

SUST Journal of Agricultural and Veterinary Sciences Journal homepage: <u>http://journals.sustech.edu</u>



# Farmers' Perception of Training Needs, Recommended Technical Packages and Constraints of Production of Main Crops in Gezira Scheme, Sudan

Abdel Gader A. M. Khalid<sup>1\*</sup>, Musa H.E. Ahmed<sup>2</sup> and Badawi K. H. Khalifa<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Planning and Coordination Administration, Gezira Scheme, Sudan. <sup>2</sup>Faculty of Agricultural Science, University of Gezira, Wad Medani, Sudan. \*Corresponding author e-mail: <u>agaderkhalid@yahoo.com</u> Article history: Received: 02/10/2013 Accepted: 30/01/2014

# Abstract

The identification of the problems and constraints preventing farmers from increasing their productivity is essential for getting the real solution of low productivity. The main objectives of this study were to see how farmers perceived their training needs, their level of awareness and adoption of the technical packages of the main crops and how they identify constraints responsible for their low productivity in Gezira Scheme. Seven irrigation divisions were selected randomly from 21 irrigation divisions (Wad Elnaw, Wad Elbur, Tabat, Kab Elgidad, Shalaie, Wad Elmansi and Gaboja). A questionnaire was designed to collect the required data by using random sample technique from 395 farmers. The information was collected during the period from April to July 2010. The data were statistically analyzed using the statistical package for social science (SPSS) to calculate frequency, percentages, mean and standard deviation. A Likert scale was used to see how farmers perceive their training needs and how they identify constraints responsible for their low productivity. The study revealed that the level of adoption was relatively low and far less than the level of awareness for the recommended agricultural packages regarding the adequate use of water, removal of crops residues, uses of sprayer and plant spacing. The study showed that the farmers rank irrigation problems at the top followed by pests and diseases, insufficient agricultural inputs, increase of costs of production, problems of harvest and post-harvest processing, agricultural finance problems, inadequate agricultural marketing, lack of extension services and insufficient number of extensionists, management problems and finally problems of storage. Based on the findings, there was a strong need to provide farmers with sufficient credit inputs supply, marketing information and to raise the capacity of farmers on irrigation water management, farm management and in different subjects related to their needs to develop skills, upgrade knowledge and bring positive change among farmers to increase productivity.

Keywords: farmers perception, training needs, production constraints

# © 2013 Sudan University of Science and Technology. All rights reserved

# Introduction

Generally perception has been seen as the process by which people receive information or stimuli from their environment and transform it into psychological awareness (Oladele, 1998), however perception are effected directly by education level, experience and exposure to mass media. Training is an essential resource, which will direct knowledge and skills towards improving production. Extension and training are very important for farmers and they play a major role in building farmers capacities, raising their awareness and providing them with modern knowledge aiming at enhancing their performance to achieve their ultimate goal of development (Al-shadiadeh, 2007). Elfaki and Khalid (2013) reported that the majority of Gezira Scheme farmers affirmed that training as a learning process was very important. In addition, the majority of them preferred practical oriented methods (field demonstration and field days) as training methods that can help in acquisition of new skills.

reviewed Literature showed that agricultural productivity increases more in developed countries compared to less developed countries. This is due to high investment in research and development, labour, land and capital as well as the improvement in the use of inputs such as fertilizers and machinery. According to Chang and Zepeda (2001), labour productivity in China increased by 4.13% whilst that of the United States was by 7.16% during 1987-1994. Hayami and Vernon (1971) hypothesized that the productivity agricultural gap among countries is based on differences in the prices of modern technical inputs in agriculture and differences in the stock of human capital capable of generating a sequence of innovations, which enables agriculture to move along the Meta production function in response to changes in factor and product price relationships.

agriculture is essential Modern for economic development. Employing modern agriculture is possible when farmers are provided with credit for purchasing modern inputs such as seeds, fertilizer etc (Schultz, 1964; Yusuf, 1984; Zuberi, 1989). Many developed countries have recognized the benefits of using modern farm technology. however, application of modern farm technology to increase agricultural output has increased financial needs of farmers. Easy and cheap credit was found to be the quickest way for boosting agricultural production and resulted in an increase in agricultural productivity of small farmers

(Siddiqi *et al.*, 2004; Abedullah *et al.*, 2009; Saboor *et al*, 2009). The impact of credit, fertilizers, seeds, and irrigation on agricultural production was found to be positive and significant (Zuberi, 1983, 1989; Iqbal *et al.*, 2001, 2003; Waqar *et al*, 2008).

In spite of the vast flat land, availability of gravity irrigation, sufficient scientific knowledge, still the Gezira Scheme suffers from low agricultural productivity. The Scheme is at present performing significantly below its potential yields. Cropping intensities are disappointing, and irrigation efficiency is low. There is a wide gap between average yields of all crops grown in the Gezira Scheme in farmers fields compared to that of research station plots. Average yields of the Gezira Scheme of cotton, sorghum, groundnuts and wheat in the period of 2000/001 to 2007/008 were 4.27 guintal/fed, 0.90 ton/fed,0.8 ton/fed and 0.79 ton/fed, respectively. Compared with yields obtained by Gezira Research Sstation in the same period for the same crops which were 18 quintal/fed, 1.9 ton/fed. 1.5 ton/fed and 1.4 ton/fed respectively (Gezira Scheme, 2009; Khalid, 2012).

Many studies (Elfaki, 2000; Suleman 2004; Banaga et al., 2008) had revealed that the main problems and constraints responsible for low productivity in Gezira Scheme were inadequate availability of agricultural inputs quality, quantity term of and (in affordability of prices), irrigation water management, pest and disease management, financing, lack of extension services, marketing and problems of harvest and post harvest processing.

The main objectives of this study were to see how farmers perceive their training needs, their level of awareness and adoption of the technical packages of the main crops and how they identify constraints responsible for their low productivity in Gezira Scheme.

# **Materials and Methods**

# **Population and sample:**

This study was conducted in the Gezira Scheme; it is located between the Blue and White Nile (Latitudes  $13^{\circ} - 30^{\circ} - 15^{\circ} 15^{\circ}$  N and longitudes  $32^{\circ} 30^{-} - 33^{\circ} 30^{-}$  E). The Scheme has a sum of 132,000 farmers, for administrative purposes it is divided into 21 irrigation division. Seven irrigation divisions were selected randomly from (21) irrigation divisions (Wad Elnaw, Wad Elbur, Tabat, Kab Elgidad, Shalaie, Wad Elmansi and Gaboja). The random sampling technique was used. Accordingly, a proportion sample of 395 farmers was randomly selected from the total number of farmers (50555) in the selected irrigation divisions according to size of farmers in each irrigation division. The sample 0.78% out of the total population of the selected divisions. The respondents from each selected division were (57, 53 60, 59, 56, 59, and 51 respectively).

The formula used (Israel, 1992)

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2} = \frac{50555}{1 + 50555(.05)^2} = 395$$

Where:-

N = Total population (50555)

n = Sample size

e = Standard error = 0.05

A questionnaire consisting of fifteen auestions was developed covering questions about farmers' preference of training, the level of awareness and adoption rate of technical packages of the main crops, pest and disease management practices and production constraints in the Scheme. The personal interview technique was used to implement the questionnaire. The survey for collecting the data was carried out during April-July 2010. The collected data were statistically analyzed and interpreted by using the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS).

1) Descriptive analysis (frequencies, percentage, mean and standard deviation) were used to assess the level of awareness and adoption rate.

- 2) Comparison method was used to find out knowledge and practices gap.
- 3) A Likert scale was used to determine the training needs areas and constraints responsible for low productivity.

Three point scales were categorized according to their mean scores. Responses on three point a Likert-scale with mean scores of 1.50 and above were classified as major problems and constraints, those with a mean score of 1.0 < 1.5 were classified as moderate problems and constraints, while those with a mean score less than 1.0 were classified as minor problems and constraints.

# **Results and Discussion**

Farmers' preference of training needs areas: Results (Table 1) shows that the training needs of farmers in order of priority were seed production, technical packages, water cost return, distribution and management of water, agricultural extension activities, agricultural marketing and processing of agricultural product was very high. Corresponding mean values of those levels of needs (approximated to two decimal numbers) were 1.75, 1.67, 1.67, 1.60, 1.58, 1.58 and 1.58, respectively. On the other hand, the training needs of the farmers in the field management, storage, pests and diseases, agricultural plan, agricultural finance, agricultural insurance, and women and rural youth were found medium with corresponding mean values of 1.49, 1.49, 1.34, 1.33, 1.25 and 1.18. These findings indicated that the areas in which farmers expressed training needs are very relevant to knowledge and skills required for executing training programs as well as responding to farmers' needs

| Training needs areas                            | Weighted | S.D  | Training needs |
|---|----------|------|----------------|
|   | average  |      | level          |
| Seed production                                 | 1.75     | 0.64 | High           |
| Water cost return                               | 1.67     | 0.56 | High           |
| Technical packages                              | 1.67     | 0.64 | High           |
| Distribution and management of irrigation water | 1.60     | 0.67 | High           |
| Agricultural marketing                          | 1.58     | 0.63 | High           |
| Agricultural extension                          | 1.58     | 0.77 | High           |
| Processing of agricultural product              | 1.58     | 0.54 | High           |
| Pest &disease                                   | 1.49     | 0.58 | Medium         |
| Field management                                | 1.49     | 0.76 | Medium         |
| Agricultural plan                               | 1.34     | 0.88 | Medium         |
| Agricultural finance                            | 1.33     | 0.72 | Medium         |
| Storage of crops                                | 1.29     | 0.71 | Medium         |
| Agricultural insurance                          | 1.25     | 0.76 | Medium         |
| Women and rural youth development               | 1.18     | 0.76 | Medium         |

#### Table 1: Distribution of farmers according to their opinion about training needs

Source: Field survey (2010)

\* According to a Likrt scale, the training needs were high when the mean value is more than 1.5.

Awareness of technical packages of the main crops:

# Importance of application of agricultural recommendations and improved seed and knowledge of sowing date:

Table 2 reflects that the majority of farmers (87.1%) mentioned that the application of agricultural recommendation is very important for increasing their agricultural productivity. It also raveled that the vast majority of the farmers (93.9%) were aware of the recommendation regarding sowing of improved seeds, and their importance to

increase the agricultural productivity. The data in table (2) again showed that farmers sowing date knowledge for the main crops was high except for groundnuts with corresponding values of 91.6%, 99.0%, 82.2% and 48.8% for cotton, dura, wheat and groundnuts, respectively. This result indicates that there is a knowledge gap, which requires designing training program to be filled especially for groundnuts sowing date.

| Items  | Frequency | Percent |
|--|-----------|---------|
| The impact of application of agricultural recommendation:                            |           |         |
| Those who said very important  | 344       | 87.1    |
| Those who said important   | 51        | 12.9    |
| Those who said was not important   | 0.00      | 0.00    |
| Importance of improved seed:   |           |         |
| Those who said important   | 371       | 93.9    |
| Those who said was not important   | 24        | 6.1     |
| Recommended sowing date:   |           |         |
| Cotton   | 372       | 91.6    |
| Sorghum  | 391       | 99.0    |
| Groundnuts   | 193       | 48.8    |
| Wheat  | 225       | 82.2    |
| Recommended plant spacing:   |           |         |
| Cotton   | 202       | 51.2    |
| Sorghum  | 238       | 60.2    |
| Groundnuts   | 322       | 81,1    |
| Recommended fertilizer dose:   |           |         |
| Sorghum  | 115       | 28.8    |
| Cotton   | 160       | 40.4    |
| Groundnuts   | 141       | 35.7    |
| Wheat  | 221       | 55.9    |
| Tomato   | 166       | 42.0    |
| Onion  | 128       | 32.4    |
| Adequate uses of irrigation water:   |           |         |
| Those who were aware   | 290       | 74.5    |
| Those who were not aware   | 105       | 26.5    |
| Impact of removal of crops residues in reducing the incidence of pests and diseases: |           |         |
| Those who were aware   | 330       | 85.0    |
| Those who were not aware   | 65        | 15.0    |
| Chemical side effects:   |           |         |
| Those who were aware   | 270       | 68.4    |
| Those who were not aware   | 125       | 31.6    |
|  |           |         |

# Table 2: Frequencies distribution and percentages of farmers according to their awareness of technical packages of the main crops

Source: field survey 2010

# Knowledge of recommended plant spacing and dose of fertilizers:

The data in Table 2 again reflects that 81.1%, 60.2% and 51.2%, of the farmers are aware of the recommended plant spacing in groundnuts, cotton and dura, respectively. The results indicated that there is a relatively high need for training on plant spacing packages especially for cotton and dura. The result in Table 2 also showed that 55.9%, 42%, 40.4, 32.4% and 28.8% of the farmers were aware of the recommended fertilizer dose for wheat, tomato, cotton, onion and sorghum, respectively, which

means that the awareness of farmers of the recommended dose of fertilizers to increase yield was very low particularly for onion and sorghum. Therefore, there is a need to organize training programs considering the recommended dose of fertilizers for the different crops.

### Adoption of some practices of crop production and pests and diseases management:

The results in Table 3 indicates that only 43.8%, 41.8%, 40.5%, 40.5%, 32.9% and 11% of the farmers always practice pest and

disease management, removal of crops residues, rouging, adequate use of water, use of sprayer and correct plant spacing, respectively. Therefore, the results indicated that the farmers' practices in the areas tested were very low which necessitates more extension coverage to bridge the skill gaps regarding those practices. The results in the same Table showed that 47.9%, 39.4% and 12.7% of the farmers used knapsack, plant leaf branch and sweeper, respectively. Also, the results in Table 3 indicated that 52.1% of the farmers were not using the recommended equipment (Knapsack). Therefore, more training and extension work is needed to teach them the recommended spraying equipments and how to protect themselves from side effects of pesticides. The results in Table 3 showed that 45.8%, 44.9% and 9.3% of the farmers mentioned that they start spraying when the pests effects appear, protective spraying and at economic threshold, respectively. This also reflected a need to plan training programs to increase farmers' adoption rate of the recommended time of spraying.

Table 3: Frequencies distribution and percentages of farmers according to their adoption of some practices for crop production and pests and diseases management

| Items   | Frequency | Percent |
|---|-----------|---------|
| Some practices for crop production:                   |           |         |
| Plant spacing   | 45        | 11.0    |
| Uses of sprayer                                       | 130       | 43.8    |
| Pest and disease management                           | 173       | 32.9    |
| Adequate uses of water                                | 160       | 40.5    |
| Rouging   | 160       | 40.5    |
| Removal of crops residues                             | 165       | 41.8    |
| Spraying equipments used:                             |           |         |
| Plant leaf/branch                                     | 84        | 39.4    |
| Broom   | 36        | 12.7    |
| Knapsack sprayer                                      | 102       | 47.9    |
| Using protective clothes and masks during spraying to |           |         |
| avoid chemical side effects :                         |           |         |
| Those who used  | 59        | 27.8    |
| Those who did not use                                 | 153       | 72.2    |
| Start of spraying:                                    |           |         |
| Protective spraying                                   | 128       | 44.9    |
| When the pests effects appear                         | 130       | 45.8    |
| At economic threshold                                 | 26        | 9.3     |

Source: field survey 2010

**Variation between level of awareness and level of adoption of some recommendations:** Some studies (Adeniji *et al*, 2007; Muhammad, 2009) had revealed that the level of adoption was far less than the level of awareness. Tables 2 and 3 showed similar results for the awareness and adoption of adequate use of irrigation water, plant spacing of the main crops grown in Gezira,

removal of crop residue and side effects of pesticides with corresponding values of 75.5%, 64.2%, 85% and 64.4% for awareness and 40.5%, 11%, 48.8% and 27.8% for adoption, respectively. The intensive practical oriented extension coverage will probably be one of the solutions that may increase the adoption rate to match the level of awareness.

Farmers' response towards factors and constraints responsible for low productivity: The identification of the constraints of high productivity is essential for getting the real solution of low productivity. In this regard, the data in Table 4 showed that the farmers rank irrigation problems at the top followed pests and diseases, shortage bv of agricultural inputs, increase of costs of production, problems of harvest and postharvest processing, agricultural marketing, agricultural finance problems, lack of extension services, management problems and finally problems of storage. The results about the constraints responsible for low productivity in this study were in line with the result reported by Banaga et al. (2008).

In a similar farmer perception study in Gezira Scheme carried out in 1998, farmers ranked irrigation problems first followed by lack of inputs, lack of credits, marketing problems, lack of extension and lack of labors. respectively (Elfaki 2000).The Scheme management should consider farmers perception regarding constraints preventing farmers from increasing their productivity and make all the necessary arrangements to remove constraints and help farmers to boost their productivity and ultimately lead to the increase of Gezira Scheme contribution in the national economy.

 Table 4: Distribution of farmers according to their apprehension of problems and constraints of production

| Agricultural problems areas in priority        | Mean | St.d | Rank order |
|--|------|------|------------|
| Irrigation problems                            | 1.98 | .13  | 1          |
| Pests and diseases                             | 1.92 | .34  | 2          |
| Lack of agricultural inputs                    | 1.90 | .31  | 3          |
| Increase of cost of production                 | 1.74 | .54  | 4          |
| Problems of harvest and post-harvest processes | 1.66 | .65  | 5          |
| Inadequate agricultural marketing              | 1.67 | .55  | 6          |
| Agricultural finance problems                  | 1.61 | .51  | 7          |
| Lack of extension services                     | 1.46 | .56  | 8          |
| Management problems                            | 1.19 | .50  | 9          |
| Storage problems                               | 1.03 | .65  | 10         |

Source: field survey 2010

# **Conclusions and implications**

Half of the 14 areas tested for training needs were perceived by famers as highly needed, while the need for training for the rest was seen as medium. Application of the recommended technical packages was perceived as very important by the vast majority of farmers. Awareness of most of the technical packages was generally high. However, the level of adoption was raging between low and very low. Ranking of production constraints was found to be more or less similar to previous studies headed by irrigation problems, pests and diseases and lack of inputs.

# References

- Abedullah, N. M., Khalid, M. and Kouser, S. (2009). The Role of Agricultural Credit in the Growth of Livestock Sector: A case study of Faisalabad Pakistan Vet. J., 29(2): 81-84.
- Adeniji, O.B., Atala, T.K. and Ogungbile, A.O. (2007). Adoption of improved cotton production technologies in Katsina State, Nigeria. *Journal of Applied Sciences* 7: 397-401.

- Al-shadiadeh, A.N.H. (2007). Descriptive study of the training needs for men and women farmers in semi desert areas: A case study of South Jordan. *World Applied Sciences Journal* **2** (1): 12-21.
- Banaga, A. M., Elfaki, M.H., Ibraheem, I.
  M. (2008). The Gezira Scheme Training and Capacity Building Technical Committee. Training Needs Assessment for Gezira Scheme Farmers and Staff Report. Barakat, Gezira Scheme, Sudan. (In Arabic)
- Chang, H. and Zepeda, L. (2001). Agricultural Productivity for Sustainable Food Security in Asia and the Pacific: The Role of Investment. FAO Corporate Document Repository, originated by: Economic and Social Development Department.
- Gezira Scheme. (2009). Planning and Socioeconomic Studies Unit Report. Barakat, Sudan.
- Elfaki. M. H. (2000). Agricultural Extension and Agricultural Research Linkages in the Sudan with Special Reference to Gezira. Ph.D Thesis. University of Gezira. Wad Medani, Sudan.
- Elfaki, M. H. and Khalid, A. A. (2013). Determination of training needs for water users associations in Gezira Scheme, Sudan. *Gezira Journal of Agricultural science*, **11** (1): 123-134.
- Hayami, Y. and Vernon, W. R. (1971).Agricultural Development: An International Perspective. The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore and London.
- Iqbal, M.; Azeem khan, M. and Munir, A. (2001). Determinants of higher wheat productivity in irrigated Pakistan. *The Pakistan Development Review*, **40** (4): 753–766.
- Khalid A.M. (2012). Determination of Training Needs for Gezira Scheme Farmers. Ph.D Thesis University of Gezira. Wad Medani, Sudan.
- Muhammad. I. (2009). Training Needs Assessment of Cotton Growers to Meet the Challenges of WTO by Maintaining Cotton Quality in the Punjab (Pakistan). Department of

Social Sciences. University of Agriculture, Faisalabad, Pakistan.

- Oladele, J.O. (1998). Fundamentals of Psychological Foundations of Education (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Handbook for Education student and Teachers Johns-Lad Publishers Ltd. Lagos.
- Saboor, A., Maqsood, H. and Madiha, M. (2009). Impact of micro credit in alleviating poverty: An insight from rural Rawalpindi, Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal life social science* **7**(1): 90-97.
- Schultz, T. W. (1964). *Transforming Traditional Agriculture*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Siddiqi, M., Wasif, M., and Kishwar, N. B. (2004). Institutional Credit: A Policy Tool for Enhancement of Agricultural Income of Pakistan. *International Research Journal of Arts and Humanities.* **37**
- Suleman , S. A. (2004). Towards Generalization of the Agricultural Insurance Services in the Sudan. Sudan Currency Printing Press. Khartoum, Sudan. (in Arabic)
- Yusuf. M. (1984). Farm Credit Situation in Asia. Asian Productivity Organization, Tokyo, Japan, Pp455–494
- Zuberi, H.A. (1989). Production Function, Institutional Credit and Agricultural Development in Pakistan. *The Pakistan Development Review* 28:1 Pakistan Institute of Development Economics, Islamabad
- Zuberi, H. A. (1983). Institutional credit and balanced growth: A case study of Pakistan. *Journal of Economic Development* **8** (2):167-184
- Waqar. A, H. Zakir, M. S. Hazoor and H.Ijaz. (2008). Impact of agricultural credit on growth and poverty in Pakistan (time series analysis through error correction model), *European Journal of Scientific Research.* 23 (2): 243-251.

رؤية المزارعين لاحتياجات التدريب، الحزم التقنية الموصى بها ومعوقات الإنتاج للمحاصيل الرئيسية بمشروع الجزيرة، السودان

> عبد القادر أحمد محمد خالد<sup>1</sup>، موسي هجو الفكي أحمد<sup>2</sup> و بدوي خالد حاج خليفة<sup>2</sup> <sup>1</sup> إدارة التخطيط والتنسيق، مشروع الجزيرة، السودان. <sup>2</sup> كلية العلوم الزراعية، جامعة الجزيرة، السودان. **المستخلص**،

التعرف على المشاكل والمعوقات التي تحد من تحقيق أعلى انتاجية من الأهمية بمكان لإيجاد الحلول لمشكلة تدنى الإنتاجية هدفت الدراسة لمعرفة مدي وعى وادراك المزارعين لإحتياجاتهم التدريبية، المستوي المعرفي وتبنى الحزم التقنية للمحاصيل الرئيسية وإمكانية التعرف على المعوقات التي تؤدي لتدنى الإنتاجية بمشروع الجزيرة. تم إختيار (7) أقسام ري عشوائيا من جملة 21 قسم ري بالمشروع (ودالنو،ودالبر، طابت، كاب الجداد، شلعي، ودالمنسى وقسم ري قبوجة). تم تصميم إستبيان لجمع المعلومات المطلوبة باستخدام تقنية العينة العشوائية البسيطة بحجم عينة لهذه الدراسة 395 مزارع. تم جمع البيانات الأولية بواسطة الإستبيان في الفترة من أبريل - يوليو 2010. وتم تحليلها باستخدام برنامج الحزم الإحصائية للعلوم الاجتماعية (SPSS) لحساب التكرارت، النسب المئوية ،المتوسط والانحراف المعياري كما تم استخدام a Likert لتحديد احتياجات التدريب للمزار عين ومعرفة مقدرتهم على تحديد المشاكل والمعوقات الأساسية التي تؤدي لتدنى الانتاجية بالمشروع. كشفت الدراسة ان تبنى الحزم التقنية الموصى بها ضعيف جداً مقارنة مع المستوى المعرفي للمزارعين وخاصبة فيما يتعلق بالإستخدام الأمثل لمياه الري ، از الة مخلفات المحاصيل، إستخدام الر شاشات لتطبيق المبيدات و المسافة بين النباتات على التوالي. كما كشفت الدراسة عن وعي وادراك المزارعين للمشاكل التي تتسبب في تدنى الإنتاجية وأن مشكلة ادارة الري تأتى على قمة المشاكل تليها مشكلة الأمراض والافات، عدم كفاية المدخلات، إرتفاع تكاليف الانتاج، مشاكل الحصاد وعمليات مابعد الحصاد، مشاكل التمويل، مشاكل التسويق، ضعف الخدمات الإر شادية وقلة عدد المرشدين، المشاكل الإدارية وأخيراً مشكلة التخزين. إستنادا على هذه النتائج ظهرت الحاجة القوية لتزويد المزارعين بالمدخلات الكافية، معلومات السوق ورفع قدرات المزارعين في مجال إدارة مياه الري، إدارة الحقل في المجالات المختلفة المتعلقة باحتياجاتهم لتطوير مهاراتهم وزيادة معارفهم لإحداث التغيير المرغوب وسط المزارعين لزيادة الإنتاجية.