



Mission-Report:

Decision on Upgrading Strategies by farmers at each CCS

14th July until 30th July

by Jana Schindler (Task 8.1.; ZALF e.V.)

Inhalt

I. Objective.....	1
II. Method.....	1
III. Results	4
1. Selection of UPS per CSS	4
2. The impact assessment results	5
IV. Observations and Conclusion.....	13
V. Annexe.....	14
1. Workplan.....	14
2. Methodological Approach.....	16
3. Photos.....	21

I. Objective

The main goal of the mission was that the local stakeholders at each case study site (CCS) select from various UPS those they favor for implementation. The UPS were presented to the CSS and then assessed in a structured methodological procedure regarding their suitability and sustainability in the specific local context.

II. Method

The methodological approach used for the selection process was a modified version of the Framework for Participatory Impact Assessment (FoPIA). The same stepwise procedure was followed in all villages. The existing framework had to be adapted in order to be applicable at the “grassroot” level. The design of the modified approach had been shared and modified with the Trans-SEC consortium colleagues beforehand. After a first pretest in Tanzania with farmers at ARI Ilonga Research Station, the methodological approach was again adapted and modified. At each CSS 5 workshops were held during 3 days. There was one workshop for the UPS of each food value chain component (FVCC). At each workshop 12-15 local stakeholders participated. On the third day there

was a wrap up workshop where 5 representatives of each workshop group, sub-village representatives and local authorities were invited.

Stakeholder selection for the UPS selection workshops per FVCC:

The participants / stakeholders who participated during the workshops were selected with respect to the following criteria:

- UPS competences (experience, knowledge)
- “Stakeholder participants should not be too dominant due to their hierarchical position”
- Have participated in the Household survey baseline
- Good knowledge on village conditions
- Representation of all sub-villages
- Gender (6 women, 6 men) → consider trade offs
- Age (young – adults – old)
- economic status (poor-moderate – rich)

The food security criteria used during the process were based on the findings of the March 2014 mission in Tanzania in all the CSS. The overall methodological approach for this mission consisted of 3 main parts: UPS presentation & selection, impact assessment and wrapping up.

PART 1: UPS Presentation & Selection

Methodological steps	Time requirement
Step 1: Introduction Presentation of the objective and the process of the day Short presentation of the FVC concept and all UPS that are assessed in the village Self-introduction of each participant (every stakeholder and every Trans-SEC team member)	approx. 30 min
Step 2: UPS presentation Short presentation of the UPS by UPS experts (15-20 min each): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Technical information - Experiences - Requirements Group work: Stakeholders elaborate advantages/strengths/opportunities and weaknesses/challenges/threats (simplified SW(OT)) The group work results are presented to the rest of the group and additional inputs added Stakeholders give their votes using 10 beans to be distributed among the UPS	approx. 2 h – 2,5 h

PART 2: Impact Assessment

Methodological steps	Time requirement
Step 1: Introduction Explanation of the impact assessment process and the method used	approx. 15 min
Step 2: Food security criteria Presentation of the food security criteria and clear explanation of their meaning Questions and discussions about the meaning of these criteria	approx. 15 min

<p>Step 3: Assessment of the UPS along the criteria</p> <p>The impact assessment process is explained by the moderator. The impact assessment is done in 2 rounds: 1. round: positive scoring; 2. round negative scoring</p> <p>The participants are asked to assess/estimate the impact in app. 5 – 10 years of the selected UPS on each criterion.</p> <p>Assessment levels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 0 no positive/ negative impact - 1 slight positive/ negative impact - 2 moderate positive/ negative impact - 3 high positive/ negative impact <p>The process starts with the positive scoring round, followed by the negative scoring round</p> <p>Each UPS is assessed with regards to the FS criteria</p> <p>Presentation of the average value for each criteria → discuss, re-adjust if necessary</p> <p>Presentation of final results, discussion and explanation of results by farmers</p>	<p>approx. 1 h per UPS</p>
--	-----------------------------------

PART 3: Wrap up Workshop

Methodological steps	Time requirement
<p>Step 1: Short UPS presentation</p> <p>Final 6 UPS, which have been selected in the villages are presented to the stakeholders.</p> <p>These UPS are explained very shortly by the UPS experts.</p> <p>In a moderated process the linkages between the UPS are highlighted and the stakeholders are asked for the feedback and add-on activities necessary for successful UPS implementation.</p>	<p>approx. 1h 30 min</p>
<p>Step 2: Announcements</p> <p>Announcement of the upcoming activities by Trans-SEC in the village.</p>	<p>approx. 30 min</p>

III. Results

The main results are:

- 1. The selection of UPS per CSS
- 2. The impact assessment results

1. Selection of UPS per CSS

The representatives selected the UPS for the whole village. The following UPS were selected during the process. In case two UPS voting results were very close it was discussed if the picture represents the priorities and if there is a need of re-voting. The participants could choose two UPS for the FVCC “Natural Resource Management / Crop Production” and “Processing”, and they could choose 1 UPS for the FVCC “Marketing” and “Consumption”. The selected priorities per village in the following tables are marked in light blue.

Ilakala

FVCC	UPS	Votes (no. of beans)
Natural Resource Management / Crop Production	Tied Ridging	64
	Micro-Fertilizer	36
	Weeding	30
Processing	Crop residues	50
	Processing machine	46
	Improved stove	24
Marketing	Sms	30
	Crop livestock	19
	Storage education	37
	Products development	34
Consumption	Nutrition education	54
	Kitchen garden	35
	Storage conservation	21

Changarawe

FVCC	UPS	Votes (no. of beans)
Natural Resource Management / Crop Production	Tied Ridging	60
	Micro-Fertilizer	26
	Weeding	34
Processing	Crop residues	22
	Processing machine	85
	Improved stove	23
Marketing	Sms	13
	Crop livestock	76
	Storage education	12
	Products development	19
Consumption	Nutrition education	55
	Kitchen garden	32
	Storage conservation	33

Idifu

FVCC	UPS	Votes (no. of beans)
Natural Resource Management / Crop Production	Infiltration pits	64
	Micro-Fertilizer	35
	Weeding	21
Processing	Crop residues	17
	Processing machine	66
	Improved stove	30
	Manure/Biogas	17
Marketing	Crop livestock	24
	Storage education	24
	Products development	72
Consumption	Nutrition education	53
	Kitchen garden	38
	Storage conservation	19

Ilolo

FVCC	UPS	Votes (no. of beans)
Natural Resource Management / Crop Production	Infiltration pits	68
	Micro-Fertilizer	40
	Weeding	22
Processing	Crop residues	8
	Processing machine	59
	Improved stove	24
	Manure/Biogas	14
	Wood supply	25
Marketing		
	Crop livestock	32
	Storage education	41
Consumption	Products development	47
	Nutrition education	62
	Kitchen garden	39
	Storage conservation	19

2. The impact assessment results

After the decisions on the UPS per FVCC at each CSS the prioritized UPS were assessed in regards of their impacts on the sustainability criteria for improved food security. These criteria had been developed beforehand in a 5 step process:

1. Step: Consortium brainstorming at the Trans-SEC preparatory meeting in 2012.
2. Step: Literature review and expertise in order to structure and precise the criteria
3. Step: Adaptation and modifications with SUA and ARI in March 2014
4. Step: Farmers workshops at all case study sites, where the farmers added, modified and scored the criteria (March mission 2014)

5. Step: A synthesis process to have neutrally defined criteria for the assessment process (after march mission 2014)

The final set of criteria and their definition used during the assessment process are:

Social	Economic	Environmental
Food diversity (diversified, balanced food-intake)	Production (agr. yield)	Soil fertility (improved soil properties)
Social relations (socio-cultural acceptance on family- and village level)	Income (household income)	Available soil water (available water for plants over the growing season)
Working conditions (working hours, quality, load)	Market participation (surplus sold at markets or inputs purchase)	Agro- Biodiversity (Nr. of crops and wild species)
Farming skills [trainings/adoption of new techniques]		

As described in the methodological process above the process had to be split into a) a positive rating round, followed by b) a negative rating round. The guiding questions posed to the farmers participating at this impact assessment were:

- a) *Positive scoring*: In the 5 to 10 years to come, can the UPS "x" affect criteria "z" positively? If yes, on a scale 1 to 3 how strong will the positive effect be and why? If there is no positive or no affect at all, please score 0.
- b) *negative scoring*: In the 5 to 10 years to come, can the UPS "x" affect criteria "z" negatively? If yes, on a scale 1 to 3 how strong will the negative effect be and why? If there is no negative or no affect at all, please score 0.

The scoring results are the following:

Ilakala

Ilakala						
Impact Positive						
	NR/PR		Markets	Processing		Consumption
UPS	TieRidges	MicroFert	Storage Edu	Machine	Crop residues	Education
production	3	3	2,82	2,92	2,33	2,7
income	3	3	3	2,58	2,42	2,8
market	2,78	3	2,64	3	2	1,4
fooddiv	3	3	2,64	2	2,58	2,8
relations	2,89	3	2,73	2,58	2,75	2,8
workcond	2,89	2,67	2,27	3	2,33	2,5
skills	2,89	3	2,82	2,75	2,58	3
soil	2,89	3	1,55	2,25	2,42	2,4
water	3	2,89	1,73	2,3	2,5	2,1
cropdiv	2,78	2,89	2,45	2,58	2,7	3
average	2,91	2,95	2,47	2,60	2,46	2,55
Impact Negative						
UPS	TieRidges	MicroFert	Storage Edu	Machine	Crop residues	Education
production	0	0	0	-0,42	-0,75	0
income	0	0	0	-0,42	0	0
market	0	0	-0,36	-0,42	0	-0,1
fooddiv	0	0	0	-0,25	0	0
relations	0	0	-0,09	-0,42	0	0
workcond	-1,2	-0,67	0	-0,5	-0,25	0
skills	0	0	0	-0,5	0	0
soil	0	0	0	0	-0,67	0
water	0	-0,33	0	0	-0,25	0
cropdiv	0		0	-0,33	-0,25	0
average	- 0,12	- 0,11	- 0,05	- 0,33	- 0,22	- 0,01

Few reasons discussed:

UPS	Positive scoring (+)	Negative scoring (-)
Tied ridges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Soil and water conservation - Improved soil fertility - Higher yields - Because of higher yields → higher income 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Time and labor intensive
Micro-fertilizer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased soil fertility - Higher production - More income due to higher production - Improved relationship at home because of more food availability at home - Improved knowledge on how to apply fertilizer properly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Time and labor intensive - If there is no rain, then fertilizer investment is lost and no yield gains
Crop residues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased soil fertility and soil moisture - Increased production - Increased income due to higher production 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Labor and time intensive to collect the residues - If no proper application of residues, it may harm soil fertility
Processing machine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Facilitation of processing (faster and larger quantities) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conflicts on how to operate the machine properly

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduced workload - Income gains - Improved knowledge how to use the machine 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Break downs and no resources for reparation - If only a few in community benefit causes conflicts because of disrespect of the other villagers - If machine is not close by, then resources and time investment to transport to the threshing place - Loss of traditional technique and knowledge → if machine breaks down farmers have forgotten how to thresh manually
Storage Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improved income for well stored crops - Selling crops at appropriate time (when the price is high) - Long term storage possibilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If the price at the market is low then they will still loose - The market is far and farmers don't have the experience how to negotiate and what price is the real price - Jealousy in the village because oine farmer knows how to store and the other does not
Nutrition Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Larger quantity and more diversified diet - Improved health and strength due to diversified diet - Passing on the knowledge in the village improves the relationship in community - Reduced costs for health care 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - None

Changarawe

Changarawe						
Impact Positive						
	NR/PR		Markets	Processing		Consumption
UPS	Tie ridges	Weeding	Chicken	Machine	Stove	
production	2,55	2,91	2,82	2,54	0,31	2,91
income	2,64	3	2,82	2,23	0,38	2,73
market	2,82	2,55	2,36	2,08	0,23	3
fooddiv	3	2,73	2,45	2,38	0,15	2,91
relations	2,73	3	2,82	1,85	0,38	2,91
workcond	2,82	1,55	2,64	2,85	2	2,91
skills	3	3	3	2,31	0,08	2,73
soil	2,73	2,91	2,73	0,92	0	0
water	3	3	1,64	0,46	0	0
cropdiv	3	3	2,73	1,08	0,08	3
average	2,83	2,77	2,60	1,87	0,36	2,31
Impact Negative						
UPS	TieRidges	Weeding	Chicken	Machine	Stove	
production	-1,36	0	0	0	0	0
income	-1,45	-0,27	-0,09	0	0	0
market	-1,36	-0,27	-0,45	0	0	0
fooddiv	0	0	-0,18	0	0	0
relations	-0,36	-0,27	-0,36	-0,38	0	0
workcond	-1	0	-0,45	0	0	0
skills	-0,18	0	-0,36	0	0	0
soil	-0,55	0	0	0	0	0
water	-0,55	0	-0,36	0	0	0
cropdiv	-0,09	0	-0,55	0	0	0
average	- 0,69	- 0,08	- 0,28	- 0,04	-	-

Few reasons discussed:

UPS	Positive scoring (+)	Negative scoring (-)
Tied ridges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Moisture and soil conservation - Increased yield due to moisture and soil conservation - Increase of income due to higher production 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In years of flooding it hinders water to flow off - Labor and time intensive - Technical prescription how to set up tied ridges is difficult and it may be difficult for

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improved income allows families to diversify their diets - Improved skills how to set up tied ridges 	<p>farmers to follow</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If rains fails→ time and money investment to set up tied ridges are wasted - Price losses at market because of higher production in whole community - Family conflicts may arise→ if there is more income husband might waste it for individual interests only (2. Wife, alcohol etc.)
Weeding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yields increase because of less weeds in the field - If continuously done it decreases costs for labor → labor charge more when the weeds are many in the fields - Crop diversity increases because of intercrops 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Costly and labor intensive - Due to labor intensive work the cultivated area decreases
Processing machine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Simplification of work and time reduction - Income due to service provision in village - The improved quality of processed grains attracts traders in the village - More income due to faster processing - Due to more income diversification of diet - Working together in a group strengthens the relationship among the people in the group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conflicts at home may arise, because processing is normally the work of women, but husband may refuse her participation
Improved stove	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduction of firewood used - Women saves time at firewood collection and can spend more time in the family - Cooking efficiency improves (faster and more pots at a time can be heated) - Improved health because of smoke reduction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - none
Crops& chicken	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Selling of diverse products increases income opportunities - Manure adds to soil fertility - Diversification of diet because of eggs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Those who don't benefit from the UPS will have losses, because they have only the local breeds instead of the faster growing breed - Diseases of chicken may cause high losses - Investments high to maintain chicken (financial and time intensive UPS)
Nutrition Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Knowledge gains on how to diversify diet and healthier, balanced food intake - Improved skills how to diversify the diet - Passing on the gained knowledge improves relationship with neighbors - Improved health 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - none

Iloilo

Iloilo						
Impact Positive						
	NR/PR		Markets	Processing		Consumption
UPS	Infil Pits	Microfert	oil-new prod	machine	wood	education
production	2,31	2,31	2,83	2,77	1,85	2,36
income	2,15	2,08	3	2,46	2,69	2,55
market	2,38	1,46	2,83	2,77	2,69	2,82
fooddiv	2,46	1,69	2,83	2,46	2,62	2,64
relations	2,38	1,85	2,5	2,23	3	2,73
workcond	2,31	2,69	2,5	2,62	2,62	2,82
skills	2,77	2,62	2,92	2,69	2,85	3
soil	2,85	2,54	2,17	1,31	2,38	0,82
water	3	0	0	1,08	2,54	1,27
cropdiv	2,38	2,69	1	1,85	2,38	3
average	2,50	1,99	2,26	2,22	2,56	2,40
Impact Negative						
	NR/PR		Markets	Processing		Consumption
UPS	Infil Pits	Microfert	oil-new prod	machine	wood	education
production	-0,85	-1,15	-0,33	-0,31	-0,23	0
income	-1,46	-1,54	-0,33	-0,38	-0,23	0
market	0	-1	-0,33	-0,46	-1	-0,27
fooddiv	0	-1,38	0	0	0	-0,45
relations	-0,85	-1,23	0	0	-0,92	-0,09
workcond	-1,46	-1,08	0	0	-0,46	0
skills	0	0	0	0	0	0
soil	0	0	0	0	-0,69	0
water	0	-1,85	0	0	-0,54	0
cropdiv	0	0	0	0	-0,38	0
average	- 0,46	- 0,92	- 0,10	- 0,12	- 0,45	- 0,08

Few reasons discussed:

UPS	Positive scoring (+)	Negative scoring (-)
Infiltration pits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Moisture and soil conservation increases yield - More yields adds to income - Due to income diversification of diet - Neighbors learn from each other → might be positive - Improved knowledge and skills how to properly set up the pits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Labor and time intensive - Only smaller cultivation areas can be prepared due to workload - Costly due to labor requirements - Family conflicts because it needs to be decided who will do the extra work in the family
Micro-dosing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased production - Because of higher production, surplus can be sold → income gains - Grain weight increases, which attracts traders - Assurance that the yields will grow big 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Costly - Time intensive to apply the fertilizer - If rain lacks then negative effects for plant and loss of money which was invested to buy the fertilizer - Fertilizer can harm soil and plant
Processing machine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inspires to cultivate larger areas, because the farmers don't cultivate the maximum of area, because they don't know where to process the large quantities - Income increase especially of those who own the machine - The produce will be cleaner, which attracts traders - Residues from processing can be added to the soil for moisture retention and fertility - Creates employment opportunities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High investment to purchase the machine - For those who don't have money they cannot benefit from the machine - If large quantities are processed in the village the price may fall
Wood supply	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If the proper tree is chosen it can add to fertility and moisture of the soil - Women may spend more time with family because she does not need to look for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If trees are not adapted to the locality it may destroy yields (toxic, take off of too much water) - Conflicts with livestock-keepers → because

	firewood the whole day - Learning how to afforest properly - Food for humans and animals - Reduces wind erosion - Firewood nearby	livestock may destroy the trees - Pests may destroy the trees - Efficiency of ploughing reduces if there are trees in the field - Labor intensive to set up the nursery and to take care of the trees
New product sunflower oil	- More oil production - Increased income due to surplus that can be sold - Because of income → diversification of diet - Time saving, because at the moment they have to travel to get to an oil press	- If a lot of families are involved the oil price will decrease (no reliable market) - Sunflower expands where normally food crops are produced - High investment in machine to buy and to maintain
Nutrition Education	- More and diverse production - Improved health - Production of a variety of foods that can be sold at the market - Knowledge will be passed to neighbors, which adds to relationship - Food wastes add to fertility and soil moisture	- Grazing animals may destroy the production - If income increases sometimes the HH head starts to misbehave in the family - If those people who are trained don't pass the information to the others, there will be conflicts in the village - Willingness to participate might be small

Idifu

Idifu						
Impact Positive						
	NR/PR		Markets	Processing		Consumption
UPS	Infil pits	Microfert	new prod	Pr.machine	imprstove	education
production	1,83	2,83	3	2,36	1,4	2,22
income	2,83	3	2,73	2,45	2,3	2,44
market	2,17	2,67	3	2,64	0,3	2,44
fooddiv	2,83	2,67	3	2	2	2,89
relations	2,75	2,75	2,73	2,45	2,6	2,56
workcond	2,83	2,83	2,36	2,73	2,2	2,56
skills	2,75	3	2,73	2,09	0,5	2,89
soil	2,92	2,75	2,27	1,09	0	0,56
water	2,92	2,5	2,36	0	0	2,22
cropdiv	2,75	2,75	1,45	2,55	0,5	2,78
average	2,66	2,78	2,56	2,04	1,18	2,36
Impact Negative						
	NR/PR		Markets	Processing		
UPS	Infil pits	Microfert	new prod	Pr.machine	imprstove	education
production	-1,5	0	-0,64	0	0	0
income	-0,25	0	-0,82	0	0	-0,67
market	0	0	-1,27	0	0	-0,11
fooddiv	0	-0,08	-1,18	0	0	0
relations	0	-0,08	-1,27	-0,55	-0,5	-1
workcond	0	0	-0,64	-0,45	0	0
skills	0	-0,75	-0,64	-0,55	0	0
soil	0	-0,5	-1,09	0	0	-1
water	-0,08	-0,17	0	0	0	0
cropdiv	-0,33	-0,75	-1,55	-0,27	0	0
average	- 0,22	- 0,23	- 0,91	- 0,18	- 0,05	- 0,28

Few reasons discussed:

UPS	Positive scoring (+)	Negative scoring (-)
Infiltration pits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Moisture and soil conservation - Moisture and oil conservation adds to yield increase - Due to increased yield → increased income - Allows to grow also crops that may need more water (due to conservation) - Improved knowledge how to set up the pits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Labor and time intensive - Cultivation area decreases because of workload - Lack of rainfall causes high losses because of high time and labor investments for preparation - Reduced soil moisture in case the rain will not come (because of exposing deeper soil layers to the sun)
Micro-dosing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Crops will grow faster - Improved grain quality - Money gains because of higher yields - Proper fertilizer use due to education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fertilizer may harm crops and humans if not applied properly - Strong believe that fertilizer may harm the soil and therefore conflicts in family - If rainfall lacks, harm of crops and soil - Labor intensive to apply
Processing machine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Time saving and simplified work - Allows farmer to cultivate larger areas, because processing is available - Processed grains will be cleaner and less losses than threshing with stick - Income gains 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High investments to buy and maintain the machine - Conflicts with neighbors who don't have the opportunity to benefit from the technology - Knowledge on traditional threshing might get lost - If machine can only be applied for one particular crop, the farmers might focus on that and neglect the diversification in the field

Improved stove	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Less wood used - Higher cooking efficiency → more foods at a time can be prepared - Saved time for fuel wood collection, because less wood used - More time that can be spent in the family instead of fire wood collection - Less smoke → improved health - Cooking time saved that can be used to be invested in agricultural production 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jealousy of neighbors when they do not benefit from the improved stove training
New product sunflower oil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Selling oil increases income - Value addition - More income → kids can go to school, diverse foods can be bought at market → diversification of diet - Time saving 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased competition among those farmers who are involved in the oil business → may cause conflicts - High supply decreases price - High costs for buying and maintaining the machine - Less diversification of crops because farmers will focus on sunflower production
Nutrition Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased production - New products that can also be sold at market - Knowledge on how to diversify, balance the diet - Improved health due to balanced diet 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Competition among the farmers because there are not a lot of clients who can buy → this can also cause conflicts

IV. Observations and Conclusion

result related observations:

Regarding the positive arguments it was observed that the UPS chosen by the stakeholders are often related to the increase of the agricultural production and to therefore add also to the income situation of the household. The trainings which are foreseen are expected to widen the agricultural knowledge and skills.

The farmers expressed some uncertainty regarding the UPS especially when they require high monetary, time and labor investments while depending on sufficient and well distributed rainfall for agricultural production as main-prerequisite. If the rainfall is poor the investments are wasted, as considered a main risk to all CSS. In all CSS the stakeholders emphasized that other villagers need to have the chance to benefit from the interventions, otherwise conflicts due to jealousy may arise in the community. The sub-village is therefore often mentioned as point of entry. Losing traditional techniques and knowledge was a concern also explained.

Method related observations:

The methodological approach applied at the four CCS proved successful in selecting the priority UPS at the locality. The SWOT and the Impact Assessment sessions allowed the farmers to exchange ideas and opened up a learning process which led to a higher awareness on the consequences of the UPS. The farmers exchanged their experiences and expertise and were informed and supported by experts. The SWOT helped to elaborate the strengths and challenges of each UPS, while the Impact

Assessment allowed again a more detailed observation and reflection on possible future consequences along the relevant criteria for improved food security. Assumed benefits, risks and worries were mentioned. These can be integrated by the experts into the upcoming trainings and the implementation phase. This exercise also helps the experts to understand local perceptions and concerns related to the UPS.

With this methodological approach we also experienced some challenges. The workshops altogether took about 5-6 hours, which was quite tiring for the farmers. During the pre-test in Ilonga, the researcher team observed that a positive and negative scoring at the same time is impossible for the farmers. The scoring rounds were therefore separated into a positive and a negative scoring round. A quantitative interpretation of the combined negative and positive results is therefore not possible. It was challenging for the farmers to express their negative assumption of possible consequences. Here it was clearly observed that the smaller the researcher team involved in the process became, the more open the farmers expressed their ideas. Another observation is the importance of the selection of the participants. The majority of the farmers chosen for the workshops had to be participants from the household survey. The members of the household survey were chosen randomly and not necessarily according to their expertise. Therefore the participants of the workshop were not necessarily those participants that had the highest knowledge in the field of intervention. This was a clear weakness of the process.

The modified version of the FoPIA (Framework for Participatory Impact Assessment) was successfully applied for the selection of the priority UPS at the CSS. Six out of app. 16 UPS were chosen for the implementation in each village. The process allowed a reflection and interaction among the farmers themselves but also among the farmers and the researchers. Based on the farmers' feedbacks the experts who will guide the implementation phase are sensitized about the challenges found at each locality. The success of this mission is also a product of the very constructive interaction and collaboration of all mission team members.

V. Annex

1. Workplan

Tanzania-field trip from 12th July until 31st July 2014

03. July 2014

Date	Time	Activity	Partner
11.7.		Flight to Tanzania	
12.7.		Arrival, travel to Morogoro	
13.7.		Organizational issues of moderators and UPS trainers training	Team (mission)
14.7.		Training of moderators and UPS trainers	Team
15.7.		Workshop trial at SUA, feedback	Team
16.7.		Travel to Ilakala and preparation of next days workshops	
17.7.		Stakeholder Workshop (presentation UPS and Assessment)	
18.7.		Stakeholder Workshop (presentation UPS and	

		Assessment)	
19.7.		Morning: Stakeholder Feedback workshop Afternoon: Travel to Changarawe and preparation of next days workshops	
20.7.		Stakeholder Workshop (presentation UPS and Assessment)	
21.7.		Stakeholder Workshop (presentation UPS and Assessment)	
22.7.		Morning: Stakeholder Feedback workshop Afternoon: Travel to Dodoma, meeting with ARI	
23.7.		Morning: Time of reflection and putting in data Afternoon: Travel to Ilolo and preparation of next days workshops	
24.7.		Stakeholder Workshop (presentation UPS and Assessment)	
25.7.		Stakeholder Workshop (presentation UPS and Assessment)	
26.7.		Morning: Stakeholder Feedback workshop Afternoon: Travel to Idifu and preparation of next days workshops	
27.7.		Stakeholder Workshop (presentation UPS and Assessment)	
28.7.		Stakeholder Workshop (presentation UPS and Assessment)	
29.7.		Morning: Stakeholder Feedback workshop Afternoon: Travel to Morogoro and if possible: already some feedback rounds with SUA	
30.7.		Final discussions with SUA and ARI	
31.7.		Morning: Final discussions with SUA and ARI Afternoon: Trip to Dar and at night flight back to Germany	
1.8.		Arrival in Germany	

2. Methodological Approach

Stakeholder workshop at CSS (Changarawe, Ilakala, Ilolo, Idifu) – structure, rationale and preparation:

Proposal on individual tasks:

- Moderators: Devota (ARI) and Laurent (ARI,MVIWATA) are main moderators (facilitator). ZALF responsible for methodological backstopping→2-3
 - Scientific backstopping of the workshops: Hannes, Jana (ZALF), Khamaldin&Frieder Coordinators→4
 - Regional organisation: Swai (Dodoma), Bashir (Morogoro)→2
 - Translator (Swahili → English): Khamaldin, Bashir, Swai (Gogo→Swahili: Shani (Agr. Extension Ilolo/Idifu)→1
 - UPS experts:
 - o Natural Resources/Production: Swai, Bashir (ARI)
 - o Processing: Valerian (SUA)
 - o Markets: Khamaldin, Mwinuka (SUA)
 - o Consumption: Hadijah (SUA) → 3
- = Team: 9-10 travelling together (Frieder, Khamaldin, Mwinuka, Hannes, Laurent, Devota, Swai/Bashir, Jana, 2 SUA experts) , max 10-11 people / need of 3 cars

Information

The stakeholders, who will participate in the workshops will be selected: HH surevy information (who is really active in the competence-field) and the criteria stated below:

- Organisation of 4 groups in each village according to
 - o UPS competences (experience, knowledge)
 - o “Stakeholder participants should not be too dominant due to their hierarchical position”
 - o Have participated in the Household survey baseline
 - o Good knowledge on village conditions
 - o Representation of all sub-villages
 - o Gender (6 women, 6 men) → consider trade offs
 - o Age (young – adults – old)
 - o economic status (poor-moderate – rich)
- 2 sessions a day: 8:00 – 13:00 / 14:00 – 18:30 (2,5 days in each village), last half day is a sum up of the results
- UPS presented in which village: check out attached sheet

Steps	What actually happens	Why?	Preparation needs	Who prepares?
Part 1: Introduction and UPS presentation				
Step 1.1 (30 mins)	<p>Introduction</p> <p>Present the objective and the process of the day</p> <p>Short presentation of the concept and all UPS that are assessed in the village</p> <p>Self-Introduction of each participant (every stakeholder and every Trans-SEC team member)</p>	<p>Understanding of objective and procedure of the WS</p> <p>Giving an overview of the activities in the village</p> <p>To know each other, what expertise is in the WS</p>		<p>Moderator</p> <p>ZALF Team</p>
Step 1.2 (2h30)	<p>UPS presentation</p> <p>Short Presentation of the UPS by UPS experts (15-20 min each)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Technical information - Experiences - Requirements <p>Group work: The Group of 12 Participants will be split into groups:</p> <p>Depending on Nr of UPS to analyse:</p> <p>3 UPS: 3 groups of 4 people analyse 1 UPS each</p> <p>4 UPS: 2 groups of 6 people analyse 2 UPS</p>	<p>Giving an overview of the activities in the village</p> <p>Building common understanding of the UPS</p> <p>Building awareness of the opportunities and the challenges of each UPS</p>	<p>Preparation of picture material for each UPS</p> <p>Preparation of the input which will be given by UPS expert (→ please check information sheet)</p> <p>Preparation of SW(OT) Sheet which will be filled in during the presentation process, first the stakeholders should be asked if they are aware of: advantages/strengths/opportunities and weaknesses/challenges/threats. This should then be added by experts.</p>	<p>Khamaldin</p> <p>Experts(Picture preparation by artist or photoshop)</p> <p>Experts</p> <p>ZALF team</p> <p>The working groups will be accompanied by an expert to elaborate the opportunities and strengths of the UPS</p> <p>Moderators guide through the process</p>

	<p>each</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stakeholders will elaborate advantages/strengths/opportunities and weaknesses/challenges/threats (simplified SW(OT)) - The group work results will be presented to the rest of the group and complemented 			
<p>Step 1.3 (30 mins)</p>	<p>First Ranking Round</p> <p>The UPS of the FVCC will be reduced in that process to a number of either 2 (FVCC NR/FP and PR) or 1 (FVCC MAR and CON).</p> <p>The participants receive 10 beans. At a voting pole they can then distribute those beans among the UPS according to the level of priority for implementation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants distribute the 10 beans among the presented UPS • Note the points given to each UPS by each participant • Discussion and conclusion on the results, if necessary, do a re-ranking • The priority UPS will be assessed in regards of its impact on the FS criteria 	<p>Prioritizing of UPS and minimization to a maximum Nr of 2 UPS</p>	<p>Preparation of ranking tables. The moderator gives a short summary on each UPS one after another. After the short summary the stakeholders are asked to rank each UPS. A hidden voting pole is prepared. One participant after another gives their vote. The points are noted down.</p> <p>Results are projected</p>	<p>ZALF team and UPS Experts</p> <p>ZALF team, moderators</p> <p>Moderator guide the process</p>
<p>Sum: 3h – 3h30min</p>	<p>Energyzer!!!! 15 min break to move and have a drink and biscuits!</p>			

Part 2: Impact Assessment 2 UPS				
Step 2.1 (15 mins)	Explanation of the Impact Assessment Process and the method used	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Common understanding of the process 		
Step 2.2 (30 min)	<p>Food Security Criteria</p> <p>Presentation of the criteria and clear explanation of their meaning.</p> <p>Question and Discussion round on the meaning on the Criteria.</p>	<p>Common understanding of the criteria</p> <p>Adaptation of the ranking and final specification of the criteria, if needed</p> <p>Criteria are clearly understood in the local context</p> <p>The farmers are aware of the highest scored criteria</p>	Preparation of Criteria wall sheets/Poster for each village with the results	Prepared by ZALF team and presented by moderators
Step 2.2 For the 2 UPS app 45 min	<p>Assessment of the UPS along the criteria</p> <p>The impact assessment process is explained by the moderator. The IA is done in 2 rounds: 1.round: positive scoring, 2.round negative scoring</p> <p>The participants are asked to assess the impact of the selected UPS on each criterion.</p> <p>Assessment Levels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 0 no positive/negative impact - 1 slight positive/negative impact - 2 moderate positive begative impact - 3 high positive/negative impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The process starts with the positive 	<p>Learning and awareness raising of the impacts of each UPS</p> <p>Selection of the UPS, which will be implemented for testing</p>	<p>Preparation of ranking wall sheet for the UPS</p> <p>Preparation of calculation sheets</p> <p>Organization of enough small stones and maize grains for the assessment process (→ to discuss with Laurent)</p> <p>Modification and Adaptation needs of UPS have to be noted down.</p>	<p>ZALF Team</p> <p>ZALF Team</p> <p>Swai/Bashir</p>

	<p>scoring round, followed by the negative scoring round</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Show for each criteria the average value → discuss, readjust if necessary • Presentation final results, discussion and explanation of results by farmers 			Moderator guides the process
Step 2.3 (30 mins)	<p>Final discussions on the results</p> <p>For the Wrap up workshop the group selects 5 representatives</p>			Guided by moderators
Sum: 2h				
Part 3: Presentation of results (3rd day)				
Step 3.1 (1h30 mins)	<p>Final 6 UPS, which have been selected in the village are presented to the stakeholders.</p> <p>Those UPS are explained very shortly by the UPS experts.</p> <p>In a moderated process the linkages between the UPS are highlighted and the stakeholders are asked for the feedback and add-on activities necessary for successful UPS implementation.</p>	Participants are aware of the UPS, which will be implemented/tested in the village	Finally selected Ups have to be noted down	Team
Step 3.2 (30 mins)	Announcement of the upcoming activities by Trans-SEC in the village.	Participants are aware of the next steps and the requirements of the UPS	<u>Time planning visualization</u>	Moderators
Closing note - End of workshop				

3. Photos

Ilakala (UPS explanation and presentation)



Changarawe (Workshops)



Iloilo (Voting process)



Idifu (Workshop participants and participants presentation of SWOT analysis)

