



COMPONENT 1

ESTABLISHING SEED CANE NURSERIES ON SMALL HOLDINGS

Component Leader: Malcolm Bennett-Easy Sugar Industry Research Institute Kendal Road, Mandeville Jamaica

OBJECTIVES

The main objectives of the Nursery Cane project were to:

- 1. improve viability and sustainability of the smallholder in sugar cane by improving access to new improved cane varieties
- 2. expedite the delivery of improved high yielding, disease resistant varieties to growers on small holdings
- 3. facilitate more rapid multiplication and distribution of newer varieties across the industry
- 4. ensure that seed cane supplied to growers was obtained from pure stand nurseries

Background

Sugar cane varieties are the foundation on which the Jamaican industry is built. At any given time there may be thousands of varieties at various stages of development and in commercial production. Typically, there are some two dozen varieties achieving the status of being grown on more than 1% of cane area. A new variety comes through the 10-12 year testing process and is released to the industry every 3-4 years. The new variety brings with it the potential for productivity increases, pest and disease resistance and various desirable agronomic traits deemed suitable for increased performance thus enhancing farm viability.

Traditionally, the release and multiplication of new varieties occurred exclusively on major estates. Small cane growers usually encountered difficulties in immediately accessing these newer varieties. They were often left to the expedience of continuing to grow older varieties that were declining in productivity until the newer varieties were grown in abundance. The CFC nursery cane project was specifically designed to change those circumstances and place the small cane grower on an equal footing with major estates. It was felt that productivity gains from use of newer varieties would go some way towards improving the smallholders' viability.

Varieties for the Jamaican industry are bred mainly by the West Indies Central Sugar Cane Breeding Station (WICSCBS), located in Barbados but jointly funded by Jamaica and other members of the Sugar Association of the Caribbean (SAC). Progeny of breeding in the form of true seed (or fuzz) is sent annually to the Sugar Industry Research Institute (SIRI) for local evaluation for the Jamaican industry. SIRI also occasionally conducts its own small breeding initiatives. This project coincided with the release of a very promising high yielding variety, J9501, which emerged from SIRI's crossing programme. This variety, along with others such as BJ8532, BJ8534, BJ82156, BJ7839 and BJ78100 which originated from the WICSCBS were to form the main plank of this nursery cane project.

METHOD

The approach employed by SIRI in establishing Component 1 nurseries was as follows:

SIRI Extension Agronomists identified reliable farmers with the aptitude and track record in cane growing and an attitude of cooperation which involved closely following recommendations. Land preparation was done under the supervision of SIRI Extension personnel.

The component leader then provided the recommended varieties for establishment of the nurseries, often between 1 and 4 ha in size.

The main sources of varieties for the project were Primary Nurseries, previously established on the SIRI experiment farm









Fig. 1: J9501, Variety bred by SIRI which featured prominently in CFC nursery project

at Springfield in the parish of Clarendon and on major estates. From these locations, SIRI, in its capacity as PEA, was able to establish Secondary Nurseries on small holdings across the industry. Nurseries were grown and maintained under specific guidelines developed by the PEA, Exhibit1. Once the PEA deemed the material to be satisfactorily grown and suitable for use as seed cane, SIRI's Extension agronomists then assisted the growers in finding markets. Participants were obliged to return to the project an equivalent quantity of seed cane as received to establish plots. Some growers nonetheless displayed reluctance to return the appropriate quantity of seed cane. Seed cane made available to the PEA in this way was then used to establish other plots. First preference for sale of seed cane from these nurseries was to other smallholders in that particular cane farming district. When that need was satisfied then the remaining seed was made available to whoever was in the process of cane planting and was prepared to purchase planting material.

With the focus being on smallholders, the CFC project ensured that such farms were in the forefront of propagation of the new elite cultivars available to the industry.

Accomplishment

During the course of the project Secondary nurseries totaling 79.03ha were established. This fell short of the original target which was set with greater expectation of farmer cooperation than encountered and without anticipation of the onslaught of hurricanes. For instance, it was expected that farmers could be relied on to inject much higher levels of inputs than turned out to be the case. More resources from the Fund were therefore utilised in plot preparation and maintenance than planned. This limited the number of plots that could be set up.

Nurseries established yielded approximately 2768 tonnes seed cane which would have gone a long way in complementing seed cane from other sources for the 2007-2008 replanting seasons. The value of this seed cane is calculated to be approximately US\$81,500. An important noticeable feature was that both agronomic and cultural practices on farms where

Fig. 2: Dibbled top planting of CFC nursery ensures good field population on smallholders plot

nursery projects were established were improved over previous years and this resulted in increased levels of productivity and potential earnings.

The enthusiasm for cane growing was noticeably spurred in farmers who visited these plots on field days. Although farmers now have greater access to elite varieties they have since been making increasing requests for expansion of the project.

Major estates and farms also became indirect beneficiaries of seed cane produced by smallholders under the programme, although they were not the prime targets as the CFC project tended to fill a void in nursery cane production for the industry as a whole.

The elite varieties multiplied were J9501, BJ78100, BJ8532, BJ8534, BJ7938 and BJ82156

The nurseries planted during the 3-year period, are presented in Table1. Although considerable effort was made to ensure that nursery plots were





AGREEMENT for DEVELOPING SEED CANE NURSERY Between the GROWER and the SUGAR INDUSTRY RESEARCH INSTITUTE (SIRI) under the CFC PROGRAMME

| /We(hereafter called the grower) located atin the parish ofdo hereby agree the following terms and conditions for participating in a seed cane nursery project. |
|---|
| TERMS AND CONDITIONS |
| The grower agrees to allocatehectares of land deemed suitable for seed car growing upon inspection by the grower and SIRI Extension Agent. |
| 2. The grower agrees to prepare land, ensuring adequate tilth, to the creation of furrows. Furows may be drawn in a narrow row format to maximize production |
| 3. The grower agrees to plant only varieties supplied by SIRI and where supplying is nece sary, only seed of the same variety may be used |
| The grower agrees to provide fertilizer, herbicides and other essential inputs necessary for proper field establishment and cane growth |
| The grower agrees to maintain a very high standard of field husbandry for the entire life the nursery |
| The grower agrees to allow the agents of SIRI free access to the nursery |
| 7. The grower will rogue stools of varieties not true to type so as to maintain varietal purity |
| 3. Cutting of seed cane will commence after 6-7 months |
| The grower agrees to cut and make available to SIRI an equal quantity of seed cane a received in establishing his/her nursery. |
| The grower will make provision to sell the remainder of seed cane or use the seed cane in his/hown planting programme. |
| The grower will sell ratoon nursery seed cane at 6-7 months. |
| The certification of the nursery will expire after 4th harvest. |
| Grower: |
| SIRI: |
| Date: |
| This project is being financed by the Common Fund for Commodities, an intergovernmental financial instit |

Exhibit 1: Grower Contract with PEA for Participating in Nursery Cane Project

tion established within the framework of the United Nations, headquartered in Amsterdam, the Netherlands.







Fig.3: CFC seed cane nursery, Rhymesbury,

Clarendon

Fig. 4: CFC Clarendon 4: CFC Seed Cane Nursery, Ebony Park

equitably planted in all five agroecological areas a higher number was planted in the irrigated and wet west areas as these were the areas most actively engaged in replanting. In the Wet East ecological zone, for instance, there was almost no replanting activity among farmers.

Challenges Encountered

Implementation of this component of the Project was affected by several challenges namely:

- 1. Inability of many growers to adequately finance essential operations for proper maintenance and development of plots. This was an overriding obstacle to achieving the projected targets in 2007 especially.
- 2. Drought during the early part of 2005 and 2006 impeded land preparation and planting
- Established nurseries were 3. setback (stalk breakage, lodging, severe scouring) by hurricanes in 2004 and 2006
- Lack of appropriate field 4. equipment affecting preparation in some regions







Fig. 5: Four month old seed cane nursery, Westmoreland





Table 1: Growers name, location, plot size, variety and date planted 2004-2007

(Yield of seed cane estimated at 7-8 months). Factory processed canes are actual yield.

| Grower | District | Plot size (ha) | Variety | Date Planted | End Use | Estim. Yield (tc/ha) |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Eason | Shrewsbury | 1 | BJ8532 | May (05) | Seed cane | 40 |
| Jackson | Grange Hill | 2.4 | BJ8532 | June (05) | Sugar processing | 77 |
| Raymond | Haynes | 2 | BJ78100 | April (05) | Seed cane | 80 |
| Lieba | Chapleton | 1 | BJ78100 | May (05) | Seed cane | 40 |
| S Williams | Upper Clarendon | 1 | BJ78100 | May (05) | Seed cane | 42 |
| E. Clarke | Upper Clarendon | 1 | BJ78100 | May (05) | Seed cane | 40 |
| A. Rose | Upper Clarendon | 1 | BJ78100 | May (05) | Sugar processing | 44 |
| K. Salabie | Burnt Savannah | 2 | BJ8532 | June (05) | Sugar processing | 78 |
| Suberon | Delveland | 0.5 | BJ8532 | June (05) | Sugar processing | 68 |
| Retreat | Retreat | 1 | BJ8532 | May (05) | Sugar processing | 64 |
| D .Glashen | Content | 0.75 | J9501 | June (05) | Sugar processing | 66 |
| A. Sangster | Galloway | 1 | BJ8532 | May (05) | Sugar processing | 74 |
| L Hanna | Four Paths | 4.05 | BJ8532 | Jan (04) | Seed Cane | 79 |
| Dr Baugh | Content | 2.3 | J9501 | Jan (04) | Sugar processing | 75 |
| K Evans | Rhymesbury | 2.83 | BJ8532 | Jan (04) | Sugar processing | 72 |
| Ebony Park | Ebony Park | 2.40 | BJ8532 | Jan (04) | Sugar processing | 78 |
| J Logan | Tollgate | 0.80 | BJ78100 | May (07) | Seed cane | 56 |
| Sybron | Content | 0.45 | BJ8532 | Jan (04) | Seed cane | 18 |
| S Morgan | Pennant | 1.2 | BJ78100 | Feb (04) | Seed cane | 48 |
| O Golding | Chapleton | 1.2 | J9501 | Feb (04) | Seed cane | 50 |
| Advance Farm | Hampton (Tilston) | 2.5 | BJ8532 | Feb (04) | Factory processed | 75 |
| D. Stanford | Lakes Pen | 4.0 | BJ8532 | Mar (04) | Seed cane | 120 |
| Curtis Ext farmer | March Pen | 2.5 | BJ78100 | Mar (04) | Factoy processed | 65 |
| J. Plummer | Content | 8.3 | BJ78100 BJ8252 | Mar (04) | Factoy processed | 66 |
| Eda Barham | Bogue | 1.2 | BJ8252 | April (04) | Factory processed | 74 |
| Box | Barton Isle | 4.0 | BJ8252 BJ78100 | May (04) | Factory processed | 70 |
| D Stanley | Braes River | 2.0 | BJ82102 | June (04) | Factory processed | 60 |
| Mark Watson | Bogue | 1.2 | BJ82102 | June (04) | Factory processed | 60 |
| Lennie Rhoden | Sheffield | 1.8 | BJ82156 BJ78100 | June (04) | Factory processed | 70 |
| D. McFarlane | Burnt Savannah | 1.8 | BJ78100 BJ82156 | June (04) | Factory processed | 70 |
| Robinson | Golden Grove | 1.0 | BJ8532 | June (04) | Factory processed | 74 |
| Retreat | Retreat | 5.5 | BJ8252 | June (04) | Factory processed | 72 |
| Hubert Baker | Braes River | 1.0 | J9501 | June (05) | Factory processed | 63 |
| T. Moo-Pen | Bogue | 0.5 | BJ8534 | Feb (05) | Factory processed | 77 |
| W. Green | Bogue | 0.75 | BJ78100 | Feb (06) | Factory processed | 68 |







| Table 1: Growers name, location, plot size, variety and date planted 2004-2007 (contd.) | | | | | | |
|---|---------|-------------|---------------|--------------|---------------------------|-----|
| Lebert Forbes | Elim | 0.75 | BJ8532 | Feb (06) | Factory processed | 63 |
| C Smith | Elim | 0.75 | BJ78100 | Feb (06) | Factory processed | 66 |
| C Hinds | Content | 2.0 | BJ8534 | Mar (06) | Factory processed | 80 |
| Advanced Farm | Tilston | 1 | BJ8534 | Mar (06) | Seed cane | 50 |
| Irving Clarke | Pennant | 0.75 | BJ78100 | April (06) | Seed cane | 35 |
| Bimbo Rodriquez | Elim | 1 | BJ78100 | April (06) | Factory processed | 65 |
| V. Palmer | Elim | 2 | BJ78100 | June (06) | Stood over | 80 |
| Total | 79.03 | | | | | |
| | 1 | and 2006. T | he vields for | 2007 were no | t available for this repo | rt. |

The estimated seed cane production from 79.03ha planted is 2768 tonnes with an estimated value of \$5,536,000.

| Table 2: Secondary Nurseries planted in different agro ecological zones for years 1, 2 & 3 | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| Ecological Zone | Year 1 Area Planted (ha) | Year 2 Area Planted (ha) | Year 3 Area Planted (ha) | Total Area Planted (ha) | | |
| Wet West | 17.50 | 9.40 | 5.25 | 32.15 | | |
| Irrigated | 20.50 | 18.33 | 3.55 | 42.38 | | |
| Wet East | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | |
| Dry north coast | 2.5 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | | |
| Total | 41.5 | 27.73 | 9.8 | 79.03 | | |

The irrigated area accounted for the highest number of plots planted over the three-year period while there was hardly any replanting activity outside the major estate in the wet East, Table 2. Seed cane generated by the nurseries had a considerable impact on the supply of seed cane available to Estates and farmers. However, the anticipated quantity was not used for planting, because of low replanting levels in the industry over the duration of the project. Instead, much was taken to maturity and processed for sugar in factories. There was a marked increase in productivity levels (tc/ha) on all project farms as reflected in Table 3. The increased yield achieved was attributed largely to improvements in agronomic and cultural practices that were influenced by activities in the nurseries.

| Table 3: Productivity before and after establishment of nurseries on participating farms in each agro-ecological area | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|--|--|--|
| Agro-ecological area (Project farms) | Yield tc/ha before installing project | Yield tc/ha after installing project | % change in Yield | | | |
| Wet West | 62 | 74 | 19 | | | |
| Irrigated | 56 | 67 | 19 | | | |
| Wet East | 75 | 78 | 4 | | | |
| Dry North Coast | 65 | 75 | 15 | | | |

Lessons learnt

- * An effort to boost seed cane production comes to naught unless there is a complementary coordinated cane planting programme.
- Sugar cane growers will respond positively to programmes that have the potential to improve productivity on their holdings.
- * A more vigorous and stringent approach should be pursued to ensure that growers adhere to the agreement into which they enter with the PEA.







- * It is essential to establish a close working relationship between growers and technocrats so as to facilitate the transfer of new technologies.
- **▼** If adequate financial assistance is made available to growers, on a timely basis and properly monitored, significant increases in production and productivity could be realized

CONCLUSIONS

- **★** The establishment of these variety nurseries facilitated a more equitable distribution of new varieties amongst small holdings
- **★** Participating growers, for the most part, realized improvements in productivity of between 15-20%.
- **★** Improvements in agronomic and cultural practices were realized on some farms geographically contiguous to the projects.
- ★ Increased quantities of seed cane available for the replanting programme were achieved even though most of it ended up being factory processed. ☆