations that currently exist in your parish.
.....
.....

Which of these farmers' organizations do you think is well organized/successful?
.....
.....

Where/ how do you get technical assistance (RADA, other agencies, input supplying, etc.)?
.....
.....
.....
.....

MARKETING AND PRICES

How do you get your crops sold? (Visit by buyer, take them to local market or hotel, etc.)
.....
.....
.....

To whom do you sell most of your produce? (Tick no more than two answers)

- Supermarkets
- Restaurants
- Hotels
- Processing plant
- Produce stand/hawker
- Other, please explain
  .....
  .....
  .....

Do you presently sell your crops as an individual or through a farmers' organization? (You can tick both)

- As an individual
- Through a farmers' organization

Do you prefer selling as an individual or do you prefer to sell through a farmers'

- As an individual
- Through a farmers' organization

How do you set your prices?

.....
.....
.....
.....

Is there competition between buyers?

.....
.....
.....
.....

When do buyers pay?

.....
.....
.....
.....

What are the usual prices or range of prices for 3 of the main crops you sell?

$/kg	Minimum	Maximum	Average
Crop 1			
Crop 2			
Crop 3			

(Average price, maximum and minimum prices, variability between season, price varies according to grade)

What are the main problems/ challenge you experience with getting your produce marketed?

.....
.....
.....

What are some of the benefits of selling your produce as an individual?

.....
.....

What are the challenges you know of or think you could face if they sold your produce through a farmers' organization?

.....
.....

What are some of the benefits of selling your produce through a farmers' organization?

.....

.....
.....

Which crops would you say are more profitable?
.....
.....
.....

Is there an opportunity for selling more products?
.....
.....
.....
How can the profitability of the less profitable crops be improved?
.....
.....
.....

TRANSPORT

How is transport organized and carried out?
.....
.....
.....
……
…….

What volumes are carried on each trip to the market?
.....
.....
.....
.....

What are the costs per package used for transporting produce to the different markets?
.....
.....
.....
.....

What are the transport problems faced?
.....
.....
.....
.....

PACKAGING, STORAGE AND PROCESSING

Type and size of packaging material, and how much does it cost?
.....
.....
.....
.....

Storage arrangements, if any. Where, how and by whom? (on farm, cooperative, farmer group, in market, by end user, type, cost)
.....
.....
.....
.....

WRAP-UP OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

What are solutions to the production problems/ challenge you face for production?
.....
.....
.....
.....

What are solutions to marketing problems/ challenge do you face?
……
……
……
……

How would describe your partnerships with other actors in the value chain?
.....
.....
.....

Do you feel that people like yourself can generally change things in your community if they want to?
……
……
……
…….

What kind of equipment and investments do you need in production, post-harvest and pre-market?
……
……
……
……

What type of technical assistance or training do you think you need in production, post-harvest and pre-market operations?
……
……
……
.....

Do you need more access to credit? If so, what kind?
Any other comments or questions?……



……
……

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS / OBSERVATIONS ON HOUSING (IF TIME PERMITS)

What type of dwelling is it?

1=Detached house,
2=Multi-family house,
3=Separate apartment,
4=Improvised (inc. temporary) housing unit,
5=other (please specify)

How many rooms?

How long has your household been living in this dwelling? .....

What is the main construction material of the external walls?

1=Brick,
2=Concrete blocks,
3=Unbaked brick, adobe,
4=Wood/Bamboo
5=Metal sheeting,
6=other (please specify)

What is the major material of the roof?

1=Concrete,
2=Metal sheets,
3=Tile,
4=Other (please specify)

What is the primary material of the floor?

1=Wood,
2=Tile,
3=Linoleum,
4=Concrete,
5=Other (please specify)

Is this dwelling owned by the respondent?

- No
- Yes

If no, who is the owner of the dwelling?

Does someone in your household own a mobile phone?

- 0=No
- 1=Yes

Does the house have electricity?

- 0=No
- 1=Yes

Does the house have tap water?

Appendix 3

PROPOSALS FOR CAPACITY BUILDING ACTIVITIES

The capacity building activities to be undertaken with the Brighton Farmers group in St. Elizabeth will cover training in the following areas:

1. The farm as a business
2. Post harvest practices
3. General Agricultural practices

Three presenters have been selected to cover the three areas named above. The JGGA has prepared outlines for these presentations and consultants have been invited to submit proposals for the required services in this regard.

The proposals have been received and analyzed and the persons chosen for the respective topics are now preparing the relevant materials to do the training presentations. We are hoping, with your agreement, to do the training during the week of January 18 to 22, 2009.

We have reserved two venues in the community for purposes of carrying out the training sessions. Training props (computer, projector, screen etc) have also been secured for the sessions.

Proposals have also been received for the provision of lunches for the participants in the training sessions. One provider has been selected.

Training will be done in three one day sessions each consisting of a pre-lunch presentation and demonstration session and a post-lunch demonstration, question and answer and wrap up session. The relevant models, handouts, material and other appurtenances will be provided to make the most effective delivery possible in the existing facility.

THE FOLLOWING SECTION SHOWS THE TRAINING OUTLINES, LETTERS OF INTEREST, RESUMES, FINANCIAL AND PROPOSALS OF TRAINING PRESENTERS.

JSIF/WB PROJECT

CAPACITY BUILDING WORKSHOP FOR SMALL FARMERS

TRAINING OUTLINE

1) RECORD KEEPING
   a) Importance of record keeping
   b) Elements of record keeping
   c) Methodology
   d) Business Papers
   e) Features of Business Papers
   f) Recording Sheets/Books
   g) How to calculate Profit

2) BUSINESS PLAN DEVELOPMENT
   a) Knowing what you want to do &
   b) How to get it done *"if you don't know where you are going any road will take you"*

3) INTRODUCTION TO BUSINESS MANAGEMENT (this incorporates aspects of the outline set out above)
   a) Goal Setting
   b) Arranging inputs human and other resources
   c) Providing the necessary hands-on leadership
   d) Monitor and follow-up

4) FINANCIAL PLANNING & MANAGEMENT
   a) Budget
   b) Outflows (expenditure)
   c) Inflows (Income)
   d) Savings
   e) Statutory Deductions

5) IDENTIFYING BUSINESS IDEAS
   a) Best Practices

6) Market Identification & Marketing
   a) Identify Segment(s) to be served
   b) Develop Plans to adequately serve segment (customer needs & expectation)
   c) Delivering produce on time

7) PRODUCT COSTING & PRICING
   a) Seasonality (Glut or Scarcity)
   b) What pricing strategy being used (Cost Recovery/Percentage Mark-up)
   c) Competition

JSIF/WB PROJECT

CAPACITY BUILDING TRAINING

IMPROVED FARMING PRACTICES

SESSION OUTLINE

Emphasize that one has to follow the" ***path of productivity and profit***".

1. Preliminary Evaluation – water, disease and weed control, market, soil test etc.
2. Land Preparation
3. Seed selection
4. Nursery preparation and sowing seeds
5. Care of seedlings
6. Transplanting seedlings
7. Irrigation program
8. Nutrition program
9. Begin pests and disease sampling
10. General Crop care(pest and disease control programme
11. Cleaning the edges of the plot.
12. Reaping crops (timing, correct method, packaging and storing etc.)
13. Removal of old plants and soil treatment after reaping.
14. Preparing for the new crop (timing, crop rotation etc.)
15. A word on general farm management

JSIF/WB PROJECT

CAPACITY BUILDING TRAINING

POST_HARVEST PRACTICES

SESSION OUTLINE

The Training session will focus on the following:

1. Introduction – It is estimated that post- harvest loss in Jamaica is as high as 50%. Good post harvest handling preserves good quality, it cannot make poor quality good quality. Good quality means money for everybody.
2. Essential Post harvest hand ling equipment.
3. Food Safety
4. Crop Post Harvest handling and Market Requirement
5. Post harvest storage
6. Packaging
7. Customer relations

BETTY E. DAVIS, B.Sc. (HONS), MBA
4 Roehampton Drive, Kingston 19

Telephone (876) 925-0224, 844-9556
bettymcdavis@yahoo.com

January 8, 2009

Mrs. Stephanie Hutchinson-Ffrench
Project Manager
Jamaica Social Investment Fund
1c-1f Pawsey Road
Kingston

Dear Madam

Thanks for inviting me to submit a proposal to participate in the capacity building workshops for small farmers.It is my pleasure to confirm my interest in participating in the programme.

I bring to the table 28 years experience in the financial sector with a great deal of emphasis on the small business sector. I am from a farming community and background and was engaged in the farming of traditional crops until 2006 when I entered into greenhouse production. I am currently a Consultant/ Trainer with the Jamaica Business Development Centre (JBDC).

I have a keen interest in contributing to the development of **MSMEs** in Jamaica.

Yours faithfully

Betty Davis

BETTY E. DAVIS, B.Sc. (HONS), MBA

4 Roehampton Drive, Kingston 19
Telephone (876) 925-0224, 844-9556
bettymcdavis@yahoo.com

SPECIAL SKILLS
Decision-making, Team-building, Marketing, Credit & Delinquency Management, Facilitator in Human Resource Management & Customer Service

AREAS OF INTEREST
General & Financial Management, Business Risk & Loan Administration, Project Management

MAJOR ACHIEVEMENTS

St. Catherine Co-operative Credit Union Limited
Received commendation from the Board of Directors for creating new loan products, significantly increasing the loan portfolio & membership while improving service delivery and reducing delinquency to within industry standard

New Era Finance Limited
Doubled the loan portfolio at the Constant Spring Branch within fourteen months

Workers Bank
Regularised the Bank of Credit & Commerce International (BCCI) portfolio during the turbulent melt down of the financial sector

Professional Secretaries Association
Instrumental in drafting the constitution for the Caribbean Professional Secretaries Association

EXPERIENCE
Currently:
- An Associate with **Human Resource Associates** (Consultants in Training & Organizational Development)
- Greenhouse Farmer
- Consultant – Jamaica Business Development Centre

St. Catherine Co-operative Credit Union
Operations Manager (also acted as General Manager) 2004-2008

New Era Finance Limited
Manager, Constant Spring & Spanish Town Branches 2001-2004

City of Kingston Co-operative Credit Union
Loans Co-ordinator 1997-2001

Workers Bank
Positions included Assistant Manager (Main Branch) 1980-1997
Assistant to the General Manager,
Legal & Board Recording Secretary

-2-

-2-

GOVERNMENT OF JAMAICA 1974-1980

Positions included Secretary to the Chairman, Office of the Services Commission
Secretary to the Deputy Registrar of Co-operative Societies
Secretary to the Director of Personnel – Ministry of Agriculture

LECTURER – CPS Course (Office Technology) 1985-1986
Institute of Management & Production (IMP)
& Priory Adult College of Education (PACE)

Prepared transcript of tapes (Medical & Clinical) for: 1984-1987
University of the West Indies (Mona)
Industrial Disputes Tribunal

EDUCATION

Master, Business Administration (MBA) 2001-2003
Nova South Eastern University

Bachelor of Science (Management Studies) Honours 1987-1992
University of the West Indies (Mona)
GCE A'Levels: Economics & Accounts 1984-1985
Diploma – Certified Professional Secretary (CPS) 1981-1983

ADDITIONAL TRAINING

ST CATHERINE CO-OPERATIVE CREDIT UNION
Corporate Governance, Project Management, Risk Management, Micro Lending, Financial Markets, Disaster Planning

WORKERS BANK
Financing, Lending, Lease Financing, FAMAS Operational Instructions
Credit Appraisal Techniques (CAT)
Management Trainee Programme (1 year)

Two-year Paralegal Training Course accredited by the Council of Legal Education of the West Indies

AFFILIATIONS

Direct Member	Jamaica Agricultural Society	2005-present
Member	Jamaica Greenhouse Growers Assn (Finance Ctte)	2007-present
Member	Kiwanis Club of South St. Catherine	1997-present
Admin Co-ordinator	Interchurch Health Ministries	1998-2000
Member PTA	St. Andrew High & Munro College	1997-2004
Counsellor & Co-ordinator	The Aids Hospice, Kencot, in association with Bethel Baptist Church	

HOBBIES

Reading, Water sports, Travelling, Meeting people

References: Available upon request

Financial Proposals

Betty Davis

1. Research, preparation and presentation of training session on ***"The Farm as a Business"***

Presentation		$ 16,000
Travelling 280 kM @ $35/kM		$ 9,800
	Total	$ 25,800

2. Research, preparation and presentation of training session on ***"Post harvest practices"***

Presentation		$ 19,000
Travelling 250 kM @ $35/kM		$ 9,800
	Total	$ 28,800

3. Research, preparation and presentation of training session on ***"General Agricultural practices"***

Presentation		$ 17,600
Travelling 250 kM @ $35/kM		$ 9,800
	Total	$ 27,400

LESLIE C. ORR
2 GREAT HOUSE BOULEVARD, MONA, KINGSTON 6; PHONE: 847-6014

January 5, 2009

Mr. Ewan Barrett
Jamaica Greenhouse Growers Association
RADA Building
Caledonia Road
Mandeville
Manchester

Dear Mr. Barrett,

Re: Small Farmers Capacity BuildingTraining Sessions

I write to express my interest in providing services for training in all three areas of capacity building training as set in the outlines received. I have attached my resume as well as financial proposals for all three outlined.
Thank you for inviting me to quote on the project and I look forward to working with your organization.

Yours Sincerely

Leslie Orr

LESLIE CONSTANTINE ORR

2 Great House Boulevard
Mona, Kingston 6
Tel: (876) 847-6014

Objective: *To contribute to your organization by utilizing the experience and knowledge gained in Project Management, Team Leadership, Economic Analyses, Database Management, Planning and Project Implementation and to increase its productivity and profitability.*

EXPERIENCE

January 2003 to August 2007 - Ministry of Agriculture and Lands

- Consultant - in Agriculture and Agro-related Industry - Ministry of Agriculture and Land.

August 1991 – January 2002 - Urban Development Corporation

Responsible for managing the following Projects:

- Christian Pen Site and Services Department
- Caymanas Estate Development
- Cave Hill Housing Development
- Whitfield Town Post Office
- University Hospital of the West Indies – Polyclinic Construction
- Bluefields Upper Level Road Construction
- Retirement Settlement Development
- Ocho Rios Storm Water Outfall Pipeline
- Hellshire Waste Stabilization Ponds
- Whitehouse Fishing Village

October 1988 – Dec. 1990 – All Island Banana Growers Association
Chief Executive Officer

- Formulate policies and objectives of the organization in conjunction with the Board of Directors.
- Develop operational plans/budgets and programmes
- Monitor the actual performance in relation to budget/targets, through periodic financial and operational plans, reports and initiate the necessary corrective actions
- Communicate the operational performance to the Board of Directors periodically and recommend any changes in policies, strategies, to achieve the objectives.
- Attend Board and Committee meetings, represents the Banana Growers in joint industrial council and other forum as required.
- Negotiate and follow-up with the Government/financial institutions for loans, advances, subsidies, etc and ensure proper administration of funds.

- Negotiate all major purchases and contractual agreements, which have a significant financial or operation implication on the Association.
- Review and approve, prior to release, all important financial data and reports to the Directors, Government, financial institutions and media.

September 1986 – June 1988

- Engaged in Private Business

January 1985 – May 1986 – Agro 21 Corporation Limited
Acting Director of Finance

The control and management of Agro 21's financial operation including:

- To ensure the availability of adequate funding, maintain control and accountability of retained funds.
- The approval of invoices for payment and the preparation of monthly, quarterly and annual statements of expenditure, using the computer and manual systems.
- The analysis and evaluation of the financial models of Investment Projects, as presented to Agro 21 by investors (foreign and local).
- Administer special project funds, i.e. USAID Special Funds.
- Liaise with funding agencies on matters of finance for project related needs, i.e. Agricultural Credit Bank, Commercial Banks, National Investment Bank, United States Agency for International Development (USAID)/Jamaica) and the Government of Jamaica.

June 1984 – January 1985
Counterpart Director of Finance

- General, financial and administrative duties
- Work on special projects emphasizing technical and financial analyses.

June 1983 – May 1984 – Project Analysis & Monitoring Co. Ltd. (PAMCO)
Senior Project Analyst

- Monitoring the implementation and evaluating he stage of progress of on-going projects (these and public sector projects with multi-million dollar expenditure and which appears on Government of Jamaica Capital Budget

September 1981 – August 1982

- Engaged in private business

1980 – June 1981 – Jamaica Development Bank
Senior Project Supervisor (Projects Division)

- Supervise the implementation and evaluation of industrial and agricultural projects.
- Collect performance records on projects, so as to create and effective feedback system and maintain a dynamic data bank for future projects preparation.
- Provide extension and advisory service to clients in agro-industrial and other projects.

1977 – 1980

- Preparation, appraisal and evaluation of agro-industrial projects

1964 – 1969 – Ministry of Agriculture
Area Extension Officer

- Provide advisory services to small farmers
- Administer subsidy disbursement to small farmers within supervised areas under the Farmers' Development Programme (FDP) – A government of Jamaica Programme

EDUCATION

1979 – 1984 - University of the West Indies (Mona)

- Post Graduate Diploma in Management Studies

1973 – 1975 - University of Maryland (College PK)

- B.Sc. Degree in Agricultural and Resource Economics

1961 – 1964 - Jamaica School of Agriculture

- Diploma in Agriculture

1957 – 1960 - Holmwood Technical High School

- Certificate in General Education

SPECIALIZED TRAINING

May – June 1989 - The Netherlands Universities Foundation on International Cooperation (NUFFIC)

- Project Management and Implementation

Held: The Hague, Netherlands

April – June 1978 – Agro Industrial Project Course

- Project Appraisal, Planning and Implementation

Sponsored by:

- The Economic Development Institute of the World Bank
- The Caribbean Development Bank
- The Inter-American Development Bank

Held: Wildey, St. Michael, Barbados, W.I.

Award: Fellow of the Economic Development Institute of the World Bank (EDI)

REFERENCES:

1. Mr. Ewan Barrett
Mercury Gardens, Spanish Town P.O., St. Catherine
Ph: 943-0642

2. Mr. Len Hutchinson
4 Hillman Avenue, Kingston 8
Ph: 925-2422

3. Mr. L. Ramdial
National Works Agency
Tel: 815-1280

Financial Proposals L. C. Orr

1. Research, preparation and presentation of training session on ***"The Farm as a Business"***

Presentation		$ 18,000
Travelling 280 kM @ $35/kM		$ 9,800
	Total	$ 27,800

2. Research, preparation and presentation of training session on ***"Post harvest practices"***

Presentation		$ 17,800
Travelling 280 kM @ $35/kM		$ 9,800
	Total	$ 27,600

3. Research, preparation and presentation of training session on ***"General Agricultural practices"***

Presentation		$ 16,000
Travelling 280 kM @ $35/kM		$ 9,800
	Total	$ 25,800

ERROL G. L. REID
KITSON TOWN POSTAL AGENCY, ST. CATHERINE
PH: 292-0011, email: errol_reidcara@yahoo.com

January 6, 2009

Mr. Ewan Barrett
Jamaica Greenhouse Growers Association
RADA Building
Caledonia Road
Mandeville
Manchester

Dear Mr. Barrett,

Re: Small Farmers Capacity Building Training Sessions

Thanks for your invitation to submit a proposal to participate in capacity building workshops for small farmers. I use this opportunity to confirm my interest in participating in this programme.
My experience working with farmers the farming community span over thirty years during which I made significant contribution to the growth and development of the sector.
My background therefore, equips me to make a valuable contribution to the development of the small farming sector.

Yours Faithfully,

Errol G. L. Reid

ERROL G.L. REID

OBJECTIVES



To achieve meaningful sustainable change to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of business and to impact positively the lives of persons with whom I come into contact.

EXPERIENCE

2004 – March 2008 **National Solid Waste Management Authority, 61 Half-Way-Tree Road, Kingston 10**

Regional Operations Manager *Jan. – Oct. 2004*
Commercial Services Manager *Oct. 2004 – March 2008*
Customer Relations Manager *Oct. 2004 - 2007*

- Responsibility for developing and maintaining commercial business islandwide
- Responsibility for developing and maintaining good customer relations with consumer public

March – September 2002 **Antilles Chemical Company, 96 Marcus Garvey Drive, Kingston 15**

Vice President, Marketing & Sales

- Responsibility for promoting domestic and regional fertilizer sales

1994-2002 **Racadam Agri-Supplies & Services, Morant Bay, St. Thomas**

Managing Director

- Contributed to the agricultural development in St. Thomas
- Under my stewardship the company was the leading agricultural supplies store in St. Thomas for four (4) consecutive years

1979–1993 **Master Blend Feeds, Old Harbour, St. Catherine**

Sales Manager *1988-1993*
Sales Supervisor *1984 -1987*
Technical Sales Representative *1979 - 1983*
Employees' Representative on MBF Board of Directors *1980-1984*

- Increased regional sales from $25 million to $350 million
- Managed sales team of four (4) Technical Sales Representatives, one (1) Sales Supervisor and ten (10) Distribution Salesmen
- Implemented training courses for new recruits

1974–1979 **Jamaica Development Bank**

Credit Supervisor

- Provided supervision to borrowers on sound management of their farming operations

1974 **Ministry of Agriculture, Hope Gardens, Kingston 6**

Sectorial Specialist

- Responsible for food crop production in Jamaica

EDUCATION

1967–1970 **Jamaica School of Agriculture**

- Diploma in Agriculture

1970–1973 **University of the West Indies, St. Augustine**

- B.Sc. Agriculture (Hons.)

Institute of Management and Production

- Certificate in Financial Management

RELIGION

Christian

EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

- Chairman and Founder of Cotton Tree Development Committee
- Chairman of Bath Junior High School 1998 - 2001
- President – St. Thomas Chamber of Commerce 1998 - 2002
- Member of Board of Wilmington Primary School 1998 - 2002
- Member of Board of Directors of St. Thomas P.C. Bank 1997 - 2001
- Member of Board of Lyssons Primary and Junior High School 1998 - 2002
- Director – Tides of Time Outreach Project to pioneer development in Danvers Pen, St. Thomas

HOBBIES

Swimming, fishing, farming and reading

REFEREES

Available upon request

Financial Proposals

Errol G Reid

1. Research, preparation and presentation of training session on ***"The Farm as a Business"***

Presentation		$ 18,000
Travelling 250 kM @ $35/kM		$ 8,750
	Total	$ 26,750

2. Research, preparation and presentation of training session on ***"Post harvest practices"***

Presentation		$ 15,500
Travelling 250 kM @ $35/kM		$ 8,750
	Total	$ 24,250

3. Research, preparation and presentation of training session on ***"General Agricultural practices"***

Presentation		$ 17,600
Travelling 250 kM @ $35/kM		$ 8,750
	Total	$ 26,350

Appendix 5

LIST OF FARMERS IN ATTENDANCE

Name	Address	Phone #	Group Member (yes/no)
1 Everton Lindo	Clifton, Brighton P.O.	565-5865	yes
2 Ryan Daley	Brighton P.O.	399-8403	Yes
3 Dorret Stone	Clifton, Brighton P.O.	343-8930	Yes
4 Victor Williams	Brighton P.O.	403-3011	Yes
5 Lynval Mc Kenzie	Clifton, Brighton P.O	482-1595	Yes
6 Austin Stone	Clifton, Brighton P.O	373-1402	Yes
7 Verna Stone	Clifton, Brighton P.O	412-6257	Yes
8 Tony Johnson	Brighton P.O.	844-7944	Yes
9 Debbie Mc Kenzie	Clifton, Brighton P.O	856-8729	Yes
10 Natalie Mc Kenzie	Clifton, Brighton P.O	465-2809	Yes
11 Henley Samuels	Brighton P.O.		Yes
12 Hector Bailey	Brighton P.O.		Yes
13 Patricia Taylor	Brighton P.O.	310-4755	Yes
14 Vesta Mannings	Brighton P.O.		Yes
15 Ira Black	Brighton P.O.	874-1516	Yes
16 Anidia Warren	Springvale, Brighton P.O.	447-0912	Yes

Appendix 6

Training Evaluation Form
Brighton's Farmers Productive Alliance – St. Elizabeth



Please take a few minutes to answer the following evaluation questions. Your response will help in improving future training sessions. Place a tick in the box below your answer.

1. Overall, how did the training achieve the following goals

   a. Did you get a good understanding of proper agricultural practices?

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

   b. Did you gather different ideas of farming best practices?

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

   c. Did you get an understanding of different methods of crop production?

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

2. You will use the information received today on your farm and to teach other farmers as well.

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

3. Training should be done on a regular basis as new ideas are developed.

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

4. Training should be expanded to include RADA officers.

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

5. Other farmers should be exposed to this type of training.

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

6. Training will improve the way I farm

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly

				Disagree

Comments:_____
_____
_____

Appendix 7

PROGRAMME

NCDP II Pilot Survey Workshop
Bridge House Inn
14 Crane Road
Black River
February 18, 2009

Registration:	9:00: AM - 9:30 AM
Chairman:	Derrick Smith - Coordinator (JGGA)
Prayer:	Rev. Henley Samuels, Brighton Farmers Group
Welcome:	Lenworth Blake - Pres. JGGA
Message /Greetings:	Hon. J.C Hutchinson - MP
Project Overview:	Mrs. Stephannie Hutchinson-Ffrench – Project Manager JSIF
Project Report:	Ewan Barrett - Consultant (JGGA)

Question and Answer & Discussion session

Vote of thanks:	President - Brighton Farmers' Productive Alliance Group

Lunch

Departure