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Study Overview

**Goal:** Develop guidelines for improving management of agriculture demonstration sites

**Objectives:**
- Assess and document prevailing practices across food security programs in Bangladesh, Niger and Zimbabwe
- Identify key constraints, lessons learned and best practices
- Disseminate findings and provide recommendation for improving management of demos

**Methodology:**
- Semi structured questionnaire used to evaluate constraints and opportunities for improving management of demos
- 38 key informant interviews conducted with program staff and their partners in Bangladesh, Niger and Zimbabwe
- 31 FGDs done with program participants in the three case study countries
- Stakeholder workshops held in each case study country to vet findings and encourage collaborative learning and adaptive management
- Phone interviews done with 16 program support staff covering programs in 17 countries
- Findings synthesized for analysis, draft guidelines prepared
## Participants – FGDs, KIIs & Phone Interviews

**Implementing Countries from Phone Interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th># of FGDs</th>
<th># of KIIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Study Overview

• We are in the process of finalizing guidelines for publication

• Publication will include
  • Guiding principles for management of demos in food security programs
  • Assessment tool for demos evaluating application of principles
  • Compilation of useful resources for improving management of demos

• **Target audience:** program staff and partners working on food security programs that feature demos

• **Today’s goal is two-fold:**
  1) Share main findings from study
  2) Solicit feedback on guiding principles and recommendations

• Final publication available end of May
Presentation Outline

Main Presentation:
1. Significance of demos
2. Perceptions about demos
3. Guiding principles
   - Design & Planning
   - Stakeholder Engagement
   - Management of Costs
   - Risk Management
   - Information Management
   - Gender & Social Inclusion
   - Sustainability

Group Exercise:
- How can the recommendations be applied in your programs?
- Identify gaps or relevant issues that may have been missed

Q&A: 15-20 mins
Definition of Demos

There are as many names for demonstration plots as there are variations on them. They are called field demonstrations, demonstration sites, demos, model farms, model plots, and learning plots.

An agricultural demo:

• Showcases an innovative agricultural practice under local conditions allowing the farmer and community to evaluate the relative merit of the practice (“Seeing is believing”)

• Fosters learning and knowledge transfer with respect to the innovative agricultural practice through the plot itself, the farmer(s) who are working on the demo, and activities associated with the plot (“learning by doing”).
Significance of Demos

- More than 6,839 demos implemented across seven programs in Bangladesh reaching over 2.2 million farmers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th># of Demos</th>
<th># of Farmers Targeted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accelerating Agriculture Productivity Improvement (AAPI)</td>
<td>&gt; 3,600</td>
<td>1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Extension Project (AESA)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agro Input Project</td>
<td>&gt;400</td>
<td>&gt; 1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Resilient Environment and Livelihood (CREL)</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cereal Systems Initiative for South Asia (CSISA) III</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobolok’s Palli Karma-Sahayak Foundation Project</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shushilon Resilient Project</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>62,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>&gt; 6,839</td>
<td>&gt; 2.2 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Significance of Demos Contd.

- **1,332** demos implemented across three programs in Niger reaching over **434,400** farmers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th># of demos</th>
<th># of Farmers Targeted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Livelihoods, Agriculture and Health Interventions in Action (LAHIA)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme d’Appui à la Sécurité Alimentaire des Ménages-Tanadin Abincin Iyali (PASAM-TAI)</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience and Economic Growth in Sahel (REGIS)</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **964** demos across three programs in Zimbabwe reaching more than **101,740** farmers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th># of demos</th>
<th># of Farmers Targeted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMALIMA</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>39,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FtF Crop Development Program</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing Nutrition, Stepping Up Resilience and Enterprise (ENSURE)</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demos come in all shapes and sizes

- **Bangladesh** – winter season demos, composite demos, block demos
- **Niger** – off-season for demos, FMNR demos, private sector demos
- **Zimbabwe** – main cropping season, commercial demos, baby and mother demos

### Types of Agriculture Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Agriculture Practices</th>
<th>Bangladesh</th>
<th>Niger</th>
<th>Zimbabwe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservation agriculture – minimum tillage, maximum soil cover, crop rotation and intercropping and land preparation (row spacing, timely planting and weeding)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition or homestead gardens</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Pest Management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved cereal varieties (millet, sorghum, maize, rice)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulture (fruit, vegetables and spices)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legume varieties (cowpea, groundnut)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry production</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle rearing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fodder production and live fencing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water harvesting, dead-level contours, infiltration pits, mini-dams, or ponds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil fertility – fertilizer application techniques and composting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer Managed Natural Regeneration (FMNR) and Agroforestry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquaculture</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perceptions

Popularity of Agriculture Demos

• Seeing is believing
• Learning by doing
• Risk management
• Scalability
• Tradition

“Not learning by doing, but learning by risking.”

Toba Beta

“Aristotle

“For the things we have to learn before we can do them, we learn by doing them.”

World Vision

Building a better world for children
Concerns about Demos

• Weak participatory approaches

• **Sustainability** - would farmer’s use of practices continue without project support? Would learning and gains last?

• Inadequate engagement of private sector

• **Automatic thinking** – demos are seen as a default strategy in agriculture extension. Weak integration of behavior change

• **Quantity compromises quality** - programs may meet targets but fail to meet objectives

• **Poor presentation** - in most cases, demos fail to show a clear advantage of using the promoted practice

• **Credibility** - agricultural demos are often sited on land with favorable conditions to minimize the risk of failure
Concerns about Demos Contd.

- Farmers concerns centered on the poor implementation of and lack of institutional support for the demo
- Challenges in scaling up or uptake by neighboring farmers
- Climatic shocks and stresses – demos not designed to withstand shocks
- Lack of clear objectives and vague distinction between dissemination and research
- Lack of reference materials
Guiding Principle # 1: Design and Planning

We sought to understand decision making processes related to design and planning for demos including:

- How do implementers go about deciding if demos are needed and what types of demos are needed?
- Setting targets for number of demos to be established
- Establishing criteria for selection of host farmers
- Lining up implementation resources including guidance for field staff and oversight for demos
- Factors influencing location of demos
Guiding Principle # 1: Design and Planning

Genesis of Agriculture demos

• Demos as an idea are typically included in proposals

• Pre-design assessments will identify demos as an existing methodology to be continued.

• Little evidence that assessments are done to evaluate necessity, constraints and opportunities for improving on demos

• When asked “who came up with the idea of conducting demos in their area?”, farmers in all three case study countries stated that either the program or the program and government extension workers came up with the idea

• Targets for types and number of demos based on rough estimates
Guiding Principle # 1: Design and Planning Contd.

- Decisions on types of demos to be established are based on guidance from extension workers and research centers.

- Researchers may advise on the size, layout and treatments.

- The selection of practices to be promoted is often done by program staff in consultation with government and in a few cases, private sector extension service providers.

- Number of demos and size of demo usually determined by implementers and dependent on budget.

**Best practices:**

- Piloting of different demos in first year and using evidence gathered to inform scale up of demos.

- ENSURE program in Zimbabwe started with master demos then evolved to mother & baby demos.

- Farmer field school model with Christian Care in Zimbabwe where every farmer established a demo.
Selection criteria for host farmers

- Selection of hosts for demo sites is done through consultation between program staff, government extension agents and local leaders.
- Few programs have a set of written criteria.
- Selection of hosts typically tied to the desired location for the demo e.g. if preference is to have a demo by the roadside.
- The most common criteria for selecting hosts is a requirement that they be a “progressive farmer”.
- Other common criteria for selecting host farmers include:
  - The farmer must be willing to contribute towards the cost of implementing the demo.
  - A farmer who is willing to teach others and has strong pedagogical skills.
- Community leaders recommend specific farmers based on criteria provided by programs sometimes in consultation with farmers.

Recommendations:
- Programs should facilitate an objective method for selecting demo hosts.
- Need to leverage positive deviants.
Guiding Principle # 1: Design and Planning Contd.

Selection of demo site location

- The decision is often made by farmers based on guidance provided by program staff and government extension agents.

- Preference is to have a demo located by the roadside or in a busy transport corridor to serve as an advertisement.

- Another common criteria for selecting the location of a demo is to have it in a central location.

- Environmental protection is factored as a criterion imposed by implementers.

Recommendations:

- Implementers should seek to clearly define criteria for site selection.

- Balance the need to have demos by the roadside and ensuring demos are accessible to farmers; do not exclude farmers interior locations; addresses potential environment degradation.
Guiding Principle # 1: Design and Planning Contd.

Support structures for overseeing demos

- Lack of adequate oversight was brought up as a common constraint by farmers and extension officers.

- A typical support structure includes a technical manager at the project management unit, a field officer and then a lead farmer who hosts the demo.

Recommendation:
- Implementers should carefully monitor the ratio of demo sites to extension agents and make adjustments where needed.
Guiding Principle # 1: Design and Planning Contd.

Technical guidance for field staff:

• Most programs don’t have written guidelines on how to managed demos and approaches are often agreed upon verbally

• In Bangladesh, guidelines are provided through government extension agencies which field staff may find restrictive

• Most programs provide training for field staff and lead farmers at beginning of season and this is an opportunity to develop a consistent set of guidelines on approaches to establishing demos
Guiding Principle # 2: Management of Costs

We sought to understand:

1. What are the typical costs for implementing demos
2. How are the costs formulated and allocated?
3. What mechanisms are used to disburse funds associated with implementation of demos?
4. How do implementers ensure that implementation of demo sites is cost-effective?
## Guiding Principle # 2: Management of Costs

### Direct Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Costs</th>
<th>Implementer</th>
<th>Farmer</th>
<th>Private Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seed</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertilizer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manure</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticides &amp; herbicides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved livestock breeds</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary products</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal feed/fodder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquaculture inputs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guiding Principle # 2: Management of Costs

Indirect costs:

• Staff salaries

• Technical support from public and private extension providers

• Training costs (transport, allowances, field days) to support demos
Guiding Principle # 2: Management of Costs Contd.

How are these costs formulated and allocated?

- Cost info may not be available at design phase or may vary over time and this makes it difficult to budget
- Most programs seek to minimize the level of direct support provided but there are inconsistencies even with programs operating in the same area
- Tendency is to have farmers, public extension and private sector absorb most of the costs but often their capacity and resources are very limited

What mechanisms are used to disburse funds associated with implementation of demos?

- Most implementers supply inputs while a few provide vouchers or reimbursement to farmers for inputs
- Timely delivery of inputs is a major challenge

Recommendations:

- Need for a budgeting tool and flexibility
- Disbursements can be used to strengthen market linkages and overcome logistical hurdles
- Sustainability concerns – need to be more realistic about the capacity of stakeholders in selecting practices to demonstrate
Guiding Principle # 3: Stakeholder Engagement

We sought to understand:

• Who are the stakeholders involved in the implementation of demos?

• Roles, interests and capacity of stakeholders

• Coordination mechanisms used for engaging stakeholders
## Guiding Principle # 3: Stakeholder Engagement Contd.

### Stakeholder Landscape

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAKEHOLDER</th>
<th>INTERESTS</th>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>CAPACITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementers</td>
<td>Improved food security and resilience</td>
<td>Funding; mobilization; training and technical</td>
<td>Human, Physical,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>support; facilitate linkages</td>
<td>Financial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers</td>
<td>Dissemination of innovative technologies</td>
<td>Data gathering and analysis; training and</td>
<td>Human, Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>technical support; influence policy</td>
<td>Financial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Extension departments</td>
<td>Dissemination of innovative technologies</td>
<td>Coordination; training and technical support</td>
<td>Human, Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local leadership (decentralized government,</td>
<td>Community welfare</td>
<td>Social cohesion; community development</td>
<td>Human, Natural,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traditional and religious leaders)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input and equipment suppliers (formal and</td>
<td>Sales. Market share</td>
<td>Product supply; training and technical</td>
<td>Physical, Financial,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>informal)</td>
<td></td>
<td>support</td>
<td>Human</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output buyers (formal and informal)</td>
<td>Consistent supply and quality products</td>
<td>Off-takers; technical support and training</td>
<td>Physical, Financial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local service providers (LSPs)</td>
<td>Fee for services</td>
<td>Facilitate market linkages; provide training</td>
<td>Human, Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead farmers/demo hosts</td>
<td>Improved food security and resilience</td>
<td>Training and technical support; change</td>
<td>Human, Natural,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td>agents</td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer organizations</td>
<td>Improved service delivery</td>
<td>Facilitate market linkages; provide training</td>
<td>Human, Social,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and technical support;</td>
<td>Physical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guiding Principle # 3: Stakeholder Engagement
Contd.

Coordination Mechanisms

- A few instances where MoUs govern the relationship between programs and private sector and/or research institutions
- Farmer field days are the main mode of interaction
- Coordination committees mostly bring together development partners
- Sharing of reports is done but feedback loops are not functional
- Demo signs are used as a way to disseminate info regarding partnerships in demo activities
Guiding Principle #3: Stakeholder Engagement
Contd.

Recommendations for strengthening stakeholder engagement:

• Systematic stakeholder mapping and capacity assessment

• Pay attention to power dynamics – farmers invest the most yet have little say

• MoUs can help in clarifying roles and coordination mechanisms

• Better coordination platforms needed to address delays in delivery and evaluate performance of demos

• Appreciation of the role informal private sector plays
Guiding Principle # 4: Information Management

We wanted to understand:
- What data is typically collected?
- How is this data collected?
- Are the data being used and if so, how?
- Monitoring: ongoing process by which stakeholder assess progress toward goals and objectives
- Adaptive management: structured decision-making and governance processes that allow for flexibility and adjustment as understanding of system outcomes from decision are better understood (Walker 1986)
Guiding Principle # 4: Information Management Contd.

How is this data being used?

What data is gathered about the demo?

Agronomic: Date of planting, yields (est. by volume), management

How is this data collected?

Farmer writes in notebook from project

Project staff visit demo several times, discuss records/issues

Evaluate practices with farmer/farmer group

Project reporting and planning

World Vision
Building a better world for children
Guiding Principle # 4: Information Management Contd.

What data is collected?

- Collection of data is not consistent and sometimes missing even basic data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project management</td>
<td>Number of farmers, number of demos, attendance at trainings, meetings, field days, number of visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Rainfall, shocks (like flood or drought), soil health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agronomic</td>
<td>Date of planting, weeding, fertilizer application, pest and disease, yield, labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other performance indicators</td>
<td>Gross margins, acceptability of practice, household consumption or sales, farmer learning metrics, adoption rate, changes in demand for inputs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guiding Principle # 4: Information Management
Contd.

What data is collected?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most common</td>
<td>Date of planting, weeding, fertilizer application, pest and disease, reported yield, shocks (like flood or drought), number of farmers, number of demos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat common</td>
<td>Gross margins, attendance at trainings, meetings, field days, number of visits, measured yield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less common</td>
<td>Acceptability of practice, rainfall, labor, soil health, farmer learning metrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare but useful</td>
<td>Household consumption or sales, adoption rate, changes in demand for inputs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are many standard templates available for agronomic data and other participatory assessments but collection varied widely:

- **Formats**: Ad hoc registers, standard templates, mobile data forms (ODK), cell phones, photos, Facebook groups
- **Frequency of collection**: weekly, monthly, seasonally
- **Who**: Agricultural extension agents, project staff and technicians, farmers
- **Equipment**: weighing scales, GPS, smartphones, measuring tape

How is data collected?
Guiding Principle # 4: Information Management
Contd.

How is data being used?

• Dissemination
  ▪ Share outcomes of demonstration in meetings or farmer field days
  ▪ Signboards
  ▪ Facilitate learning
    - Video, dramas, Facebook groups, radio
    - Guided tours and visits
    - Trainings

• Monitoring
  ▪ Used to get advice for management, pest and disease
  ▪ Evaluate and understand practices
Guiding Principle # 4: Information Management Contd.

How is data being used?

- **Project reporting** –
  - Data tracking tools like indicator tracking tables, databases
  - Reports to donors, regional management or ministries
Guiding Principle # 4: Information Management
Contd.

How is data being used?
• *Project learning*
  - Identify and adapt best technologies and practices under local conditions/constraints
  - Structured feedback loops to improve current implementation and program planning

“Data is organized for a monthly meeting, we evaluate problems and try to adjust. Annually we look at all data and evaluate, discuss what worked and build a plan for upcoming year.”

Research Institute, Bangladesh
Guiding Principle # 4: Information Management Contd.

Recommendations and Tools

- Collect basic data in a standardized format
- Ensure that data is compiled and shared in a meaningful form with stakeholder (especially farmers)
- There is a lot of information to unpack from a demo and assessments with farmers should go beyond agronomic measurements and use the demo to understand acceptability, trade-offs, labor, etc.
- There are many new ICT tools that can be an opportunity for easier data collection for project management, monitoring of crops and issues, communication and outreach
Guiding Principle # 5: Risk Management

- Demo plots inherently are a risk management strategy. They allow farmers to try out a new idea on a small piece of land to adapt it and evaluate how it works before applying it to a larger area.

- Stakeholders at all levels encountered many challenges with demo site implementation.

- **Risk reduction**: strategies that proactively reduce risk/enhance the resilience of a system with respect to local drivers of vulnerability (USAID Technical Ref).

- **Risk mitigation**: strategies employed after a shock or stress to limit the negative impact.
Guiding Principle # 5: Risk Management Contd.

Environmental constraints:
- Climate risks (flood, drought, late or early onset of rain)
- Pest and disease
- Livestock damage
  - Compensation for demo failure
  - Have many demos in the case of failures/variation
  - Learn for failures/variation
  - Drought resilient varieties
  - Small size of demo
  - Assessment of potential risks
Guiding Principle # 5: Risk Management Contd.

Behavior-change constraints:
• Financial constraints
• Failure to follow guidelines
• Risk aversion
• Lead farmer selection

RISK REDUCTION
• Lead farmer selection
• Practice selection
• Supporting financial programs
• Close training and monitoring
Guiding Principle # 5: Risk Management Contd.

Institutional constraints:

- Quality inputs
- Delivery of inputs
- Adequate staffing and well-trained staff
- Adequate stakeholder engagement in design

RISK REDUCTION

- Evaluate supply chain and financing early in project
- Train village level agents
- Set feasible targets and activity plans for extension agents
- Provide adequate training
Guiding Principle # 5: Risk Management Contd.

Recommendations

- DFAPs have good tools at the community level to assess shocks, stresses and vulnerable groups and develop action plans.
- There is a need to scale these methods to individual activities like demo plot programs and use them to evaluate what practices to use.
Significance:

- The integration of women and marginalized groups in food security projects is essential for livelihood improvements.
- Gender empowerment in agriculture is one of the primary pathways for linking agriculture, food security and nutrition.
- Women are active participants in agricultural activities and often face a significant yield gap relative to male farmers (FAO 2011)
Guiding Principle # 6: Social Exclusion and Gender Integration Contd.

Key issues:

- Inclusion of socially marginalized is not a priority for most demonstration sites. When these groups are included, they are specifically targeted from the beginning and activities work to address the context-specific needs and constraints.
- Women in DFAPs and other projects are purposefully included.
- It is important to address constraints to agricultural growth and productivity – time, labor, ownership or access to land or other assets and access to information.
Lessons learned and best practices:

- Sensitization tools for gender are effective in raising awareness of time constraints for women.
- Activities like aquaculture, home gardens, fruit drying, poultry keeping were identified by women as a priority/feasible.
- Space advocated and negotiated for women’s groups for land cultivation can be an avenue for improving livelihoods.

Seed multiplication demos were done for farmers with no/limited land.

FGD, Bangladesh
Guiding Principle # 6: Social Exclusion and Gender Integration Contd.

Recommendations:

• As part of project design, do an assessment to identify socially marginalized individuals or groups.
• Use gender as a lens for understanding and implementing demonstration.
• Ask the right questions early and include socially marginalized groups and women from the beginning. They can identify priorities, needs and barriers.
• Gender dynamics are context specific and may be fluid. Assessments should be done regularly and sensitizations and training conducted if needed.
• Consider hiring female extension officers and/or advocate for female extension officers in the government or private sector.
Guiding Principle # 7: Sustainability

- There is a lack of clarity about the definition of sustainability for demo plots.
- A project’s goals and outcomes determine the definition of sustainability with respect to demo site management. This could be defined in the following three ways:
  - The demo site continues after the phase out of the project.
  - Farmers adopt the practice or varieties promoted through the demo, but the demo itself does not need to continue after the phase out of the project.
  - Farmers have an understanding of how to evaluate new technologies and practices and use “demos’ to continue to experiment and learn.
Guiding Principle # 7: Sustainability Contd.

Lessons learned and best practices:

• Employing fee based models like an annual fee or a user fee to fund support.

• Partnering with government extension or the private sector. Trainings to these stakeholders can build capacity and they have different incentives to continue to provide demonstration and learning opportunities.

• Increasing awareness of demonstrated technologies or practices through outreach and involvement of other farmers.
Guiding Principle # 7: Sustainability Contd.

Recommendations:

- From the beginning, consider what will happen after the project, and identify sustainability goals and options
- Use the Collaborative, Learning and Adapting approach by USAID to build capacity for learning, knowledge management and problem solving
- Strengthen linkages with service providers for inputs, seeds, pesticides, and assistance.
Guiding Principle #1 Design and Planning: Evaluate specific needs around demos and ensure alignment with farmer needs.

Guiding Principle #2 Management of Costs: Ensure flexibility in budgeting and use market systems for disbursement.

Guiding Principle #3 Stakeholder Engagement: Incorporate systematic stakeholder mapping and capacity assessment and ensure coordination platforms to address delays in delivery of inputs and services to farmers.

Guiding Principle #4 Information Management: Encourage participatory data reviews and adaptive management.
Guiding Principle #5 Risk Management: Integrate risk assessments and contingency planning strategies in design and planning of demos.

Guiding Principle #6 Social Exclusion and Gender Integration: Identify specific needs for socially marginalized groups and women around demos.

Guiding Principle #7 Sustainability: Define sustainability from the beginning and work with stakeholders to monitor objectives and capacities.
Group Exercise

In your assigned groups, discuss the following:

• How can the recommendations be applied in your programs

• Identify gaps or relevant issues that may have been missed

Capture notes and report back in 10 mins
Group Exercise

Building a better world for children