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How to use the guidelines

These guidelines are envisaged as a tool, which you and your organisation can use to take stock of your successful approaches to sustainable agriculture and scaling-up strategies to increase their impact. Because these guidelines have been developed for different organisations, they are not a conventional manual or “cookery book” containing advice you only have to follow to achieve the desired results. Recommendations must be adapted to suit your needs and the conditions under which your organisation or project works. The guidelines should be considered a document in progress, which can be improved on and developed even further by Sustainet.

Use of the guidelines

These guidelines have been produced as a ring book to make it easier for you to take out certain sections you may require, for instance, going to the field for a group interview with farmers or organising a “scaling-up workshop”. They are also available on the attached CD that includes additional documents for further reading and the report format.

Symbols guide you through the document (see key below). Additionally, some space is provided for your own notes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction: A weathercock indicates the direction in which the wind is blowing. It symbolizes paragraphs that introduce a new topic or section.</th>
<th>Methodological setting and data collection: The shovel is a tool with which you can turn over the soil and dig for things. It symbolizes “methods” and “data collection”, a paragraph that suggests instruments and tools to generate information.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey question: The big corn plant – the Sustainet label – stands for “survey question”. Several survey questions are given for each survey topic and address the main points of interest in each topic.</td>
<td>Assumptions: The seed bag symbolises the underlying assumptions for each question, as seeds are the starting point for new plants. Each assumption specifies why the question is important and how it is linked to the survey question and topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples: Just as there are many different apples in one basket, many examples are given for each set of questions and give an idea of how to use the methods recommended for data collection and documentation.</td>
<td>Activities: Since a wheelbarrow can be used for a number of different activities, it stands for all the actions we recommend for the implementation of the self-assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional hints: The sunflower symbolises “additional hints”, which are presented to you as an extra goody in the way you might give flowers away.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Content of the guidelines

According to your needs and interest you can either read through the document from beginning to end, which will give you a complete picture, or simply pick the chapters relevant to your work as either facilitator, management or project staff, field coordinator or other person interested in the project.

Chapter A will give you the main cornerstones, if you want to grasp the purpose and method of self-assessment quickly.

Part one of this chapter (A1) introduces Sustainet and describes its objectives, activities and intended impacts. It further tells you how Sustainet was initiated and its plans for worldwide coverage. Chapter (A2) gives a picture of how the self-assessment framework was developed in cooperation with Indian Sustainet partner organisations and a consultancy team from the Centre for Advanced Training in Rural Development (SLE), Humboldt University Berlin, Germany. We have outlined the objectives, time frame and working steps of the SLE consultancy project and give interested readers an insight into the various stages of developing the self-assessment framework. For further details of the process, you can take a look at the workshop plans, timetables and list of participants in the Annex.

Chapter B presents you the conceptual framework. For those interested in the concepts, definitions and inter-linkages of the two units of analysis “good practices in sustainable agriculture” and “scaling-up strategies”, this chapter provides models and explanations.

Chapter C outlines the actual self-assessment. It specifies survey questions, sources of information, the methods and tools we recommend for data collection, and ideas for documentation, all of which are recommendations for conducting self-assessment in your organisation or project. This chapter is primarily seen as instruction for your organisation’s self-assessment facilitators, since it goes into considerable detail. Additionally, it provides information for people who want to understand the concepts and inter-linkages introduced in the conceptual framework, which have been extended to include specific assumptions for each survey question.

Chapter D deals with the organisational side of self-assessment. It gives recommendations on how to plan the self-assessment (D1), and covers aspects such as selection of facilitators and case study area, and how existing data can be integrated into the assessment. The next two parts are primarily based on the field-testing experience in Indian partner organisations and give hints on conducting and documenting the self-assessment. Part (D2) covers aspects such as how to prepare for the field phase, how to conduct the field survey and document the data, and how to carry out the first analysis. Similarly, part (D3) makes recommendations on the assessment of your organisation’s scaling-up strategies, such as meetings with management, department and field staff. Section (D4) contains recommendations on how to learn from the assessment findings in your organisation or project. This chapter will also give you some guidance on report writing. The final aspect considered in this chapter is how to communicate the findings in your organisation, and to Sustainet and other stakeholders.

Chapter E introduces the suggested report format and gives hints on visualisation and layout.
How to Use the Guidelines

In the Annex we provide you with the following documents:

- a glossary with working definitions of key terms, drafted by the participants of the self-assessment workshops;
- a list of further reading material, particularly on scaling up;
- a brief introduction into SWOT-analysis and a sample moderation plan;
- a timetable and list of participants of the Conceptual Workshop;
- a list of participants in the Methodology and Reflection Workshop.

The glossary provides definitions as drafted by the participants of the self-assessment workshops. Additionally, a list of literature is provided should you require further information or clarification on topics mentioned in the guidelines.

We – Sustainet, its partner organisations in India and Germany, and the SLE team – hope that these draft guidelines will facilitate your organisation’s self-assessment. If you need clarification or would like to help us revise the guidelines with your comments and recommendations, please contact the Sustainet Secretariate (helga.stamm-berg@gtz.de, jenni.heise@gtz.de). Feel free to pass on these guidelines to any other interested person or organisation. Should you copy the document or CD, please respect the copyright, which lies with SLE.
Foreword

This document is the result of a five-month project carried out by a consultant team from the Centre for Advanced Training in Rural Development (SLE in its German abbreviation), Humboldt-University Berlin, who stayed three months in India. The project was commissioned by the German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ) / Sustainable Agriculture Information Network (Sustainet). The SLE consultant team was composed of a geographer, a political scientist and sinologist, an environment engineer, an energy engineer, an anthropologist and tropical agronomist (all participants of the 42nd training course) and an agricultural economist (team leader). It cooperated closely with staff from altogether 14 partner NGO and bilateral projects and was supported by the National Coordinator of Sustainet India.

Interdisciplinary consultancy projects are an integral part of the SLE training programme, the aim of which is to prepare young professionals for assignments in bilateral and multilateral development organisations. It enables participants to obtain valuable practice in the use of action- and decision-oriented research methods. At the same time, projects contribute to identifying and solving problems in rural development.

In 2004, the four groups from the 42nd course of the SLE simultaneously conducted projects in India, Madagascar, Mali, and Mozambique.

Prof. Dr. Uwe Jens Nagel
Dean
Faculty of Agricultural and Horticultural Sciences
Humboldt University Berlin

Carola Jacobi-Sambou
Director
SLE - Centre for Advanced Training in Rural Development

14/02/2005
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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>African Conservation Tillage Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEZ</td>
<td>Agro-Ecological Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BftW</td>
<td>Bread for the World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMVEL</td>
<td>Federal Ministry of Consumer Protection and Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMZ</td>
<td>Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development (Bundesministerium für Wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPL</td>
<td>Below Poverty Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Conservation Agriculture Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIAT</td>
<td>International Centre for Tropical Agriculture (Centro de Investigación Agricola Tropical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Developing Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWHH</td>
<td>German Agro Action (Deutsche Welthungerhilfe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO</td>
<td>Government Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMO</td>
<td>Genetically Modified Organisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTZ</td>
<td>German Agency for Technical Cooperation (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ha</td>
<td>Hectare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>Human Immunodeficiency Virus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUB</td>
<td>Humbolt University Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYV</td>
<td>High Yielding Variety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGBP</td>
<td>Indo-German Bilateral Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIRR</td>
<td>International Institute for Rural Reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>km</td>
<td>Kilometre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSS</td>
<td>Farmers Welfare Association (Kisan Seva Samity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm</td>
<td>Millimetre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>Natural Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTFP</td>
<td>Non-Timber Forest Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs.</td>
<td>Rupees (Rs. 100 ≈ Euro 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARD</td>
<td>Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHG</td>
<td>Self-Help Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLE</td>
<td>Centre for Advanced Training in Rural Development (Seminar für Ländliche Entwicklung)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Sector Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOT</td>
<td>Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDC</td>
<td>Village Development Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTO</td>
<td>World Trade Organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Background and objectives of the self-assessment

These guidelines for the self-assessment of good practices and scaling-up strategies in sustainable agriculture were developed with the ambitious goal in mind of contributing significantly to the reduction of food insecurity and poverty worldwide. Why do we put so much effort, time, and money into something that looks like just another desk exercise – evaluating sustainable agricultural projects and their impact on the fight against food poverty? Have not the causes of malnutrition and the means of eliminating it been known for decades, while the number of people facing food insecurity is growing steadily year by year? Contrary to approaches that focus on the potential of agriculture in terms of increased productivity (e.g., high-input agriculture, including cultivation of genetically modified varieties), we concentrate on reaching the poorest population groups by promoting agricultural practices that fulfil environmental, economical, institutional and socio-cultural sustainability criteria.

We believe that sustainable agriculture not only improves food quality and quantity, but also counters some of the root causes of food insecurity: degrading natural resources, inequitable access to livelihood resources, dependence of small and marginal farmers on external inputs, which results in increased indebtedness and unfavourable market conditions.

Many development organisations and farmers around the world have had positive experiences with sustainable agricultural practices. By documenting their lessons learnt, assessing the preconditions and impact of good practices, and communicating them to others, these one-time, all-too-often ‘island’ solutions have the potential to be developed into strategies that are transferable to other places and other contexts. This is the core idea behind the Sustainable Agriculture Information Network (Sustainet) and the self-assessment guidelines.

In the first part of this chapter (A1), you will learn about the structure and objectives of Sustainet. You will be introduced to Sustainet’s main task, which is to share good practices in sustainable agriculture with its partners around the world, and to draw lessons from successful efforts to scale them up as well as from those that failed to do so. In the subsequent section (A2), you will find an overview of the people involved and how we proceeded to develop the self-assessment framework, and its field-testing and revision.

A1 Sustainet

The context

An estimated 700 million people worldwide – and approximately 300 million in India alone – suffer from food insecurity and malnourishment. The German Government adopted the International Action Programme 2015 and is committed to contributing to the planned 50% reduction of this statistic. 75% of the hungry poor live in rural areas and depend on agriculture for their main source of livelihood.

In India, for instance, many small and marginal farmers practice non-sustainable agriculture that has not been locally adapted (e.g., monocultures, cultivation of high-yielding varieties), which frequently leads to the depletion of natural resources (soil fertility, water, biodiversity, etc.) and a growing dependence of producers on external inputs.
Worldwide poverty and food insecurity accompanied by increasing population figures requires a shift towards more sustainable forms of agriculture that are more adapted to local social, economic and environmental conditions. Experience gained in various parts of the world shows that locally adapted agriculture makes a key contribution to the alleviation of poverty and food insecurity. Many good examples (so-called ‘best practices’) of sustainable agriculture were developed with the assistance of German development agencies and their partner organisations. Although they have had a manifold positive impact on the reduction of poverty and food insecurity, many lack wider dissemination. The need to scale up this impact is the driving force behind the Sustainet project.

The Sustainet project

The initial idea and starting-point for the Sustainet project-design was the study “Feeding the World with Sustainable Agriculture: A Summary of Evidence” (2001) - produced as a joint initiative of Bread for the World and Greenpeace. In this study, Pretty and Hine analysed 208 projects to audit recent worldwide progress towards sustainable agriculture and to assess the extent to which such projects/initiatives, if spread on a much larger scale, could feed a growing world population that is already substantially food insecure. Their desk study took place from December 1998 to February 2001.

Initiated by the German Government’s Council for Sustainable Development, Sustainet was launched under the project title “Combating world hunger with sustainable, adapted agriculture” in December 2003. Funded by the Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), Sustainet is a joint project of three major German non-governmental development organisations – Misereor, Bread for the World (BftW) and German Agro Action (DWHH) – and the German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ). For organisational and financial purposes, the project is to be implemented as a Sector Project (SP) with its secretariate located in GTZ. The project will cooperate closely with various research institutions, such as the International Centre for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT), the FAO (in particular the Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development Initiative – SARD, the Conservation Agriculture Project –CA), and the African Conservation Tillage (ACT) Network. (See organisational chart next page)

What does Sustainet want to achieve?

The overall objective of the project is for selected partners in pilot areas along with the German partners cooperating in Sustainet to systematically evaluate, communicate, and disseminate successful approaches and concepts for scaling up sustainable agriculture. With this overall objective in mind, Sustainet wants to:

- establish networks between local and international partners, hence promoting the dissemination of successful concepts, understand the factors relevant to successful scaling up, and highlight the significance of sustainable agriculture for global food security to political institutions in the partner countries and in Germany,
- identify promising key promotion priorities in rural areas and specify fields of action for agricultural policy.
Although Sustainet started in Germany, its aim is to become a worldwide network for the spread of good practices in sustainable agriculture. Sustainet plans to begin in the following pilot areas: Asia - India, Africa - Kenya / Tanzania, and Latin America - Peru / Bolivia and Northeast Brazil. Sustainet India was initiated in September 2004, and Sustainet Africa and Sustainet Latin America will start working in spring 2005. (See map next page).

Sustainet’s foremost objective in the current project phase from December 2003 to November 2006 is to select partners in the pilot areas for the systematic evaluation of their approaches and concepts in sustainable agriculture. Thus, the key question in this phase of Sustainet’s work is “What are the fostering and hampering factors in adopting and scaling up sustainable agricultural practices?” In the first phase, Sustainet and its partners will

- establish contacts with local partners in the pilot areas and initiate regional sustainable agriculture information networks,
- pre-select “models” for best practices gained in five to ten years of experience in the field of sustainable agriculture,
- develop a self-assessment framework on the scaling-up potential of good practices,
- accompany partners during their self-assessment process, facilitate exchange of experience, assess good practices supra-continentally, and
- compile and publish case study reports and lessons learnt.
Achieving the stated purpose requires an assessment framework and methodology that enables up to 80 Sustainet partner organisations in the pilot areas to systematically generate relevant information on

- good practices in sustainable agriculture (farm and inter-farm systems) they support (or have supported),
- local conditions, approach / development instruments, and external framework conditions under which these good practices were developed,
- their impact, focusing on food and nutrition security,
- strategies to scale up this impact, and
- fostering and hampering factors.

**Methodological requirements**

Sustainet invited a team from the Centre for Advanced Training in Rural Development (SLE), Humboldt University Berlin, to facilitate the development of a transferable and clearly structured self-assessment framework and methodology by selected local partner organisations in India. Thus, the SLE-team faced the challenge of finding a balance between the participatory development of a self-assessment instrument, on the one hand, and data comparability and their analysis results on the other.

The concept of self-assessment was agreed upon because it meets the following needs of Sustainet:

- to realise a participatory evaluation approach without external control of the process and results, and where findings are de-linked from funding considerations,
- to support an internal learning process in the partner organisations for the improvement of their project approaches, and
- to ensure practical and cost-effective methods to obtain data.
Sustainet is aware of a possible information bias as the assessments are carried out by the participating partners themselves. However, it believes that these partners are self-critical learning organisations eager to improve their work and share their success and failures, strengths and weaknesses with like-minded organisations.

Sustainet’s demand for comparable data requires
- an assessment framework and an approach that is transferable to the other pilot regions,
- a consensus among various stakeholders on relevant survey questions,
- a largely uniform manner of obtaining and documenting data, and
- a certain quality in data standards for future cross-analysis by research institutions.

The primary task of the SLE team was to moderate and accompany the process, focusing on content, methods and documentation, and to seek and integrate constant feedback from members of the Sustainet Steering Committee, development experts, and researchers concerned with this topic in Germany and abroad.
A2 Evolution of the guidelines

These guidelines were developed during a five-month process in which a total of 15 Indian partner organisations and projects participated. This period included (see chart below):

- the six-week preparation phase of the SLE team members in June/July 2004,
- the Conceptual Workshop in August 2004;
- the two-week methodology test runs in three partner organisations;
- the Initial Workshop of Sustainet India in September 2004 in the area where Sustainet India was founded; 18 partner organisations were invited to participate in the network;
- the Reflection and Methodology Workshop in October 2004, where the draft guidelines were revised to focus on content, method and feasibility;
- the constant feedback from various national and international Sustainet stakeholders;
- the public presentation in November 2004, where results and recommendations were presented and discussed with the Sustainet Steering Committee, SLE staff, and interested members of the public.

![Flowchart of the guidelines development process]

**Preparation**
- 6 weeks by SLE-team
- Berlin, 06-07/2004

**Conceptual Workshop**
- 3 weeks with 4 Indian partner organisations
- Dehra Dun, 08/2004

**Test-runs of the methodology**
- 2 weeks with 3 Indian partner organisations
- 08-09/2004

**Initial Workshop of Sustainet India**
- with 18 Indian partner organisations
- Gurgaon, 09/2004

**Final draft of the guidelines**
- 6 weeks by SLE-team
- Berlin, 11-12/2004

**Feedback from national & international stakeholders**
- of Sustainet India - Germany, 10/2004

**Reflection and Methodology Workshop**
- with 15 Indian partners
- Bangalore, 10/2004

**Public presentation and discussion of the results**
- Sustainet SC, SLE staff
- Berlin, 11/2004
The Conceptual Workshop

In a three-week Conceptual Workshop, the SLE team and representatives of four Sustainet India partner organisations developed the conceptual framework, formulated draft survey questions and methods, and conducted and evaluated a first field-test. The conceptual framework is the foundation of the self-assessment approach and consists of two parts: (a) local good practices in sustainable agriculture and (b) strategies to scale up these practices.

The conceptual framework and derived survey topics were our starting point in identifying survey questions. These questions describe the required information in detail and are the basis for the selection of methods and interview questions each organisation can use according to its needs and capacities. After the first field-test and the evaluation of workshop results, the team drafted recommendations for self-assessment covering preparation, implementation, and documentation. Additionally, the team developed a draft report format. In the course of evaluation, we integrated suggested changes to the conceptual framework, survey questions, as well as recommendations regarding the self-assessment process.

The test run

In a next step, we conducted and documented self-assessment test runs in three partner projects. Small teams comprised of two SLE team members and two representatives of the respective partner organisation (i.e., Cecoedecon, with main activities in natural resource management in dryland areas in Rajasthan; Agragamee, with main activities in watershed management in tribal areas in Orissa; and the Indo-German-Bilateral Project (IGBP,
implemented by Vikasa) in watershed management in Andhra Pradesh) applied the self-assessment methodology in the three project areas (see map below).

Map 2: Field test areas and partner organisations / projects

Facilitators conducting self-assessment in the organisations were accompanied by SLE team members, who focused on observing the appropriateness of the survey questions and the feasibility of the process. Based on lessons learnt during field application, the team revised the content and methodology of the self-assessment.

In the meantime, the results of the Conceptual Workshop had been sent to various national and international stakeholders (Sustainet Secretariat, FAO Rome, Sustainet coordinators in Africa, etc.) with a request for feedback. Between the test run and the Sustainet Initial Workshop, the SLE team discussed feedback and field experiences, integrating them into the second draft of the guidelines.

The Sustainet Initial Workshop

Sustainet India was founded officially at the Initial Workshop in September 2004 in the presence of representatives from 18 partner organisations. The main elements of the self-assessment framework, as developed so far, were presented to the Sustainet India partner organisations with a request for feedback. During the plenary discussion and in working groups, the focus was on improvement of the conceptual framework, survey questions, and methodology. At the end of the workshop, the partner organisations had reached a general agreement on the self-assessment principles and objectives.
The Reflection and Methodology Workshop

Contrary to the first two workshops, the Reflection and Methodology Workshop focused on the technical aspects of self-assessment. In plenary discussions and small working groups, assessment facilitators from 15 partner organisations incorporated their field experience and knowledge in the final self-assessment design. Framework survey questions were discussed with regard to their embeddedness in the conceptual framework, their inter-linkage to the overall topic, and their wording. The participants reached agreement on the priority of the survey questions and their feasibility. In the methodology section of the workshop, they came up with a number of valuable tools and methods for the field-assessment phase. Finally, participants discussed the report format and clarified further proceedings.

Finalising the first draft

In their last two weeks in India, the SLE team concluded its task of producing a self-assessment guideline draft. Whenever controversial points came up, the team made an effort to find a compromise between information requirements and feasibility with regard to the self-assessment content, and between organisational requirements and comparability with regard to the methodology.
Public presentation of findings and recommendations

Back in Germany, the SLE team presented the methodology, process and findings to the Sustainet Steering Committee, SLE staff, and other interested members of the public, focusing on explaining the set of instruments for self-assessment. The SLE team particularly took the concerns and unanswered questions identified in the Reflection and Methodology Workshop into account, focusing on the practical limits to the self-assessment process, data comparability, and the motivation for partner organisations to conduct self-assessment and participate in Sustainet.

The team presented and discussed the following recommendations:

- In view of the more than 40 survey questions and an estimated time requirement of 40-50 working days to complete the assessment, Sustainet should prioritise the most relevant aspects.
- Sustainet should facilitate a second test run in 2-3 Indian partner organisations (particularly in smaller ones with less capacity) in order to (a) elaborate further practical methods and examples for documentation, and (b) produce complete case study reports. This should enable Sustainet and its partner organisations to further prioritise survey topics and questions, and to examine the comparability and possible evaluation of the data with the help of research institutions.
- The Steering Committee should consider to what extent partner organisations facing constraints on resources for conducting self-assessment could be financially supported.
The project secretariate should reflect on whether the existing facilitation support (by the National Co-ordinators) is sufficient, or whether e.g., professional facilitators should support the process of writing and publishing case study reports.

German partner organisations should consider to what extent regular evaluation, such as the planned mid-term evaluation in 2005, could be substituted by self-assessment.

Sustainet should offer additional incentives for local partners (apart from the existing internet platform), such as acquiring funds for common scaling-up activities of national networks.

Revision of the guidelines

In January 2005 a second round of test-runs was conducted in Andrapradesh, India, to check whether the draft guidelines are easily understandable and practicable for the facilitators. In order to ensure the feasibility of the self-assessment for projects under time and resource constraints, two small partner organisations were asked to conduct the whole self-assessment within the timeframe of 10 days. The experience made and the feedback of the partner organisations were incorporated into the latest draft of the guidelines.

This revised final draft of the guidelines is the result of reflection by the SLE team and the integration of feedback from the Steering Committee and the project secretariate. A joint endeavour, it is hopefully a user-friendly and persuasive document. Nonetheless it remains a draft and is open to revision. Feedback, recommendations and ideas for change and improvement are more than welcome.
B The conceptual framework

This chapter presents the conceptual framework. It outlines the theoretical background to the two topics “good practices of sustainable agriculture” and “scaling-up strategies” and our understanding of how to assess these terms. Both terms will be defined and the different aspects involved in each term will be discussed. Charts show how these aspects are interlinked.

The conceptual framework sets out the meaning of the different aspects of “local good practices of sustainable agriculture” and “scaling-up strategies”, and the inter-linkages between them. In order to assess both topics, we first of all agreed on their definition after reviewing existing literature and drawing on the field experience of our Indian partner organisations.

The conceptual framework is the result of close cooperation between the Indian Sustainet partners and the SLE team, and includes feedback on our work from several individuals. “We” in the context of these guidelines thus refers to Sustainet, its partner organisations in India and Germany, and the SLE team.

Good practices

Conscious of the fact that there is no common understanding of “good” or “best practices”, a short introduction to the different meanings might be helpful in following our definition of “good practice” framed later on.

The terms “good practice” and “best practice” stand for “the formal and structured process of searching for those practices which lead to superior or excellent performance, the observation and exchange of information about those practices, and the adaptation and implementation of those practices into one’s own organisation” (MEADE 1994).

Reviewing the literature, it is obvious that the terms are widely used around the world, both in different contexts (for case studies, behaviour, strategies) and with a different focus (showing “best” or “good” examples in corporations, in diverse fields). In most cases, the use of the term “good” or “best practice” is associated with ranking and implies the existence of a “No. 1”. However, “good practices“ and “best practices“ are often used interchangeably.

The table on the next page may be helpful for the understanding and classification of successful approaches or activities. It shows different stages of practices, from an innovation or good idea to a proven model or a policy principle that is widely applicable.

The amount of practice evidence can differ. One model might have stood the test in a few cases, e.g., in surrounding villages with similar local conditions, whereas best practice will have been proved in different settings, e.g., different climatic zones or different continents. Similarly, the risk of failure as a result of emulating an approach or activity is higher for a model with limited practical experience than for good practice where the replicability has been tested.
Table 1: States of practice, evidence and applicability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State of Practice</th>
<th>Level of Evidence</th>
<th>General Applicability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>- minimal objective evidence</td>
<td>- new idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- inferences from parallel experiences and contexts</td>
<td>- no previous experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- high risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promising practice, state of the art</td>
<td>- unproven in multiple settings</td>
<td>- high risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- anecdotal evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- testimonials articles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model, lessons learnt</td>
<td>- positive evidence in a few cases</td>
<td>- limited number of settings and experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- program evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- conferences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good practice, better practice, exemplary</td>
<td>- clear evidence from some settings</td>
<td>- promise of replicability, medium risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- several evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best practice, protocols, codes of practice</td>
<td>- evidence of impact from multiple settings</td>
<td>- demonstrated replicability, limited risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- meta-analyses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- expert review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy principle</td>
<td>- proven in multiple settings</td>
<td>- consistently replicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- replication studies</td>
<td>- widely applicable &quot;truisms&quot; essential for success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- evidence quantitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- scientific</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hancock et al. 2003:12

Using the term “good practices” as defined in the table above may not include all of the approaches used by Sustainet partner organisations in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. These cover both small initiatives with locally adapted solutions that have not yet been tested elsewhere and large experienced organisations with national strategies and models already verified in different contexts. Bearing in mind that there is no “one beats all” solution in the extensive field of sustainable agriculture, but a variety of locally adapted solutions, we decided to use the term “good” rather than “best”. From our point of view it is almost impossible to rank different approaches, since the success of a specific approach will always depend largely on local conditions.

Sustainet should therefore have a wide approach that includes all levels of experience and refers to categories extending from innovation to policy principle. We decided to use the term “good practices” in the sense of including all levels of experience.

In order to cover successful projects in the field of sustainable agriculture, we agreed on the following working definition: First of all, good practice in sustainable agriculture is not an approach restricted to a sole activity but several activities at least in the same or different fields. Thus, we have to talk about good practice as a couple of activities or measures.
Regarding the criteria for “good practice” we agreed upon the following:

- **Measurable outputs and impact**: this implies that the project has already existed for some years and produced visible results. We distinguish between a short-term impact (e.g., increased yields) and a more aggregated long-term impact, where we focus on food and nutrition security.

- **Replicability**: the aim of a project should be to create activities in sustainable agriculture that are replicable with little or no external inputs rather than “island” solutions.

- **Local appropriateness**: sustainable agricultural practice should be easily adaptable, since this is an acceptance criterion at local level.

- **Sustainability**: general sustainability criteria, i.e., environmental friendliness, economic and financial viability, technical appropriateness, social and cultural acceptance, and building of viable institutions, are of course also vital in the field of agriculture.

In order to describe and analyse the criteria of “good practices of sustainable agriculture”, we began to draft a conceptual framework chart, asking questions such as “What are the main characteristics of good practice?”, “What are the preconditions?”, “What are the impact and replication factors?”. Once we see something that looks like “good practice”, we cross-check whether all the aspects mentioned have been met. For this purpose, we start with an analysis of the various activities in sustainable agriculture (the white quadrangle in the centre of the chart on the following page) that constitute local good practice in the specific project context. For practical reasons we focus on the one or two more successful activities in the different fields of agriculture. For each single activity selected we look at the methods and techniques that have been adopted, and their technical appropriateness. Regarding the methods adopted, we want to identify the reasons why groups of farmers (marginal, small, big) either adopt or do not adopt certain methods. To avoid overlapping with the subsequent analysis of local good practice sustainability as a whole, questions on technical appropriateness are limited to finding out the extent to which each activity incorporates indigenous knowledge, makes use of locally available resources, and is manageable and safe.

The next step is to check the extent to which a good practice generally fulfils sustainability criteria:

- **Environmental friendliness** means that the practice has a positive – at least a non-degrading – impact on the environment, thus contributing to the improvement of soils, water, and flora and fauna (biodiversity).

- **Economic viability** means that the practice has lasting benefits for the family and village / community economy, and is financially advantageous – or at least bearable – for the adopting farmers.

- **Social and cultural acceptance** means that the practice respects local traditions and belief systems, is positively received by the various local social groups, is sensitive to the needs of people affected by health problems, and that it has positive effects on the organisation of labour within the families and the community.
• **Building viable institutions** means that local institutions created and/or strengthened by the project have clear and shared objectives with a focus on sustainable agriculture, represent various social groups (including the marginalised), that they are respected and firmly linked to private and public service providers, and that they have sufficient managerial capacities.

**Figure 2: Conceptual framework – local good practice in sustainable agriculture**

A good practice itself is embedded in local conditions and influenced by the project approach and its instruments. Both boxes in the diagram remain white to indicate a more descriptive rather than analytical approach to the assessment.

The description of **local conditions** includes key elements of the natural, socio-economic and socio-cultural environment, as well as existing institutional structures relevant to agriculture. To enable sustainable agriculture, the **project approach** and its instruments comprise various aspects of project planning, implementation, and follow-up, that include target group analysis, identification of appropriate solutions, instruments applied, services provided, cost-effectiveness, and a withdrawal strategy.

In the context of our assessment, we are particularly interested in the contribution of local good practice in sustainable agriculture to the achievement of poverty alleviation objectives in the long term and its potential for replication. We therefore focus on the **long-term impact** on food and nutrition security, and on more equitable access to and control over
relevant farming resources. The assessment of spontaneous replication (which means that certain practices, methods, technologies or institutions are adopted without any outside support, particularly project incentives) will provide a first insight into why local good practice is replicated by farmers.

The entire framework of local good practices, the project, spontaneous replication and impact are again influenced by external factors, which can have either fostering or hampering effects. Although these factors go beyond the project’s sphere of influence and that of its target groups and differ according to context, they need to be assessed to analyse good practice reliability.

**Scaling up**

Scaling-up has almost become a new paradigm in the discussion on the impact of development activities. Generally speaking, scaling-up means “increasing impact”. Although in no way new to the field, the goal of scaling up has nevertheless become a recent mainstream issue, since the dissemination of good practices is seen as a fundamental means of preventing successful practices remaining “island” solutions. If good practices are implemented by different organisations in different regions, they run the risk of remaining isolated solutions to local situations. A number of potential good practices are thereby lost as an example to others. What is missing are activities that increase the impact of good practices by, for instance, passing on their benefits to more people. This can be achieved by strengthening the sustainability of the implementing organisation, increasing activities and geographical coverage, and broadening indirect project impact by influencing other actors working in the same field.

The second part of the conceptual framework describes the various strategies pursued by organisations or projects to scale up their local good practices. Using the „International IIRR workshop“ definition as a starting point, we understand scaling up as any effort to bring more quality benefits to more people, over a wider geographical area, more quickly, more equitably and to more lasting effect. We differentiate between scaling-up strategies and activities of local level institutions and those of implementing organisations. However, numerous overlaps do occur (see chart on the following page). Based on existing taxonomies (e.g., UVIN, JAIN AND BROWN 2000) we identified four categories for the assessment of scaling-up strategies, which are indicated in the chart on the following page from the bottom (as core activities of the organisation) to the top (as more peripheral activities).

**Organisational growth** is probably the most natural scaling-up strategy to achieve greater outreach and thus bring more benefits to more people over a wider geographical area. Organisations may increase their staff, resources, and project area. However, it is not a prerequisite for scaling up; some organisations may even decide to reduce their staff, but are still in a position to increase their impact.

Organisations can also increase their activities in order to bring more quality benefit to a greater number of people, more equitably and to more lasting effect. This can happen either on the horizontal level, when an organisation extends activities to new sectors, or on the vertical level, when activities are added to those already existent within one sector. However, for good practices of sustainable agriculture the potential for scaling up is higher when activities are increased vertically rather than horizontally.
Another category of scaling-up strategies consists of activities that enhance organisational sustainability to ensure long-term availability of human and financial resources and thus provide more quality benefits to more lasting effect. This strategy can include activities such as capacity-building of staff, organisational learning and knowledge management, and the mobilisation of resources.

Finally, an organisation can pursue the strategy of broadening its indirect impact by affecting the behaviour of other actors who work with the poor; hereby, the target group is reached indirectly through the actions and decisions of others. The most prominent example is networking, which organisations use in order to cooperate (temporarily) with other organisations for a common goal. Other activities to achieve indirect impact are public relations, influencing policies (e.g., lobbying and advocacy), mobilising and campaigning, giving support to other organisations and individuals, decentralising and outsourcing, and creating federal structures.

In addition to these four strategies, we consider having a cost-effective approach and an exit strategy fundamental to the assessment of scaling-up strategies (both aspects are covered in the assessment of the project approach and instruments). Having a cost-effective approach is important to its rapid spreading over a larger area, thus increasing the organisation’s outreach. Having an exit strategy for the project will ensure that an organisation withdraws as early as possible from a project area, and is able to spend its resources on new projects.
It should be kept in mind that the impact of all scaling-up activities mentioned above can be limited by external factors beyond the organisations’ sphere of influence (e.g., government policies and global conventions).
C Overview of survey topics, questions, and methods

This chapter is the focal point of the guidelines as it is the concrete outline of the self-assessment. The survey topics and questions, the assumptions behind the questions, methods to use, and ideas for documentation specified therein are basically our recommendations on the content of the self-assessment in your organisation or project and in your case study area(s). They were developed jointly by the Indian Sustainet partner organisations and the SLE team, and include numerous suggestions from the Sustainet secretariate, SARD/FAO, and other stakeholders concerned. The chapter is structured as follows:

- After a brief introduction to the topic and the general methodological setting, each survey topic (as identified in the conceptual framework) is divided into a number of survey questions. The survey topic C5 “Environmental friendliness”, for instance, contains seven survey questions related to improvement of soils, water, biodiversity, reduced pressure on bio-resources, and fostering and hampering factors.
- Each survey question contains the underlying assumptions as to why the question is significant and how it is linked to the survey question and topic.
- The paragraphs on data collection and documentation provide hints on methods and tools that can be used to generate and document the information.

It is important to note that survey questions are not interview questions and still need adoption to your local context. They are merely a guide to collecting relevant information and to pre-structure your case study report. It is also assumed that information will be collected and documented in a gender sensitive manner. The opinions of men and women should be asked for separately, even if not all the survey questions are framed with a gender perspective.

The survey questions at a glance

1 Project approach and instruments to enable sustainable agriculture
   1.1 What criteria and instruments did you apply to select the project area and the beneficiaries? Who are your project target groups?
   1.2 What instruments did you apply to identify and analyse which problems and solutions? Who was involved in the process and what role did they play?
   1.3 How and based on what criteria did you choose between various alternatives?
   1.4 Which awareness building and mobilisation activities did you undertake at the beginning of the project and on what issues? What strategies did you use?
   1.5 What instruments did you use, and what activities did you undertake in planning, implementation, and follow-up?
   1.6 How did you deal with unforeseen events?
   1.7 What means did you use, what activities did you undertake in the local documentation of field experience, good practices and challenges? Who did the documentation, what role did the farmers play?
   1.8 How and why did you create and strengthen local institutions?
1.9 What were your overall expenditures in the case study area (village, watershed, etc.) to date / until the end of the project?

1.10 In how many years, in what manner, and based on what criteria do you (plan to) withdraw from the area?

2 Local conditions relevant to agriculture

2.1 What is the name and number of the agro-ecological zone (AEZ) under which your case study area falls (according to FAO system)? What are the relevant geographical patterns of the area?

2.2 What changes have occurred in the area’s relevant climatic conditions in recent years and how have the farmers reacted to them?

2.3 What are the relevant socio-economic and socio-cultural characteristics of families and the community?

2.4 What access do local people have to basic infrastructure?

2.5 What are the main traditional / indigenous and other formal and non-formal local institutions, and how do they affect agriculture?

3 Changes in agricultural practices as a result of the project

3.1 To what extent did marginal, small and big farmers in the area of operation adhere to the project by adopting sustainable agricultural practices, and why / why not?

3.2 What did inter-farm linkages look like before and after introducing the practice and what caused a change?

4 Technical appropriateness

4.1 To what extent does the practice, method or technology incorporate indigenous knowledge?

4.2 To what extent does the promoted practice, method or technology make use of locally available resources (e.g. local skills) and external inputs (e.g. training) for its implementation, maintenance and repair?

4.3 To what extent can farmers modify or innovate on the practice, method or technology to make it more suitable to their individual needs, constraints and capacities?

4.4 How safe is the practice, method or technology to humans and livestock?

5 Environmental friendliness

5.1 What changes were observed in soil fertility?

5.2 How did soil erosion change?

5.3 How did the water quality change?

5.4 How did the availability of water change?

5.5 How do sustainable agricultural practices contribute to increasing biodiversity?

5.6 How do sustainable agricultural practices contribute to changes in the pressure on bio-resources?

5.7 What were the fostering and hampering factors in achieving environmental friendliness? What are the main challenges?
6 Economic viability

6.1 How do those who adopted sustainable agricultural practices (men and women) benefit economically in the long-run?

6.2 How have the adopted sustainable agricultural practices helped families to cope better with adverse situations?

6.3 How does the village or community as a whole benefit economically from the adopted sustainable agricultural practices?

6.4 To what extent do farmers who have adopted sustainable agricultural practices use existing GO / NGO / cooperatives non-monetary and monetary incentives for sustainable agriculture?

6.5 How have monetary inputs and outputs changed?

6.6 What is the time required to get the first yield, to reach a no-profit / no-loss situation, and to reach a profit situation?

6.7 What were the fostering and hampering factors in achieving economic and financial viability? What are the main challenges?

7 Social and cultural acceptance

7.1 To what extent do sustainable agricultural practices related to subsistence / food production respect traditional food and nutrition habits?

7.2 To what extent do sustainable agricultural practices respect important traditions, norms or taboos?

7.3 To what extent do the elders / traditional leaders, the younger generation and big farmers agree with the changes in agricultural practices and how do they influence the adoption of sustainable agricultural practices?

7.4 How are those who adopted sustainable agricultural practices viewed in their community / village and to what extent are they heard in the existing local hierarchies, politics, and power relations?

7.5 To what extent have sustainable agricultural practices extended to village common land / waste land?

7.6 How has the adoption of sustainable agricultural practices changed the intensity and division or sharing of labour between men and women (also seasonally)?

7.7 How have the practices affected labour contracts / arrangements?

7.8 To what extent do sustainable agricultural practices take relevant health problems into consideration (e.g. HIV/AIDS, malaria, etc.)?

7.9 What were the fostering and hampering factors in achieving social and cultural acceptance? What are the main challenges?

8 Impact with the focus on contributions to the achievement of MDG 1

8.1 How has the daily intake and variety of staple food, vegetables, fruits, and protein sources changed (for different members of the household)?

8.2 What changes in the number of food insecurity months took place?

8.3 How did the access to, distribution and control of key resources change for small and marginal farmers (men and women)?
8.4 How do the landless, daily wage labourers and other marginalised groups benefit from sustainable agricultural practices?

8.5 What are the main reasons for the observed impact / non-impact (internal and external factors)? What are the main challenges?

9 Spontaneous replication

9.1 Which of the described practices, methods, techniques or institutions were spontaneously adopted elsewhere, and which were not? Why / why not was it spontaneously adopted?

9.2 Who spontaneously adopted it and who did not? What do they have in common, and what is the difference to the those who did not adopt a practice?

9.3 Where was it spontaneously adopted (inside or outside the area of operation)? How was it spread and with what means of communication?

9.4 How did the farmers who adopted the practices modify them? How did they bridge the missing support? Is the adopted practice still successful?

10 Viability of local institutions and their scaling-up activities

10.1 What are the objectives and visions, various norms, rules, regulations and by-laws of the institution? To what extent are they agreed upon by all members?

10.2 To what extent are various community groups, including marginalised groups, represented in the institution and in decision-making?

10.3 What is the legal status of the institutions and how widely are they accepted in the area?

10.4 How has the institution grown in size and outreach since its foundation?

10.5 Which activities has the institution taken up in addition to those originally planned?

10.6 How does the local institution influence others to adopt the practices?

10.7 How has the institution strengthened its own sustainability?

10.8 What are the fostering and hampering factors for the most relevant of the institution’s scaling-up activities?

10.9 What are the future plans of the institution for scaling-up?

11 Scaling-up strategies and activities of the organisation / project

11.1 To what extent has your organisation or project expanded in size and outreach since its foundation?

11.2 What activities has your organisation or project taken up in addition to those originally planned?

11.3 How has your organisation or project broadened its indirect impact?

11.4 How has your organisation strengthened its own sustainability?

11.5 What are the fostering and hampering factors for the scaling-up strategies and activities relevant to your organisation or project (internal and external)?

11.6 What are the future plans of your organisation or project in scaling up?
C1  Project approach and instruments to enable sustainable agriculture

Knowing the approach and instruments of your organisation or project is essential for understanding the cause-and-effect chains involved in the successful (re)introduction and promotion of sustainable agriculture. The success of a sustainable agriculture practice depends at least partly on the appropriateness of the chosen approach and instruments with regard to local adaptability and acceptance, and expenditures, etc. Therefore, questions in this section refer to the criteria used in selecting beneficiaries, how you identified the main problems in the local context, how you implement and follow-up the project, and your exit strategy.

You will find material on your project approach and instruments in different documents – e.g., project planning documents, documented PRA exercises, and monitoring and evaluation reports. Thus, reviewing existing documents, survey reports, etc. will give an insight into many of the issues in this section. However, some of the available information may need updating, completion, and a more focused documentation for your case study report. We therefore suggest you cross-check existing data with field co-ordinators and other staff at your organisation or project.
### The survey questions

| 1.1: | What criteria and instruments did you apply to select the project area and the beneficiaries? Who are your project target groups? |
| 1.2: | What instruments did you apply to identify and analyse problems and solutions? Who was involved in the process and what role did they play? |
| 1.3: | How and based on what criteria did you choose between various alternatives? |
| 1.4: | What awareness-building and mobilisation activities did you undertake at the beginning of the project and on what issues? What strategies did you use? |
| 1.5: | What instruments did you use, and what activities did you undertake in planning, implementation, and follow-up? |
| 1.6: | How did you deal with unforeseen events? |
| 1.7: | What means did you use, what activities did you undertake in the local documentation of field experience, good practices and challenges? Who did the documentation, what role did the farmers play? |
| 1.8: | How and why did you create and strengthen local institutions? |
| 1.9: | What were your overall expenditures in the case study area (village, watershed, etc.) to date / until the end of the project? |
| 1.10: | In how many years, in what manner, and based on what criteria do you (plan to) withdraw from the area? |
1.1 What criteria and instruments did you apply to select the project area and the beneficiaries? Who are your project target groups?

Describing the initial steps of the project is important for a complete picture of your project approach. The participatory analysis of local needs, poverty groups, and root causes of poverty is a frequent instrument used in this context. It is usually accompanied by identifying dedicated and like-minded individuals and institutions, and consulting government statistics on poverty.

Study project documents; interview management staff and project officers, if required

1.2 What instruments did you apply to identify and analyse problems and solutions? Who was involved in the process and what role did they play?

Good practices in sustainable agriculture focus on the most urgent problems and most needy groups (tribal people, marginal farmers, women, etc.). You have probably used participatory methods such as focus group discussions and ranking exercises to explore past and present problems, and how these were / could be solved.

Study project documents; interview management staff and project officers, if required

1.3 How and based on what criteria did you choose between various alternatives?

You may have used criteria such as cost-effectiveness, feasibility and manageability to develop solutions in specific local contexts. Having used tools such as Participatory Technology Development, exposure visits etc., you may have initiated dialogue on how to integrate local knowledge into your experience with the latest technical knowledge. As a result, you may have jointly developed solutions in one or more fields of agricultural activity.

Study project documents; interview management staff and project officers, if required
Examples of fields of agricultural activity

- Soil and water management (soil protection measures, composting, water harvesting techniques like farm ponds, percolation tanks, etc.)
- Procurement and management of genetic resources / seeds (i.e. improved access to, selection, conservation and multiplication of seeds)
- Crop and animal diversification (e.g. diversification varieties, new crop addition, agro-forestry, agro-horticulture, diversification of traditional breeds)
- Land use system (e.g. settled cultivation, crop-animal husbandry, fish culture, silvi-culture, rice-fish cultivation and other alternate land use systems)
- Land preparation and planting (e.g. zero tillage, direct seeding, spacing)
- Cropping systems (e.g. inter-cropping, crop rotation, mixed cropping, multiple cropping, parallel cropping, relay cropping, etc.)
- Plant protection (e.g. biological predators, bio-pesticides, trap crops, insect repellent plants, spacing, strip plantation, time of planting)
- Forest protection (e.g. sustainable plant, wood and fodder collection, forest grazing, social fencing, community based management system)
- Animal husbandry (e.g. pasture land management, fodder cultivation, crop residue utilisation)
- Post-harvest technology and management (e.g. traditional / indigenous / modern post-harvest storage and pest management)
- Add-on activities based on farm produce / resources (e.g. api-culture, agro-/ food processing, aquaculture, processing by products etc.)

1.4 What awareness-building and mobilisation activities did you undertake at the beginning of the project and on what issues? What strategies did you use?

Through awareness and social mobilisation activities you have probably addressed various groups of people different social backgrounds, men and women), making them understand certain problems, finding adequate solutions and tapping their own potential, thereby encouraging their commitment to your project’s activities. You may have used group discussions, audio-visual shows, street plays, farmer-to-farmer visits and other tools to create awareness.

Study project documents; interview management staff and project officers, if required
Awareness building activities on Non-pesticide management in Punukular Village, Andhra Pradesh

Awareness building started with exposure trips for farmers to other villages where the practice of non-pesticidal management was already in use. Important were also the inputs provided by the Watershed Association and the women’s Self Help Groups (SHG) of the village. The women in the SHGs, for instance, warned their men against going to the market for procuring pesticides. They also took an active part in the trainings and started experiencing, observing and discussing the difference between using chemical pesticides and the ecological technologies for pest management. Additionally, cultural shows were used to educate villagers on adverse effects of chemical pesticides, health hazards and alternative strategies. The local NGO also provided farm inputs to the farmers on a non-profit basis.

Source: Interview with farmers and local NGO staff

1.5 What instruments did you use, and what activities did you undertake in planning, implementation, and follow-up?

You have certainly ensured participation by all relevant stakeholders during planning and implementation of project activities, following principles of ownership and transparency (e.g., on project goals and funds). To understand the key success factors of your project, it is important to be clear about what support instruments you have used (extension approaches, subsidies / matching funds, Participatory Implementation Planning, etc.) and why.

Study project documents; interview management staff and project officers, if required

1.6 How did you deal with unforeseen events?

Unforeseen events such as natural calamities (droughts, floods etc.) or unexpected policy changes may have led to unfavourable conditions for your project and the target groups in your case study area. Such challenges require a certain flexibility and coping strategies in project implementation.

Study project documents; interview management staff and project officers, if required
1.7 What means did you use, what activities did you undertake in the local documentation of field experience, good practices and challenges? Who did the documentation, what role did the farmers play?

Asking farmers to document their field experience, including successes and challenges, is a key element in enhancing beneficiary ownership. Local documentation (using tools such as audio- and visual documentation, display of pictures and maps on community walls, experience-sharing in meetings, etc.) are particularly convincing to farmers.

Study project documents; interview management staff and project officers, if required

1.8 How and why did you create and strengthen local institutions?

Strengthening existing local institutions and/or creating new ones is a precondition for ensuring the continuation of the project, particularly in its initial stage and after the withdrawal of the project.

Due to lack of resources, activities of existing institutional structures can be very limited. Some lack organising capacities and/or exclude different social strata; youth and women are under-represented. Strengthening capacities at the local level fosters the maintenance of the project and its common activities, such as running a seed bank. Local institutions basically undergo the three main stages of ‘initiation’, ‘growth’, and ‘maturity’, requiring different project support activities during each phase. Continuous dialogue with local institutions helps to ensure need-based support to meet specific requests at crucial stages.

Study project documents; interview management staff and project officers, if required

1.9 What were your overall expenditures in the case study area (village, watershed, etc.) to date / until the end of the project?

Cost-effectiveness ensures that your project approach and instruments can be replicated more quickly over a wider geographical area, thus reaching more people in a given time. Documenting your expenditures is a precondition for monitoring and evaluating your project approach. Transparent expenditures for different activities help to identify effective and less effective activities for the beneficiaries.
Study project documents; interview management staff and project officers, if required

Example from a watershed management project (modified)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Expenditures (Rs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures (Rs.)</td>
<td>5,138,703.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures per beneficiary (Rs.)</td>
<td>2,569.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Expenditures (Rs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Man power</td>
<td>1,016,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurring cost</td>
<td>585,332.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-recurring cost</td>
<td>180,538.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit fees</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank charges</td>
<td>16,534.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building (incl. awareness building, meetings, exposure visits, culture camps, etc.)</td>
<td>273,255.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry point activities (incl. water springs / steps, washing platforms, soak pits, treadle pumps, etc.)</td>
<td>265,840.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resource management (incl. agro-horticulture and various construction works)</td>
<td>1,905,848.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural production (incl. vegetable production, grain banks, etc.)</td>
<td>511,744.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihood support to landless (incl. backyard poultry, sheep, plough bullocks)</td>
<td>343,212.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.10 In how many years, in what manner, and based on what criteria do you (plan to) withdraw from the area?

An exit strategy ensures that your organisation withdraws as early as possible from a project area and can concentrate its resources on other areas. This strategy is closely linked to institution-building activities, as it allows you to hand over responsibility. An exit policy can include training of local institutions and individuals (e.g., in fund management), thus enabling communities to carry out maintenance activities on their own.

Study project documents; interview management staff and project officers, if required
C2 Local conditions relevant to agriculture

A local success story of sustainable agriculture cannot be fully understood and evaluated without knowing the relevant local environmental, socio-economic, socio-cultural and institutional context. For this reason, this section concentrates on a brief overview of the important geographical and climatic patterns of your case study area, the key social, economic and cultural characteristics of the families and the community, the basic infrastructural set-up, and the local institutions relevant to agriculture.

Most probably you have already collected considerable information on local conditions of the case study area during earlier field surveys, PRA exercises, evaluation missions, and the like. Therefore, a desk study of project documents, existing village profiles, survey reports, etc. will answer a great deal of the questions in this section.

However, some of the available information may be outdated, incomplete or require validation before being included in your case study report. We therefore recommend that you cross-check existing data with local people (particularly village leaders and/or members of village institutions, and farmers), the field staff of your organisation or project, government reports and statistics, and other valuable sources of information. In discussions with local stakeholders – apart from interviewing – you could use visualisation tools such as
- timelines (e.g., on rainfall patterns and temperature),
- transect (e.g., on soil types and topography),
- resource mapping (e.g., on drainage patterns),
- social mapping (e.g., on social groups and religions in the village),
- wealth ranking (e.g., on social strata and income sources), and
- Venn diagramming (e.g., on local institutions and their relevance to agriculture).

There are a number of questions in this section, particularly those related to socio-economic and socio-cultural issues (2a), which require participation of both men and women in data collection. Others, such as the one on possible conflicts within the community (also under 2a), are sensitive and should not necessarily be referred to in the village but with outsiders in possession of profound knowledge about the area and community.

To maintain a clear focus in the assessment and description of local conditions, you should always ask yourself how the particular issue you are about to refer to or document affects land use in general and agriculture in particular.

Local conditions not only have impact on agriculture but some can also be partly influenced by a sustainable agricultural project (e.g., certain drainage patterns, sources of income, or institutional arrangements). In such cases, you should indicate the changes, but make sure you avoid overlaps with other sections (e.g., ‘environmental friendliness’ or ‘social and cultural acceptance’).
The survey questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1:</th>
<th>What is the name and number of the agro-ecological zone (AEZ) under which your case study area falls (according to FAO system)? What are the relevant geographical patterns of the area?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>What changes have occurred in the area’s relevant climatic conditions in recent years and how have farmers reacted to them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3:</td>
<td>What are the relevant socio-economic and socio-cultural characteristics of families and the community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4:</td>
<td>What access do local people have to basic infrastructure?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5:</td>
<td>What are the main traditional / indigenous and other formal and non-formal local institutions, and how do they affect agriculture?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.1 What is the name and number of the agro-ecological zone (AEZ) under which your case study area falls (according to FAO system)? What are the relevant geographical patterns of the area?

The agro-ecology of a given area forms one of the core framework conditions for agriculture. The FAO (http://www.fao.org/ag/agl/agll/prtaez.stm) provides an international system of geographical mapping units based on climatic conditions (annual precipitation and mean temperatures) and land forms that determine relatively homogeneous crop-growing environments.

Geographical features such as topography (including altitude), drainage patterns, as well as soil types (including problematic soils), are important natural conditions for (potential) agricultural activities in a given locality. The steep of slopes, for instance, determines the soil erosion risk and thus requires specific measures and technologies (e.g., contour ploughing, terracing) for sustainable land use. Saline soils restrict crop cultivation and require certain treatments to make them arable (e.g., planting of salt-tolerant plants, drainage).

Study FAO and other websites and publications; study project documents, village profiles, survey reports etc.; cross-check by interviewing farmers and village leaders, use visualisation tools like resource mapping, transect. If possible, display a sketch map of the area showing soil types, streams, hills, etc.

2.2 What changes have occurred in the area’s relevant climatic conditions in recent years and how have farmers reacted to them?

The amount and distribution of rainfalls as well as seasonal and annual temperatures (mean and variations) influence agricultural activities to a large extent. For instance, they determine the timing of agricultural operations (sowing, etc.) and have an impact on the quantity and quality of yields. Changes in rainfall patterns (e.g., increased frequency of droughts) require adaptive farmer reaction in terms of e.g., changes in cropping patterns.

Study project documents, village profiles, government statistics, etc.; cross-check by interviewing farmers and village leaders, use timelines.
2.3 What are the relevant socio-economic and socio-cultural characteristics of families and the community?

Certain family characteristics (size and structure – joint or nucleus –, land-holding, main sources of income) and those of the community (migrants and immigrants, hierarchies and social groups, religions and conflicts) have a strong impact on agriculture and need to be considered in target group-oriented and need-based project planning and implementation. The needs, potential and constraints of families exclusively dependent on agriculture for their livelihood, for example, differ considerably from those who earn their income mainly with off-farm activities. Similarly, access to resources and the influence of various social groups (e.g., below poverty line families, migrating groups, community leaders) calls for a differentiated approach if sustainable agricultural projects are to be implemented successfully.

Study project documents, village profiles, survey reports, etc.; cross-check by interviewing village leaders, use social mapping if required.
Distribution of landholdings in Bhipur village, Rajasthan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE OF LANDHOLDING*</th>
<th>NUMBER OF FAMILIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landless</td>
<td>20 families (they are engaged mostly in bamboo works, other handicrafts, agriculture labour, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4 bigha</td>
<td>10 families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 bigha</td>
<td>34 families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-35 bigha</td>
<td>50 families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 bigha and above</td>
<td>5 families</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*4 bigha = approx. 1 acre

Source: Village development committee members

Main sources of income in Dhuan village, Rajasthan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASTE</th>
<th>INCOME SOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saharia community</td>
<td>Mostly collection of minor forest produce like gum, honey, amla, chironje, tendu leaves etc., labour work, hardly any interest in cultivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bheel community</td>
<td>100 % rain-fed agriculture (to a little extent also winter crops like barley, gram and pulses)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Village profile

2.4 What access do local people have to basic infrastructure?

Access to basic amenities such as markets, roads, electricity, sanitation and drinking water facilities, as well as schools and health facilities is a key socio-economic framework condition with a direct or indirect impact on agriculture and the local economy in general.

Study project documents, village profiles, survey reports, etc.; cross-check by interviewing village leaders

Access to basic infrastructure in Kodikutunda village, Orissa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASIC INFRASTRUCTURE</th>
<th>ACCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Markets</td>
<td>Distance to the local market is about 4 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>The road is not usable for jeeps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>No electricity connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation facilities</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking water facilities</td>
<td>1 stream, 1 tube well, 1 dug well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Primary school education, but no school building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facilities</td>
<td>The nearest health centre is 22 km away</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Village profile
2.5 What are the main traditional / indigenous and other formal and non-formal local institutions, and how do they affect agriculture?

In a given locality, there are a number of institutions that influence agriculture in different ways – directly or indirectly – and to a varying degree. These can be formal, such as village councils, committees, associations, local NGO branches, and government organisations etc., or informal, such as spiritual leaders, meetings of the elders, rituals and festivals etc. Their influence can relate to e.g., tenure and water rights, land-use, management of natural resources, conflict resolution, the timing of agricultural operations, and other issues relevant to agriculture.

Study project documents, village profiles, survey reports, etc.; interview village leaders

Local institutions and their relevance for agriculture in Bhipur village, Rajasthan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>RELEVANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Village Panchayat</td>
<td>A formal political body (council) of elected members; the members conduct monthly meetings in which all the issues of the villagers are discussed</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caste Panchayat</td>
<td>A forum where the disputes of a particular caste are discussed and decided; sometimes seniors of that particular caste from adjacent villages also join for decision-making</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choupal</td>
<td>General village assembly which takes place regularly to discuss and decide on development works and other related matters; it is a non-political body</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elders</td>
<td>Elders are not formally organised but meet for different issues such as repairing of village temples, distribution of water, etc.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Council of Agriculture Research</td>
<td>ICAR has a Central Sheep and Wool Research Institute branch near the village; they work for breed improvement, feeding and care, and run a few fodder development plots in surrounding areas</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Village leaders
C3 Changes in agriculture as a result of the project

Introducing sustainable agricultural practices changes farming. The intention of this topic is to examine these changes and analyse the extent to which different groups of farmers have adopted certain practices. The focus is on practices that you consider particularly successful and worth being replicated and disseminated.

In order to allow your description of changes in agricultural practices to be compared more easily with other case studies, data should be quantitative in part. However, in the course of your discussions with groups of farmers (male and female), village leaders, local committees etc., you can also use visualisation tools such as field maps (showing e.g., where farmers carry out individual practices), as this will increase their participation. You should cross-check their response to a particular practice with the opinions of other farmers and your own observations (e.g., during a field walk).

Assessing the adoption of practices in association with their technical appropriateness (see chapter C4) is useful.
The survey questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1:</th>
<th>To what extent did marginal, small, and big farmers in the area of operation adhere to the project by adopting sustainable agricultural practices, and why / why not?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2:</td>
<td>What did inter-farm linkages look like before and after introducing the practice and what caused a change?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1 To what extent did marginal, small, and big farmers in the area of operation adhere to the project by adopting sustainable agricultural practices, and why / why not?

Analysing the degree to which sustainable agricultural practices were adopted by different social groups of farmers gives an insight into their acceptance and feasibility, and their scope among the target group. Small and marginal farmers are anticipated to be those who adopt sustainable agricultural practices in the first place, since the latter (e.g., composting, multi-cropping etc.) are particularly appropriate to small-scale farming conditions (low level of mechanisation, use of own inputs e.g., organic fertiliser, family labour etc.). However, some may not adopt certain technologies or the full package of recommendations for various reasons (e.g., insecure tenure rights, the influence of ‘pesticide agents’ etc.). On the other hand, certain practices might be adopted by bigger farmers, too.

Ask key persons who have an overview of the agriculture activities in the area or village, e.g., members of the village committee; for each selected practice give the degree of adoption by marginal, small, and big farmers in percentage or in the categories ‘fully adopted’ / ‘partly adopted’ / ‘not adopted’ (define what marginal, small, and big means with regard to land tenure in the local context).

If you wish to highlight a specific practice, you can integrate a ‘micro case study’ in your assessment, e.g., an exceptionally successful family.

Use a table to assemble the information; in addition, you can use photographs and sketch maps (e.g., a field map)

3.2 What did inter-farm linkages look like before and after introducing the practice and what caused a change?

A variety of linkages exist between the farms in a village community. The joint adoption of certain agricultural practices will strengthen many of these linkages, resulting in greater social cohesion and more efficient organisation of labour. Examples of inter-farm linkages are the sharing or exchange of labour / manpower and other resources (e.g., water, land), common resources management, common activities such as community fencing, seed exchange, inter-lending, sharing of produce and knowledge, but also synergies or conflicts between upland and lowland farmers.

Discuss with different groups of farmers, herders / nomads, the landless and daily wage labourers, village leaders

Assemble the information in a table (together with the table used in survey question 1)
C4 Technical appropriateness

Technical appropriateness is a pre-condition for sustainability. Only when a practice, method or technology considers local knowledge and capacities, makes use of locally available resources without requiring continued external input, and is manageable and safe, can it be expected to be taken up permanently by local farmers. This assessment, therefore, focuses on criteria such as incorporation of traditional knowledge, potential for modification and innovation, input requirements, and skills required for maintenance and repair.

As technical appropriateness needs to be discussed individually for each practice, method or technology, you should apply the questions you selected for description under the survey topic “Changes in agricultural practices”. After you have completed the discussion on the adoption of, e.g., vermi-composting, you can continue by discussing the various aspects of the technical appropriateness of this particular practice. You should combine group interviewing with direct observations of the practices or technologies (e.g., gully plugs, compost pits) to gain a deeper insight into their technical appropriateness.

It is important to obtain the different views of men and women on this issue. It is possible that their perception of the incorporation of traditional knowledge and of safety aspects will differ considerably.

In cross-checking, do also use your own judgement and that of your field staff and other key informants on technical appropriateness. Farmers, for instance, may not be fully aware of the real challenges they face when a certain structure breaks down, and hence overestimate their capacity for maintenance and repair. Similarly, local people may have misconceptions about the dangers involved in e.g., bio-fertilisers due to a lack of experience and awareness.
The survey questions

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>To what extent does the practice, method or technology incorporate indigenous knowledge?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>To what extent does the promoted practice, method or technology make use of locally available resources (e.g. lokal skills) and external inputs (e.g. training) for its implementation, maintenance and repair?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>To what extent can farmers modify or innovate on the practice, method or technology to make it more suitable to their individual needs, constraints and capacities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>How safe is the practice, method or technology to humans and livestock?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1 To what extent does the practice, method or technology incorporate indigenous knowledge?

Practices are more sustainable if they integrate or build on local indigenous knowledge and experience (e.g., indigenous breeds of draught animals, traditional tillage and irrigation methods). This also applies to situations where long lost indigenous knowledge has been revitalised through the project.

Interview farmers (women and men); use e.g. pie-charts for visualisation; cross-check by interviewing elders and community leaders, key persons

Assemble the information in a table (together with the tables used in survey questions 1 and 2 of “changes in agriculture practices” in chapter B5)

Example pie-chart on the practice “vermi-composting”

4.2 To what extent does the promoted practice, method or technology make use of locally available resources (e.g. local skills) and external inputs (e.g. training) for its implementation, maintenance and repair?

An agriculture practice or technology that uses locally available resources for the most part is technically more appropriate and sustainable than one that relies to a large extent on external inputs for implementation and maintenance. Local resources can cover either material resources such as certain plants or stones or it can cover immaterial resources such as local skills. If more specific skills are required for a promoted practice, these can be developed by training, which is an example for external input.
Interview farmers, village leaders and field staff and/or trainers

Assemble the information in a table (together with the tables used in survey questions 3.1 and 3.2 of “changes in agriculture practices” in chapter C3); if possible, quantify the training efforts and expenses to introduce the practice, method or technology (similar to your calculation under survey question 1.9 in C1 “project approach and instruments”)

**Local resources and external inputs used during installation and maintenance of gully plugs in Bhipur village, Rajasthan (modified)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable Agriculture Practice: Gully Plugging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local resources used during installation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External inputs used during installation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local resources used during maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External inputs used during maintenance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: VDC members, farmers

### 4.3. What extent can farmers modify or innovate on the practice, method or technology to make it more suitable to their individual needs, constraints and capacities?

Certain technologies would be more appropriate if they had greater potential for modification and innovation (substitutions, add-ons, application to different contexts, etc.). This potential can come to the fore in a joint development process between farmers and project staff, where practices, methods or technologies are shaped and adapted to the specific local conditions and needs of the farmers, but also at a later stage, when others wishing to adopt them will find it easier if they can experiment on their own.

Interview farmers (adopters and non-adopters); use visualisation tools like e.g., pie charts

Assemble the information in a table (together with the tables used in survey questions 3.1 and 3.2 of “changes in agriculture practices” in chapter C3); use photographs of various modifications
4.4 How safe is the practice, method or technology to humans and livestock?

Safety for humans and livestock is an important criterion whereby people can judge the appropriateness of certain technologies (e.g., irrigation facilities), implements (e.g., chemical fertiliser) and crops or trees. The safety and health impact of practices is perceived differently by men and women, e.g., regarding danger to children.

Interview farmers (adopters and non-adopters, women and men); cross-check by interviewing field staff
Assemble the information in a table (together with the tables used in survey questions 3.1 and 3.2 of “changes in agriculture practices” in chapter C3)

**SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE PRACTICE: Non-pesticide management in Punukular Village, Andrapradesh**

| Safety for humans | Health hazards caused by toxic pesticides are eliminated. Chemical residues in food chain are reduced. There is an improvement in health of farmers, women and children and reduction in doctors’ consultations. In times of heavy pesticide use, people got injured, intoxicated and even died. The RMP (Registered Medical Practitioner) recollects that there used to be at least 50 to 60 poisoning cases per season before project start. Treatment by the local medical person costed between one and two thousand rupees, severe cases that had to be treated in the district hospital would easily cost at least four to five thousand rupees. |
| Safety for livestock | It is also safe to cattle which feeds pesticides-free fodder and drink pesticides-free water. |

Source: Farmers’ meeting and interview with the medical practitioner of the village
C5 Environmental friendliness

The non-degrading impact of agriculture on the natural environment is a core criterion for sustainability. With the focus on agriculture, this assessment concentrates on soil, water, biodiversity and pressure on bio-resources, where a direct influence is measurable. Broader criteria for the description and analysis of environmental friendliness – e.g., micro-climate – can be dispensed with, since the impact of sustainable agricultural practices would be either indirect or long-term.

To assess the environmental friendliness of sustainable agricultural practices in your case study area, you should first of all analyse project documents (such as M&E and other survey reports) and external data such as maps (including e.g., satellite photographs, if available). However, the main data collection method is focus group interviews with experienced farmers. You can use web-diagramming and other visualisation tools to structure discussions and enhance participation of group members.

The development and use of local indicators is particularly important in the cost-effective assessment of environmental change. For instance, the description of changes in soil fertility or water quality does not require ‘scientific’ research (soil tests, chemical water analysis); local people are well able to provide valuable information on these issues using their own evaluation criteria. Separate interviews with women are vital as they have their own views on soil characteristics, water quality and quantity, and bio-resources due to their separate duties in agriculture (e.g., weeding, sowing) and reproductive work (e.g., fetching water and fuel wood).
The survey questions

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>What changes were observed in soil fertility?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>How did soil erosion change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>How did the water quality change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>How did the availability of water change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>How do sustainable agricultural practices contribute to increasing biodiversity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>How do sustainable agricultural practices contribute to changes in the pressure on bio-resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>What were the fostering and hampering factors in achieving environmental friendliness? What are the main challenges?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1 What changes were observed in soil fertility?

Soil fertility, reflected in favourable chemical, physical and biological soil characteristics, is strongly connected to the environment. Agricultural practices influence chemical soil characteristics, such as pH, salinity and nutrient availability (e.g., humus, nitrate, phosphate), by using organic inputs and need-based irrigation. Mulching, zero-tillage, and the use of organic inputs can improve physical soil characteristics such as porosity, water retention capacity, and aeration of the soil in a positive manner. Biological soil characteristics can be changed by composting, for example, since microbe populations increase.

Interview groups of experienced farmers (women and men); use web-diagrams for visualisation; cross-check by interviewing knowledgeable key persons (e.g. agriculture officer, field staff)

Changes in various soil characteristics in Suria hamlet, Rajasthan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTERISTIC</th>
<th>OBSERVED CHANGES (LOCAL INDICATORS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soil porosity</td>
<td>Change from hard soil to soft soil, which can be seen by the soil lumps breaking easily into granules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water retention capacity</td>
<td>Water permeates easily and there is an increase in biomass in the field like grasses and weeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeration</td>
<td>Well pulverised soil and change from hard to soft soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humus content</td>
<td>Increased water retention and change in the soil colour, which turns brown to darkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkalinity</td>
<td>No alkalinity observed like oily patches on the soil surface resembling automobile oil like deposits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinity</td>
<td>No salinity observed like salt surfaces as white patches on the surface of soil, which disappear in rains and re-surface after rains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological properties</td>
<td>Faster decomposition of the organic matter, increased activities of microbes visible on the soil (more ants’ activities); increased presence of earthworms; increase in number and type of insects (manifested in an increased presence of birds during ploughing, tilling, and hoeing)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Farmers group

5.2 How did soil erosion change?

Soil erosion is a common environmental problem related to agriculture. Through sustainable agricultural practices, e.g., improved land conservation techniques such as contour ploughing, crop diversification, or year-round
vegetation cover, the soil is conserved as a habitat for plants and animals.

Interview groups of experienced farmers; use resource maps and conduct field walks with farmers to discuss changes in rill and gully erosion. Cross-check by interviewing knowledgeable key persons (e.g., agriculture officer, field staff); display maps if possible.

5.3 How did the water quality change?

The quality of water is a core aspect in evaluating the non-degrading impact of agriculture on the environment. Water quality can be described by criteria such as suitability for drinking, colour, ‘softness’, and mineral content. These factors are influenced by agricultural practices; the use of chemical fertilisers, for instance, is often responsible for a decline in water quality.

Interview farmers (women and men) and water user groups; use diagrams for visualisation.

Changes in water quality in Suria hamlet, Rajasthan (modified)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local indicators:</th>
<th>Changes (in % achievement of optimum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salinity (taste)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softness (use of soap)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluoride content (bone pain, better teeth)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before project | After project (now)

Source: Farmers group

5.4 How did the availability of water change?

An increased quantity of water for drinking, animals, and irrigation is a further criterion for the environmental friendliness of a sustainable agricultural practice. It can be measured in the diversity (e.g., springs, rivers, lakes),...
distance, and supply (e.g., seasonal, perennial) of water sources. Crop diversification and more stable plant / crop coverage can reduce run-off losses in the fields. Thus water will be available for plants or fill groundwater reservoirs. Through certain technologies and structures (e.g., gully plugging, diversion drains), local sources and rivers can stand or flow more persistently, so that a stable water supply for plants and animals is available.

Interview farmers (men and women) and water user groups; use resource maps for visualisation

Use tables for documentation and display maps, if possible

**Example table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WATER SOURCE (NAME)</th>
<th>DISTANCE (FROM THE VILLAGE)</th>
<th>WATER AVAILABILITY (MONTHS OF SUPPLY)</th>
<th>MAIN USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>0.5 km</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>Animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well A</td>
<td>0 km</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>Drinking water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well B</td>
<td>0 km</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Drinking water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well C</td>
<td>1.5 km</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Irrigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm pond A</td>
<td>1 km</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Irrigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm pond B</td>
<td>2 km</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community pond</td>
<td>0.5 km</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Animals, irrigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>0.5 km</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>Animals, irrigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.5 How do sustainable agricultural practices contribute to increasing biodiversity?**

An increase in biodiversity is a strong indicator for the environmental friendliness of agricultural practices. Agriculture influences the diversity of both fauna (e.g., butterflies, insects, birds, mammals) and flora (e.g., weeds, shrubs, trees). Greater crop diversity and higher organic matter content in soils, for example, provide more varied habitats and food sources for animals.
Interview experienced farmers and other knowledgeable key persons (e.g. Forest Officers); use resource mapping for visualisation; cross-check by comparing satellite images, if available

As it is hardly possible to get population figures (of insects, birds, weeds etc.) try at least to get abstract statements like ‘slight increase’, ‘few / a lot’ etc.

5.6 How do sustainable agricultural practices contribute to changes in the pressure on bio-resources?

Pressure on bio-resources usually is mainly due to either humans or livestock. For example, Local people use and often overexploit timber (e.g., fuel wood) and non-timber (e.g., resin, berries, mushrooms) forest products. Sustainable agricultural practices such as agro-forestry, vegetative bunding, forest protection measures etc. reduce human pressure on these resources. Also, grazing pressure on natural pastures and forests is a widespread negative impact of animal husbandry. Improved pasture and herd management (fencing, rotational grazing, change in herd composition etc.) and other sustainable agricultural practices reduce the pressure of animals on bio-resources.

Interview community leaders, farmers, herders. Interview farmers (men and women) and user groups such as charcoal manufacturers, hunters, honey collectors etc.; cross-check by interviewing key persons (e.g. Forest Officers)

Reduced pressure on forest in Mankadamundi village, Orissa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEFORE PROJECT</th>
<th>AFTER PROJECT (NOW)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Due to shifting cultivation the dense forest was destroyed</td>
<td>There is a social boundary and forest protection so the outsiders are not taking wood anymore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to outsider intervention, trees were cut for fuel wood and other domestic uses</td>
<td>Due to various forest plantations, the tree cover increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local people planted some trees on the bunds whose branches are used for fuel wood</td>
<td>Source: Farmers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.7 What were the fostering and hampering factors in achieving environmental friendliness? What are the main challenges?

There are root-cause factors for the environmental friendliness of sustainable agricultural practices, which can be
- internal and fostering, e.g., favourable local traditions and values,
- internal and hampering, e.g., excessive use of chemicals by some farmers,
- external and fostering, e.g., government subsidies for bio-fertiliser,
There are factors that challenge the future sustainability of positive environmental impact. They can be internal, e.g., the challenge of maintaining and repairing soil conservation structures, or external, e.g., immigration patterns.

Interview groups of farmers, community leaders, elders, key persons

Factors to achieve environmental friendliness in Bhipur village, Rajasthan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOSTERING FACTORS</th>
<th>HAMPERING FACTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal factors:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Internal factors:</strong> Encroachment and illegal occupation of land by powerful people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of the religious believes, the people look after the resources and maintain it like community ponds, lands, temples etc.</td>
<td>Illegal cutting of trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community has decided “not to use axe” and not to cut green trees</td>
<td>Increase in population and lack of awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantation of trees inside the homestead, agriculture fields, and to conserve the old trees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community drive for cleanliness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **External factors:**                                                             | **External factors:**                                                                                  |
| Good rains last year and this year                                               | Indiscriminate use of insecticides by some big farmers around the village                              |
|                                                                                  | Rehabilitation of outside farmers in the grazing land of the village                                  |
|                                                                                  | Growth of trees like *Prosopis juliflora*                                                            |

Source: Group of farmers and community leaders
Challenges to sustain environmental friendliness in Bhipur village, Rajasthan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERNAL FACTORS</th>
<th>EXTERNAL FACTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To maintain the unity and continuity of the VDC and the work for watershed development and grazing land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and repair gully plugs, farm field bunds etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of vegetation and plantation including trees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No guarantee of regular rains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenge to control the damage to grazing land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Group of farmers and community leaders
C6 Economic viability

Economic viability is a core criterion for assessing the sustainability of agricultural practices. If the practices yield long-term economic benefits for the farmers who adopt them, and for the village or area as a whole, if the financial implications of the change in practices are bearable or advantageous for farmers, these changes are likely to be sustained.

The focus of the assessment, therefore, is on the (long-term) monetary and non-monetary benefits the adoption of sustainable agricultural practices has brought about for members of farm households and the community, village or area as a whole. Examples at household level are increased or stabilised yields and income, reduced indebtedness and dependence on costly external inputs, and increased scope for saving. Village level examples are increased purchasing power of the local population, increased tax income for local government, and evolvement of small-scale processing industries.

Whether the adoption of sustainable agricultural practices has helped families to cope better with adverse situations such as droughts, or whether sustainability is only possible as a result of the incentives provided by the organisation, the government or other organisations are further key issues for economic sustainability that need to be assessed.

With regard to financial viability, survey questions focus on the (long-term) monetary input-output ratio of adopted practices and on the time required to reach a profit situation (e.g., in the case of investments for perennial crops).

The assessment of economic viability requires individual household interviews as well as group discussions at village level.

Certain visualisation tools are helpful during discussions on economic and financial issues, especially timelines (e.g., on the development of income over time). To get a comprehensive picture of the economic situation in a household, men and women should be asked separately.
# The survey questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>How do those who adopted sustainable agricultural practices (men and women) benefit economically in the long run?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>How have the adopted sustainable agricultural practices helped families to cope better with adverse situations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>How does the village or community as a whole benefit economically from the adopted sustainable agricultural practices?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>To what extent do farmers who have adopted sustainable agricultural practices use existing GO / NGO / cooperative non-monetary and monetary incentives for sustainable agriculture?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>How have monetary inputs and outputs changed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>How long does it take for the first yield to reach a no-profit / no-loss situation, and to reach a profit situation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>What were the fostering and hampering factors in achieving economic viability? What are the main challenges?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.1 How do those who adopted sustainable agricultural practices (men and women) benefit economically in the long run?

The adoption of sustainable agricultural practices has various (long-term) positive effects on the family economy. Improved soil and water management, diversification of crops, on-farm production of farm inputs such as fertiliser and seeds, improved post-harvest management, and other activities can yield benefits in terms of e.g., stabilisation or increase of yields and income, diversification of income sources and markets, reduced dependence on costly external farm inputs, reduced indebtedness and larger scope for savings or investments. The economic benefits for men differ from those of women.

Interview single farming families (men and women), who adopted sustainable agriculture; use timelines for visualisation

Average yields of main crops in Bhipur village, Rajasthan

Source: Farmers
Increase of yields after set up of seed bank in Pyalaram Village, Andrapradesh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Before project</th>
<th>After project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Farm yields of a small farmer for her 1 acre field | Sorghum 200 kg  
Red gram 20-24 kg  
Field beans 24 kg  
Hibiscus 12 kg  | Sorghum 300 kg  
Red gram 50-60 kg  
Field beans 35 kg  
Green gram 30 kg  
Italian millet 60kg  
Little millet 6 kg  
Finger millet 5 kg  
Niger 1 kg  
Black gram 5 kg | |
| Reasons for improvement                      | timely availability of seeds  
timely ploughing  
timely weeding  
increased fertility of the soil | |

Source: Individual interview with female farmer

Non-Pesticide Management (NPM) in Cotton 2001-02 in Punukula Village, Andrapradesh (on 6.4 ha, with 8 farmers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Yield (q/ha)</th>
<th>Cost of plant protection (Rs/ha)</th>
<th>Net Income (Rs/ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NPM</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>NPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.62</td>
<td>14.72</td>
<td>4301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 How have the adopted sustainable agricultural practices helped families to cope better with adverse situations?

The ability to cope with adverse situations, such as pests, dry periods, winds etc., indicates economic stability. Through various measures such as crop diversification, integrated pest management, water harvesting etc. families are able to take precautions and minimise risks.

Interview single farming families (men and women), who adopted sustainable agriculture; use timelines for visualisation

Assemble the information in a table (together with the table used in B8 “economic benefits”)
6.3 How does the village or community as a whole benefit economically from the adopted sustainable agricultural practices?

The broad adoption of sustainable agriculture influences the village / community economy as a whole. Labour-intensive practices that use local resources, and stabilised and increased income and purchasing power of small and marginal farmers can open up income opportunities for the unemployed, for local manufacturers and traders, but also for local government (e.g., taxes).

Discuss with a group of farmers (marginal, small, big) and with community leaders; cross-check information with rural banks, cooperatives, local government

6.4 To what extent do farmers who have adopted sustainable agricultural practices use existing GO / NGO / cooperative non-monetary and monetary incentives for sustainable agriculture?

The adoption of sustainable agricultural practices may require certain incentives. These can be monetary (subsidies, low interest loans, buy-back guarantees, etc.) or non-monetary (donation of materials and tools, marketing support, training etc.). However, if agricultural practices can only be maintained in the long run with considerable outside support, they are neither economically viable nor easily replicable.

Discuss with a group of farmers (marginal, small, big); cross-check by interviewing community leaders and project officers
Assemble the information in a table, indicating the types, origin, amount and duration of incentives, as well as the degree to which they are utilised by the different farmer groups

6.5 How have monetary inputs and outputs changed?

For agricultural activities to be financially viable, monetary outputs must be higher than monetary inputs, at least in the long run. On the input side, the farmer may spend money on paid labour, farm implements (e.g., patrol, hired tractors), seeds, fertiliser and pesticides, etc. On the output side, the farmer earns money by selling his harvest (e.g., milk, crops, fodder and other by-products). The adoption of sustainable agricultural practices reduces input costs (particularly for small and marginal farmers) and selling produce can increase earnings.
Interview several farmers (marginal, small) individually on two different crops (e.g. cereal and pulse); use a table for visualisation and make the calculation per unit land (in case of cropping) or animal (in case of e.g. milk production)

**Change in net income from millet cultivation in Bhipur village, Rajasthan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Ploughing</strong></td>
<td>Hired plough / Rs. 40/- Labours – Rs. 80/-</td>
<td>Hired plough / Rs. 90/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Fertilising</strong></td>
<td>Hired bullock carts – Rs. 500/-</td>
<td>Hired bullock carts – Rs. 2,500/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Seeds</strong></td>
<td>1Kg – Rs. 30/-</td>
<td>1Kg – Rs. 90/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Sowing</strong></td>
<td>Labourers – Rs. 80/-</td>
<td>Labourers – Rs. 150/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Weeding</strong></td>
<td>Labourers – Rs. 250/-</td>
<td>Labourers – Rs. 600/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Harvesting</strong></td>
<td>Labourers – Rs. 500/-</td>
<td>Labourers – Rs. 900/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Threshing</strong></td>
<td>Rs. 135/-</td>
<td>Rs. 200/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total input cost</strong></td>
<td>Rs.1,615/-</td>
<td>Rs. 4,530/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTPUT/BIGHA</th>
<th>Grains</th>
<th>Fodder</th>
<th>Grains</th>
<th>Fodder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Production</strong></td>
<td>640 kg</td>
<td>4 bull. carts</td>
<td>880 kg</td>
<td>4 bull. carts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Market rate</strong></td>
<td>Rs. 2/kg</td>
<td>Rs. 200/-</td>
<td>Rs. 4/kg</td>
<td>Rs. 300/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total income</strong></td>
<td>Rs. 2,080/-</td>
<td>Rs. 4,720/-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NET INCOME**  
Rs. 465/- per bigha  
Rs. 190/- per bigha

Source: Small farmer

**6.6 What is the time required to get the first yield, to reach a no-profit / no-loss situation, and to reach a profit situation?**

The change to sustainable agriculture may require investments by farmers, with initially no adequate returns. When investing in fruit trees, for instance, farmers may experience initial losses until the yields set in. Similarly, the shift to organic farming may result in an initial drop in yields. On the other hand, as cash requirements on the input side decline (e.g., through on-farm compost production), the time required to reach a profit situation can be minimal.

Interview individual or groups of (marginal and small) farmers, who have adopted sustainable agriculture practices; use timeline for visualisation
6.7 What were the fostering and hampering factors in achieving economic viability? What are the main challenges?

Factors influencing economic and financial viability can be:
- internal and fostering, e.g., high level of awareness regarding financial issues (e.g., market prices, measures), existing cooperative structures to increase bargaining power,
- internal and hampering, e.g., certain traditions that do not allow savings,
- external and fostering, e.g., existing market linkages, and
- external and hampering, e.g., low prices, low demand for organic food, long distance to markets.

Certain factors challenge the future sustaining of a positive economic impact. They can be internal, e.g., the demand for consumer goods may result in new debts, or external, e.g., WTO negotiations.

Interview groups of farmers, community leaders, elders, key persons; assemble the information in a table.
C7 Social and cultural acceptance

Social and cultural acceptance of agricultural practices is a precondition for their sustainability. Focusing on agriculture in a specific local context, the assessment of cultural acceptance concentrates on respect for local traditions and belief systems, including indigenous food and nutrition habits. The assessment of social acceptance comprises the attitudes of the elders / traditional leaders, youth, and big farmers towards changes in agricultural practices, changes in the status of farmers who have shifted to sustainable agriculture, the extension of sustainable agricultural practices to village common lands, effects on the organisation of labour in the family and the community, and the consideration of relevant health problems.

A variety of settings and instruments are needed to assess this topic. Issues related to local traditions, for instance, require (group) discussions with village elders; individual interviews with farmers and their families are recommended to assess both changes in the sharing and division of labour as well as health-related issues.

Men and women should be interviewed separately, particularly on labour and health issues. A female interviewer may be needed. A variety of visualisation tools will help to ease and structure the discussions, e.g.,

- food plates (on traditional food habits),
- resource maps (on village common lands),
- daily calendars (on workload).
### The survey questions

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>To what extent do sustainable agricultural practices related to subsistence / food production respect traditional food and nutrition habits?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>To what extent do sustainable agricultural practices respect important traditions, norms or taboos?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>To what extent do the elders / traditional leaders, the younger generation and big farmers agree with the changes in agricultural practices and how do they influence the adoption of sustainable agricultural practices?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>How are those who adopted sustainable agricultural practices viewed in their community / village and to what extent are they heard in the existing local hierarchies, politics, and power relations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>To what extent have sustainable agricultural practices extended to village common land / waste land?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>How has the adoption of sustainable agricultural practices changed the intensity and division or sharing of labour between men and women (also seasonally)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>How have the practices affected labour contracts / arrangements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>To what extent do sustainable agricultural practices take relevant health problems into consideration (e.g., HIV/AIDS, malaria, etc.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>What were the fostering and hampering factors in achieving social and cultural acceptance? What are the main challenges?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7.1 To what extent do sustainable agricultural practices related to subsistence / food production respect traditional food and nutrition habits?

Respect for traditional food and nutrition habits is the key criterion whereby local – particularly indigenous – people can judge whether the promoted changes in agriculture are compatible with their culture. Promoting the cultivation of (improved) varieties of traditional crops, for instance, is more likely to be culturally accepted than the introduction of new crops or varieties with distinctive features (colour, taste, etc.).

Interview a group of elders (women and men); use a ‘food plate’ for visualisation; be aware of seasonal differences in food habits.

### 7.2 To what extent do sustainable agricultural practices respect important traditions, norms or taboos?

Respecting local traditions, norms and taboos is crucial to ensuring cultural acceptance of changes in agriculture. Some ethnic groups, for instance, do not accept food crops that grow underground during certain periods according to their ritual calendar; if potatoes are to be introduced to such an area, appropriate timing should be considered. In parts of West Kenya, women are traditionally not allowed to harvest fruits, milk animals or collect eggs; as many men out-migrate seasonally in search of jobs, the introduction of orchards or animal husbandry must take taboos into account.

Interview a group of elders (women and men), community leaders and other respected persons.

### 7.3 To what extent do the elders / traditional leaders, the younger generation and big farmers agree with the changes in agricultural practices and how do they influence the adoption of sustainable agricultural practices?

The more different groups of the community agree to or actively support the adoption of sustainable agricultural practices, the more likely these will be socially and culturally accepted. Elders, community and religious leaders, are keepers of local traditions, social and cultural values, norms, and beliefs and provide behavioural guidance. If young people agree to or adopt sustainable agriculture, the more likely these will be carried on in the future.

Wealthy farmers can be positively or negatively affected by the changes in agriculture (e.g., redistribution of water resources). Should they find themselves ‘losing’, they may use their position to mobilise against change, endangering the social cohesion within the village.
Interview groups of elders, traditional leaders and other respected persons, groups of young women and men, and groups of big farmers; use your own observations of their reactions as additional source of information.

### 7.4 How are those who adopted sustainable agricultural practices viewed in their community / village and to what extent are they heard in the existing local hierarchies, politics, and power relations?

How farmers who have shifted to sustainable agriculture in their community or village are viewed is an important indicator of the social and cultural acceptance of change in agricultural practices. ‘Pioneer’ organic farmers, for instance, might initially be laughed at by their neighbours, but with growing success they may gain increasing respect and become agents of change, whose voice is taken seriously in local society and hierarchies.

Interview community leaders and key persons (e.g. teachers, agriculture officer), discuss with groups of ‘conventional farmers’

### 7.5 To what extent have sustainable agricultural practices extended to village common land / waste land?

The extension of sustainable agriculture to common and / or waste land is an indicator of the general acceptance of the practice, since it is the community as a whole that decides on the use of these lands.

Interview community leaders; use resource mapping for visualisation.

### 7.6 How has the adoption of sustainable agricultural practices changed the intensity and division or sharing of labour between men and women (also seasonally)?

Changes in sustainable agricultural practices are likely to be more acceptable if they do not overburden farmers and family members or influence labour sharing agreements within the households at the sole expense of certain members (e.g., women). By nature, sustainable agricultural practices such as composting, mixed cropping, etc. increase labour intensity. All too often this affects women in particular, who in many rural contexts already have a heavier workload. The sharing of workloads can also differ to a great extent between seasons.

Interview household members (men and women separately) of families, who adopted sustainable agriculture practices; use daily / seasonal calendars and pie-charts for visualisation; display information in graphs and tables.
Example pie-chart on women’s daily work

### BEFORE PROJECT

- **2h** rest
- **6h** cooking
- **2h** child care
- **2h** other
- **2h** weeding
- **2h** collecting fuel wood
- **2h** grazing animals

### AFTER PROJECT (NOW)

- **3h** rest
- **7h** cooking
- **2h** child care
- **1h** cleaning
- **2h** weeding
- **3h** grazing animals
- **1h** collecting fuel wood
- **2h** other

---

**7.7 How have the practices affected labour contracts / arrangements?**

Small and marginal farmers and the landless often generate some of their (seasonal) income through wage labour. Sustainable agricultural practices are more likely to be socially accepted if they induce better or more regular work contracts and arrangements; since the practices provide a basis for household food and nutrition self-sufficiency, for instance, they are less dependent on additional sources of income. Farmers who (still) engage in further income-generating activities are in a position to choose better arrangements and contracts (e.g., piece-rate payment vs. wage).

Interview daily wage labourers, unemployed, employers individually
7.8 To what extent do sustainable agricultural practices take relevant health problems into consideration (e.g., HIV/AIDS, malaria, etc.)?

Health problems decrease the ability of affected people to adopt certain practices, particularly if these are labour-intensive. Practices that are sensitive to the needs of families affected by health problems are socially more acceptable, e.g., the introduction of labour-saving zero tillage methods in regions where numerous families are affected by diseases such as HIV/AIDS, malaria, etc.

Interview household members (men and women separately) from families affected by health problems; female interviewers are required; cross-check the information by interviewing project staff.

7.9 What were the fostering and hampering factors in achieving social and cultural acceptance? What are the main challenges?

Several factors influence the social and cultural acceptance of sustainable agricultural practices. They can be

- internal and fostering, e.g., the project involved or consulted traditional leaders at each stage of community-based planning, the landless and other marginalised groups are represented in local development committees,
- internal and hampering, e.g., some people do not contribute their share of community work, reclaimed community wastelands are illegally encroached,
- external and fostering, e.g., respected outside civil society organisations and spiritual leaders create awareness about organic farming and its benefits, or
- external and hampering, e.g., labour market developments provide strong incentives for out-migration to find work.

Several factors challenge the future acceptance of sustainable agricultural practices. They can be

- internal, e.g., youth are less and less interested in agricultural work, persistent conflict over scarce resources (e.g., land/water-rights), or external, e.g., the media promote ‘modern’ foods.

Interview groups of farmers, community leaders, elders, key persons, project staff; assemble the information in a table.
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C8 Impact with the focus on contribution to the achievement of the MDG 1

The overall goal of Sustainet is to contribute to the achievement of the First Millennium Development Goal of fighting extreme poverty and hunger. This assessment, therefore, focuses on food and nutrition security, in particular on improvements in the quantity and quality of the diet. The aspect of the individual capacity to absorb nutrients, which is commonly regarded as an integral part of food security assessments, will not be considered here, as sustainable agricultural projects can do little to contribute to a reduction of water-borne diseases such as diarrhoea, gastroenteritis, etc.

To assess poverty alleviation, the focus is furthermore on access to resources and benefits for marginalised groups, which can plausibly be linked to sustainable agriculture. Small and marginal farmers’ improved access to and control over land, water, loans, livestock and seeds as well as improvements in the livelihood of the landless and other marginal groups that depend to some extent on agriculture, are the key issues investigated. It is up to Sustainet’s partner organisations to assess and document other impacts related to poverty reduction.

The assessment requires in particular focus group discussions with women, i.e., the landless, and marginal and small farmers. You need to make sure that they are actively involved in group discussions; if this is not possible, individual interviews at household level should be carried out.

Use visualisation tools such as seasonal calendars on food security and food plates on changes in the daily intake and variety of food.
The survey questions

8.1: How has the daily intake and variety of staple food, vegetables, fruit, and protein sources changed (for different members of the household)?

8.2: What changes in the number of food insecurity months took place?

8.3: How did the access to, distribution and control of key resources change for small and marginal farmers (men and women)?

8.4: How do the landless, daily wage labourers and other marginalised groups benefit from sustainable agricultural practices?

8.5: What are the main reasons for the observed impact / non-impact (internal and external factors)? What are the main challenges?
8.1 How has the daily intake and variety of staple food, vegetables, fruit, and protein sources changed (for different members of the household)?

Changes in quantity and quality of the daily diet are crucial indicators of food and nutrition security. Sustainable agricultural practices increase crop diversity and yields, thus leading to a higher intake and variety of food.

Interview the female landless, and marginal and small farmers, either in group discussions or individually; use a food plate for visualisation and take seasonal differences into consideration; cross-check the information by interviewing community leaders and elders.

Changes in the quantity and quality of the diet in winter season in Suria hamlet, Rajasthan (modified, in % households, where applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOOD ITEM</th>
<th>BEFORE PROJECT</th>
<th>AFTER PROJECT (NOW)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cereals, bread</td>
<td>Roti (bread) – millet in the morning and wheat in evening</td>
<td>Roti (bread) – millet, barley, maize, wheat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulses</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Gram, urad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables</td>
<td>Kachari, spinach, green leafy vegetables like methi, radish, tomato, leaves of gram</td>
<td>Leaves of gram, spinach, peas, tomato, carrot, brinjal, potato, cauliflower, green chillies, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat and fish</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Fish, chicken, goat etc. in the gap of 2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil</td>
<td>Sesame, mustard, groundnut</td>
<td>Mustard, groundnut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk products</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Curd and butter milk – 20-30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Women from marginal and small farmer’s households

8.2 What changes in the number of food insecurity months took place?

Sustainable agricultural practices reduce the number of food insecurity months, as yields stabilise, additional harvests are possible (e.g., through introduction of water-harvesting structures), but also due to e.g., improved storage and preservation of grains and other food crops. Thus, marginal and small farmers are in a better position to sustain themselves and their families without being dependent on e.g., food aid.

Interview women, i.e., the landless, and marginal and small farmers, either in group discussions or individually; use a seasonal calendar for visualisation; cross-check the information by interviewing community leaders and elders.
8.3 How did the access to, distribution and control of key resources change for small and marginal farmers (men and women)?

In the context of agriculture, the improved access to, distribution and control of farming resources (particularly land, water, livestock, credit, seeds) for small and marginal farmers is an important indicator of poverty alleviation. Good practices in sustainable agriculture particularly encourage and integrate disadvantaged groups of farmers to actively become part of decision-making processes dealing with the distribution of resources, e.g., in local development committees. In addition, by strengthening women's access to and control of resources (e.g., land, credit), they promote a more equal distribution of resources within the farming families. Creating the required awareness and inducing social transformation through sustainable agriculture are long-term processes.

Interview small and marginal farmers individually (women and men); cross-check the information by interviewing community leaders and village committee members.
8.4 How do the landless, daily wage labourers and other marginalised groups benefit from sustainable agricultural practices?

Many sustainable agricultural practices offer income-generating activities for the landless, daily wage labourers and other marginalised groups, e.g., through selling vermi-compost, collecting Neem-seeds, or working on a construction site. Consequently, working migration patterns may also change: marginal farmers and the landless will no longer be forced to out-migrate for jobs, while people from neighbouring areas looking for work could be attracted to the area.

Discuss with groups of landless, daily wage labourers and other marginalised people; cross-check the information by interviewing community leaders and project staff

**Benefits of non-pesticide management in Punukular Village, Andhra Pradesh**

Because the cost of cultivation for crops has dropped considerably after the project, ten of the formerly landless villagers can now afford to lease land, e.g. one farmer has leased 2 acres of land on which he is cultivating cotton without pesticides.

For the agricultural labourers there was a wage increase from 25 to 30 rupees during the project period. Agricultural labourers do not have to be exposed to deadly pesticides now, nor incur medical care expenses for treatment of pesticides-related illnesses. Some point out that there is even more work for the labourers – in the collection of neem seed or in making powders and pastes of various materials. Farmers are even leasing in land and putting all lands under crop cultivation these days – this implies greater employment potential for the agricultural workers in the village.

Source: KSS members

**Reduced migration in Dhuan village, Rajasthan**

The project has helped in decreasing the events of migration from the village. The villagers used to migrate with their family to nearby cities like Shivpuri and Kota, in search of employment during the end of January and used to return when Tendu leave picking starts i.e. end of May. This 80% to 90% migration resulted in irregularity of children’s education and health problems. But for the last three years there has been nil migration. In addition, 100% enrolment can be seen in the school and there has been no drop-out for last three years.

Source: Case study report
Benefit for marginalised groups in Bhipur village, Rajasthan

Marginal farmers benefit more indirectly from soil and water management activities as their fields are too small for farm field bunding. They – as well as the landless people – benefit from increased labour demand generated by soil and water management activities (up to 200 man-days per year employment in agriculture at an average wage rate of Rs. 50 per day).

Source: Case study report
C9 Spontaneous replication

Spontaneous replication, i.e., the adoption of good practices by farmers who are not project beneficiaries, occurs by chance and is not introduced by an implementing agency or through provision of incentives. Spontaneous adoption of a certain practice, method or technology by non-project farmers proves that external inputs are not necessarily required, and can thus be seen as an indicator of the enormous potential to scale up good practice. How these farmers modify the adopted practices gives an insight into how adaptable they are to the local context. Analysing how information about the practice has been passed on over great distance helps to understand the ‘natural’ mechanisms of spreading this information and will make planned dissemination more successful.

The first step in assessing spontaneous replication is to identify the farmers who spontaneously adopted a practice. One possibility is to ask project beneficiaries about spontaneous adopters or speak to key persons in neighbouring villages (e.g., institutional representatives). Another possibility would be to involve school teachers and children by asking them to check for certain adopted practices in their families and neighbourhoods.

Individual interviews are appropriate for collecting information from identified farmers. If possible, you should include both male and female farmers in these interviews to make the assessment gender sensitive. It is worth cross-checking individual feedback on a practice with the opinions and experiences of different farmers and your own observations (e.g., during a field / village visit).

Because of the similar approach in analysing individual agricultural practices, please document your findings in a table comparable to that used in documenting B5 “changes in agricultural practices” and B6 “technical appropriateness”.
The questions

| 9.1: | Which of the described practices, methods, techniques or institutions were spontaneously adopted elsewhere, and which were not? Why / why not was it spontaneously adopted? |
| 9.2: | Who spontaneously adopted it and who did not? What do they have in common, and what is the difference to those who did not adopt a practice? |
| 9.3: | Where was it spontaneously adopted (inside or outside the area of operation)? How was it spread and with what means of communication? |
| 9.4: | How did the farmers who adopted the practices modify them? How did they bridge the missing support? Is the adopted practice still successful? |
9.1 Which of the described practices, methods, techniques or institutions were spontaneously adopted elsewhere, and which were not? Why / why not was it spontaneously adopted?

A practice can be spontaneously replicated when the characteristic of the practice itself is suited to local conditions and when the farmer has adequate capacity for adoption (e.g., access to resources such as land, water and money, and education and access to knowledge).

Since spontaneous replication of practices can be risky, it is essential to identify the motivation for adoption (i.e. expected benefits) and factors that influence the farmer’s decision for adoption (e.g., relatives, friends or neighbours, local institutional or political support, own experience etc.) or non-adoption (e.g., interest groups such as pesticide and fertiliser dealers etc.).

Interview farmers in the project area who are not beneficiaries of the project, farmers from neighbouring villages, pesticide and fertiliser dealers, agriculture officers, agriculture extension workers, relatives of farmers of the project village (e.g. daughter in law), and / or persons who have frequent contact with people of other villages (e.g. birth attendants).

Reasons for spontaneous adoption in the neighbourhood of Dodavalasa village, Andhra Pradesh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURAL PRACTICE: CONTOUR BUILDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for adoption</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Case study report

9.2 Who spontaneously adopted it and who did not? What do they have in common, and what is the difference to those who did not adopt a practice?

A practice can be spontaneously replicated when the characteristic of the practice itself is suited to local conditions and when the farmer has adequate capacity for adoption (e.g., access to resources such as land, water and money, and education and access to knowledge).

Interview farmers in the project area who are not beneficiaries of the project, farmers from neighbouring villages, agriculture officers, relatives of farmers of the project village, and / or persons who have frequent contact with people of other villages.
Commonalities between adopters in the neighbourhood of Dodavalasa village, Andhra Pradesh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURAL PRACTICE: CONTOUR BUILDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commonalities between adopters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Case study report

9.3 Where was it spontaneously adopted (inside or outside the area of operation)? How was it spread and with what means of communication?

Practices, techniques or institutions can be spread through different channels. These can be direct contacts with farmers who practice sustainable agriculture or more indirect forms of communication, which can be either formal (e.g., publications) or informal (talks among relatives, friends etc.).

Interview farmers in the project area who are not beneficiaries of the project, farmers from neighbouring villages, agriculture officers, relatives of farmers of the project village, and / or persons who have frequent contact with people of other villages

Location of adoption and means of communication in the neighbourhood of Dodavalasa village, Andhra Pradesh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURAL PRACTICE: NON-PESTICIDE MANAGEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By 2003, all the farmers in Punukula and Pullaigudem had given up pesticides in their farming. Farmers soon became capable of explaining to others the principles behind the non pesticide management (NPM) approach and about how they were benefiting. Word spread both in sporadic ways and in a structured manner. Punukula farmers themselves decided to proactively spread the NPM message to nearby villages. Every relative that visits the village gets to hear about the transformation. Similary, when Punukula farmers go to other places for social purposes, they make it a point to bring up their story of NPM. There are hundreds of farmers from other places visiting Punukula regularly in an effort to save themselves from a crisis situation. The local implementing NGO is even planning to set up a NPM training centre in the village.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Project information leaflet
Outreach by local partner NGOs on non-pesticide management in 2003-04:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner NGOs</th>
<th>No. of non-partner NGOs reached out to</th>
<th>No. of villages</th>
<th>No. of trainings offered</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>No. of farmers covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROPS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>1159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEACE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONARE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECURE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVJYOTHI</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEAD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDS</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>2362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Project information leaflet

9.4 How did the farmers who adopted the practices modify them? How did they bridge the missing support? Is the adopted practice still successful?

Farmers who spontaneously adopt a certain practice face a double challenge, which can hamper their success. First of all, they have to adapt the practice to their own needs and local conditions. Secondly, they have to adopt it without external support such as training or financial aid.

Interview farmers in and outside the project area who spontaneously adopted the practice; take photographs of interesting modifications

Modifications, bridging of support, and success in the neighbourhood of Dodavalasa village, Andhra Pradesh

**Sustainable Agricultural Practice: Contour Building**

| Modifications, bridging of support, success | Those who adopted the practice did not modify it. They used their own resources (mainly family labour) to bridge the missing support. The practice was still successful: two families have been able to purchase extra farm land and a few families have acquired assets in the form of jewellery, household articles, and saving rates increased. |

Source: Case study report
**C10 Viable institutions and their scaling-up activities**

Viable local institutions and their efforts to implement, uphold, and further disseminate good practices are cornerstones of sustainable agricultural projects. By demonstrating the self-help potential of their members to overcome poverty and hunger, local institutions allow the implementing organisation or project to hand over responsibility for achieving a sustainable impact, while at the same time empowering local people.

This assessment, therefore, focuses on commonly agreed criteria of institutional sustainability and on scaling-up activities of local groups and organisations, created and / or supported by the project (e.g., local committees, associations, self-help groups).

Local institutions are considered viable if they have clear objectives shared by their members; if they ensure representation of all social groups in the community or village, including the marginalised; if they have legal status or are at least highly accepted within their community; if they are firmly linked to other local institutions, NGOs, government agencies, banks or private organisations; and if they mobilise their human, physical and financial resources. In order to bring more benefits to both members and non-members, they may increase their activities, organise campaigns, build federal bodies, influence local and regional policies, and increase their own sustainability by upgrading the managerial and technical skills of their members and by institutionalising internal mechanisms for learning and knowledge management.

If your project has built up and supported local institutions at different levels (local, regional), you should select at least one from each level. Group interviews with members of these institutions (male and female) are the main procedure in assessing their viability and efforts to scale up. However, cross-checks with project documents and the institution’s own documents (e.g., on objectives and by-laws), as well as interviews with non-members (e.g., on perceptions / image of the institution) are advisable.

During group discussions, you should use appropriate visualisation tools to support data collection and enhance the involvement of the participants. You can use timelines, for instance, to illustrate changes in the institution’s membership and common funds. Venn diagrams may be helpful to visualise networking, public relations and resource mobilisation activities of the institutions.
### The survey questions

| 10.1: | What are the objectives and visions, various norms, rules, regulations and by-laws of the institution? To what extent are they agreed upon by all members? |
| 10.2: | To what extent are various community groups, including marginalised groups, represented in the institution and in decision-making? |
| 10.3: | What is the legal status of the institutions and how widely are they accepted in the area? |
| 10.4: | How has the institution grown in size and outreach since its foundation? |
| 10.5: | What activities has the institution taken up in addition to those originally planned? |
| 10.6: | How does the local institution influence others to adopt the practices? |
| 10.7: | How has the institution strengthened its own sustainability? |
| 10.8: | What are the fostering and hampering factors for the most relevant of the institution’s scaling-up activities? |
| 10.9: | What are the future plans of the institution for scaling up? |
10.1 What are the objectives and visions, various norms, rules, regulations and by-laws of the institution?

Clear objectives and visions are required if an institution is to justify its existence, attract members, steer its activities, and develop criteria to evaluate its performance. Clearly identified norms, rules, regulations and by-laws help to ease an institution’s procedures and minimise conflict, thus creating a more viable institution. Only when the members of an institution share its objectives and visions, and agree to its norms, rules, regulations and by-laws, will they be committed to upholding and supporting the institution and its activities.

Study mission statements and other documents; interview group leaders and members, and project staff, if required; cross-check information by interviewing project staff

Promotion of non-pesticide management by the Punukula Village council, Andhra Pradesh

The village council of Punukula has past a resolution to announce that the village is pesticides-free and would continue to be so. They request pesticides dealers not to come into their village and market their products. The members of the village council are ready to go to other villages and start dialogue with the farmers to give up pesticides.

Source: interview with village council members

10.2 To what extent are various community groups, including marginalised groups, represented in the institution and in decision-making?

The more social groups are represented in a community institution, the more legitimacy it has to make decisions and conduct activities relevant to the entire community. The inclusion of marginalised groups (landless, tribals, etc.) in decision-making processes ensures that actions taken by the institution consider the needs and concerns of these groups and thus empower them within their communities.

Study membership books, minutes of meetings and other documents; interview group leaders and members (especially representatives of marginalised groups), and project staff, if required
10.3 What is the legal status of the institutions and how widely are they accepted in the area?

Possessing legal status ensures certain rights that enable institutions to make legal claims in court, and protects them from being suppressed in any way. This facilitates their survival under potentially difficult conditions. Additionally, if an institution is registered with local government, it can gain access more easily to external sources of support such as government funding. Support for an institution by the people can only be ensured if it is considered in its area of operation as valuable.

Interview group leaders and members; cross-check information by interviewing project staff

Recognition of the KSS by local government in Malpura Block, Rajasthan

Whereas previously a group or individual from KSS was not given much attention, the government has now begun to accept them. They are aware that KSS are representatives of 104 villages i.e., a few thousand families. Recently, for instance, KSS contacted the SDM on the phone about issues affecting local milk producers; at first, the latter said he had no time but on being told that KSS planned to write a memorandum and discuss the issues publicly, he made an appointment for the same day, putting his other duties aside. Experiences like this increase the confidence and morale of the KSS members.

Source: KSS members

10.4 How has the institution grown in size and outreach since its foundation?

Institutional growth, be it the number of members or beneficiaries, or the budget, is a scaling-up strategy to achieve greater outreach of the institution and has the potential to bring more qualitative benefits to more people over a wider geographical area. However, growth is not a precondition for scaling up, since some institutions might not expand but nevertheless be able to increase their impact.

Interview group leaders and members (including founding members); cross-check information by interviewing project staff, if required
10.5 What activities has the institution taken up in addition to those originally planned?

Intensifying an institution’s activities provides the opportunity of informing others about good practices. This can happen on the horizontal level, for example, when new activities are added to those already in existence (e.g., when a watershed management group is additionally active in health education in the form of providing training in prevention and treatment of water-borne diseases). Increasing activities on the vertical level refers to the adding on of activities at different levels to those already existing in one sector (when a local organic farming institution starts promoting the set-up of community seed banks on the input side or begins marketing organic food on the output side).

Interview group leaders and members (including founding members); cross-check information by interviewing project staff, if required

10.6 How does the local institution influence others to adopt the practices?

At the local level, the creation of or participation in federal structures is one prominent activity for influencing others. In this way, a local institution can better spread its ideas over a broader area and to a wider audience. Other activities intended to change the behaviour of actors in ways that further the goals of the local institution and benefit the poor are, for example,
- public relations activities such as giving interviews to the local media;
- networking activities e.g., getting in touch with other local or higher level institutions in order to cooperate (temporarily) for a common goal;
- mobilisation activities e.g., organising signature campaigns on local issues;
- lending support to groups and individuals pursuing goals in line with the institution’s objectives;
- participating in local government policy-making procedures or community institutions, e.g., the village council.

Interview group leaders and members; cross-check information by interviewing project staff, if required
10.7 How has the institution strengthened its own sustainability?

Enhancing an institution’s sustainability ensures long-term availability of human and financial resources. This can include activities such as the capacity-building of its members through training. Knowledge management activities are aimed at making local institutional knowledge available to its members by structuring its documentation and sharing it, e.g., at village meetings. Similarly, the goal of organisational learning activities is to analyse experience and incorporate the lessons learnt in the future planning of the institution. Last but not least, all kinds of income-generating activities, such as the selling of organic products, membership fees, etc., mobilises financial resources for the institution’s sustainability.

Interview group leaders and members; cross-check information by interviewing project staff, if required

10.8 What are the fostering and hampering factors for the most relevant of the institution’s scaling-up activities?

All scaling-up activities of local institutions contribute to a certain extent to the spread of good practices. However, their impact is limited by both internal and external factors, which may lie outside of the institution’s sphere of influence (e.g., local hierarchies, government policies).

Interview group leaders and members; cross-check information by interviewing project staff, if required

10.9 What are the future plans of the institution for scaling up?

Future plans for scaling-up activities can give hints about the lessons learnt from past experience. A new focus on networking, for instance, can indicate that the institution has recognised its previous neglect of cooperation with like-minded institutions for a common goal although opportunities were available and would have been useful.

Interview group leaders and members; cross-check information by interviewing project staff, if required
C11 Scaling-up strategies and activities of the organisation

We define “scaling up” as any effort to bring more quality benefits to more people over a wider geographical area more quickly, more equitably, and to more lasting effect. By scaling up good practices, locally successful solutions are spread and made available to other organisations for replication. In this context we are interested in the different strategies and activities organisations or projects use to scale up their good practices. This includes a description of strategies used as well as an analysis of why some prove particularly successful. Scaling-up strategies can be aimed at expanding the organisation’s coverage and size, increasing its project activities both vertically and horizontally, broadening the organisation’s indirect impact, and enhancing its sustainability.

Staff at all levels of the organisation or project should be involved in assessing scaling-up activities. As the latter occur at both the conceptual and the implementing level of the organisation, project staff in the various departments of the organisation are probably in the best position to elaborate on both aspects. Using the SWOT analysis, their task is to describe their scaling-up experience, and analyse it under the aspect of success factors and challenges. Their perception of the organisation’s scaling-up activities should be cross-checked by field and management staff. In larger organisations or projects, after the analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats in the field of scaling up, you should ask management staff to briefly assess the activities, conclusions and recommendations described. Because management staff probably has the best impression of the organisation’s overall performance, it should be their task to elaborate on the organisation’s challenges and future plans with regard to scaling up.

You should reserve two days for the self-assessment of scaling-up strategies and activities. While a one-day workshop is envisaged for the department staff (in larger organisations), an additional, joint half-day meeting of management, department staff and field coordinators may be sufficient. In order to incorporate the different perceptions and viewpoints into the self-assessment, with the support of the management staff you should create a relaxed atmosphere of free exchange of opinions.

For those of you who are less familiar with conducting SWOT-analyses, we provide a brief summary of the tool in Annex 3.
The survey questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>To what extent has your organisation or project expanded in size and outreach since its foundation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>What activities has your organisation or project taken up in addition to those originally planned?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>How has your organisation or project broadened its indirect impact?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>How has your organisation strengthened its own sustainability?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>What are the fostering and hampering factors for the scaling-up strategies and activities relevant to your organisation or project (internal and external)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>What are the future plans of your organisation or project in scaling up?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 11.1 To what extent has your organisation or project expanded in size and outreach since its foundation?

Growth of the organisation as part of its natural evolution, be it in the number of staff members, the organisation’s project budget or the geographical coverage of the project area, is a scaling-up strategy to achieve greater outreach, and thus bring more benefits to more people over a wider geographical area. However, it is not a precondition for scaling up; some organisations may decide to reduce the number of staff but still be able to increase their impact.

Study annual reports and other documents; discuss with management and other staff; interview founding members, if required; use timeline for visualisation

### 11.2 What activities has your organisation or project taken up in addition to those originally planned?

The scaling-up strategy of diversifying and intensifying the organisation’s activities provides more quality benefits to more people more equitably and to more lasting effect. This can happen either on the horizontal level, where an organisation adds new activities to those originally planned (e.g., linking watershed development with health education). Intensifying activities on the vertical level refers to the adding on of activities at different levels to those that already exist within one sector (e.g., additional to the promotion of organic farming, an organisation might also promote the setting up of community seed banks on the input side or the marketing of organic food on the output side). However, it should be noted that diversifying activities on the horizontal level does not automatically lead to scaling up of good practices in sustainable agriculture, while increasing activities on the vertical level in most cases does.

Discuss with management and other staff; interview founding members of your organisation, if required; use timeline for visualisation

### 11.3 How has your organisation or project broadened its indirect impact?

Networking and public relations activities broaden the impact of the organisation or project on the general public. Through mobilisation of people on issues related to sustainable agriculture, e.g., by organising campaigns, fairs, rallies and other public activities, the organisation or project reaches more people over a wider area and spreads awareness. Activities with the aim of influencing government policies and those of companies or other relevant organisations in the field of agriculture could be lobbying, advocacy activities or even
the direct entry into politics at either local, regional, national or even international level. Indirect impact can also be enhanced if the organisation empowers individuals, groups or other organisations in line with its own objectives. This can be done by giving support (e.g., training or financial help) to external individuals or organisations, by decentralising one’s own organisation or outsourcing an organisation’s tasks to externals in exchange for money.

Discuss with management and other staff; study annual reports and other documents

11.4 How has your organisation strengthened its own sustainability?

Enhancing an organisation’s sustainability could include activities such as capacity-building of staff through training in order to make their work more efficient and more useful to the beneficiaries. Knowledge management activities are aimed at making knowledge (including local indigenous knowledge) available and usable for all staff with structured documentation, e.g. through a management information or feedback system, and by sharing it, e.g., in meetings. Similarly, organisational learning activities are aimed at analysing experiences and incorporating lessons learnt in the future planning of the organisation or project.

Last but not least, the activities an organisation undertakes to diversify its sources of income, to stabilise project and programme funding, and to make the organisation more self-reliant, will contribute to sustaining its impact in the long run.

Discuss with management and other staff; study annual reports and other documents
11.5 What are the fostering and hampering factors for the scaling-up strategies and activities relevant to your organisation or project (internal and external)?

The relevance of certain scaling-up strategies and activities depends on the organisation’s or project’s objectives, focus, and personal experiences and visions, and will probably be different for each organisation. No matter what scaling-up strategies and activities are most relevant to an organisation, their success may be limited by both internal and external factors.

Internal strengths (e.g., a well-functioning participatory monitoring system) and weaknesses (e.g., limited representation in decision-making bodies) can foster or hamper certain scaling-up strategies and activities.

The impact of an organisation’s activities can be limited by factors outside its sphere of influence (e.g., government policies and global conventions) and exist as opportunities and threats. They can be:

- external and fostering, e.g., a high level of interconnectedness between organisations working for a common goal, e.g., organic farming is supportive of an organisation’s lobbying activities in this field;
- external and hampering, e.g., a government apparatus that refuses to cooperate or even listen to NGOs hampers the latter’s ability to influence policies.

Conduct an analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats in relevant scaling-up strategies and activities (within the frame of SWOT) together with management and other staff.

Example for a SWOT analysis for a single scaling up practice (abbreviated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALING UP PRACTICE: RESEARCH ON SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE ISSUES, FOR EXAMPLE ON THE FAILURE OF GENETICALLY MODIFIED BT COTTON CROP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRENGTHS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ good scientific background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ cooperation with NGOs, which have similar ideology and which provide men power for data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ good support from community media trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ support and positive attitude of farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ our publications on GM cotton crop failure made companies to stop supplying this particular variety of GM cotton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ good contacts with research institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ monthly meetings with data collectors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Opportunities

- Increasing awareness and interest of farmers and NGOs
- Farmers’ coalitions also interested
- New media focus on GMOs
- Farmers are already organised into groups like local self help groups, etc. → provides opportunity to reach more people
- Local research institutions are good sources of information

### Threats

- Little support of government institutions / universities
- Companies take bookings on seeds before our research reports are published
- We cannot compete with companies campaigns
- Companies have good contacts with the government level
- It is not predictable which side the media will take

### 11.6 What are the future plans of your organisation or project in scaling up?

Future plans regarding scaling-up activities hint at the lessons-learnt from past experience. A new focus on public relations, for instance, shows that the organisation or project has recognised its previous neglect of documentation of good practices, although opportunities were available and would have been useful.

Discuss with management staff
D  Organisation of the self-assessment

This chapter presents recommendations for the preparation, implementation and reporting of your self-assessment and is largely based on our experience of testing the methodology in the field.

We have described most of the required working steps as detailed as possible, so that you can adopt them easily. In each chapter you will find information on the purpose and the background, a check-list of activities, and additional advice. Some stages are only drafted roughly, providing you with the opportunity of adapting them to your needs and project context.

The self-assessment process involves four major steps: planning self-assessment (chapter D1), assessing good practices in sustainable agriculture (D2), assessing scaling-up strategies and activities (D3), and reporting and learning (D4). The sequence of steps (see overview below) is a suggestion; you should feel free to design your own procedural steps.
D1 Planning the self-assessment

Selection of facilitators

Conducting a self-assessment is a demanding task that cannot be done on the side, but requires assigning clear responsibilities. Thus, a team of skilled facilitators plan, organise and accompany the whole process.

- Select two people (preferably one man and one woman),
  - who have several years of experience working in your organisation or project,
  - who are familiar with your M&E system and reporting,
  - who have different educational backgrounds (e.g., the social and natural sciences),
  - who are fluent in English (at least one of them) to ensure adequate report writing, and
  - who know the case study area and have field experience (at least one of them).
- Clarify responsibilities with the facilitators, such as who organises the field survey, who moderates workshops, etc.
- Make sure that they can concentrate on conducting the self-assessment during the required time.

In larger organisations, it is advisable to inform the different departments / sections of the self-assessment in advance, e.g., who the facilitators are, what their tasks are etc.

Selection of the case study area

Assessing good practices in your entire project area and covering all your spheres of work would exceed the scope of a cost-effective self-assessment. A more in-depth analysis of sustainable agricultural practices in a certain case study supports Sustainet more effectively and at the same time serves partner organisations as a learning model.

- Identify your most successful village, watershed, etc. and check if the following criteria have been covered. It should be an area where
  - you can identify good practices of sustainable agriculture in terms of visible and relevant project outputs and impact,
the majority of people depend on agriculture for their main source of livelihood,
food insecurity prevailed before project implementation,
as many as possible of your support activities in sustainable agriculture have been implemented for a sufficient period (at least 3 to 5 years),
eexisting local institutions (e.g., SHGs, Watershed Management Committees etc.) were either initiated or supported by your organisation.

✓ Make sure that there are neighbouring areas for the assessment of spontaneous replication of practices, which have comparable natural and socio-economic conditions and have not (yet) been covered by your project.

✓ Decide on the size of the case study area and check the feasibility of conducting the self-assessment with the available resources.

In order to reduce the time spent on data collection, it might be helpful to select an area that has been covered by earlier case studies and/or evaluations. Whether you choose a farmers’ association and their community, a village, a micro-watershed, or a larger project area for your case study will primarily depend on your project approach and the size of your project areas. Your self-assessment should be financially and logistically feasible; for instance, if you think that data collection covering a whole district is too expensive, you should focus on one or two successful villages within the district.

### Selection of good practices of sustainable agriculture

For the self-assessment, a meaningful set of sustainable agricultural practices should be chosen. Select practices which you consider especially successful and worth for replication. A set of practices is needed in order to assess the impact of the adopted sustainable agricultural practices. However, also the single practices within the set are important, because it is envisaged to do an in-depth analysis for single practices for several survey topics (C3 “changes in agriculture”, C4 “technical appropriateness”, and C9 “spontaneous replication”).

✓ Prepare a list of sustainable agricultural practices you developed and supported in the case study area.

✓ In a next step, identify at least one practice from each relevant agricultural field you consider particularly successful or interesting, e.g.,
  - farm field *bundling* and vermi-composting from ‘soil and water management’,
  - seed multiplication from ‘management of genetic resources’,
  - agro-horticulture from ‘diversification’,
  - mixed cropping from ‘cropping systems’,
  - zero-tillage from ‘land preparation’,
  - use of bio-pesticides from ‘pest management’,
  - fodder cultivation from ‘animal husbandry’, and/or
• agro-processing from ‘post-harvest management’.

✓ You should arrive at a meaningful set of sustainable agricultural practices, which gives a sufficiently comprehensive picture of your activities in the field of sustainable agriculture. Pick only a limited number of practices to ensure the feasibility of the self-assessment.

### Selection of survey questions

Assessing and documenting the entire set of survey topics and questions could mean at least one month’s work for the two facilitators, which not every partner organisation or project can afford. Moreover, some of the questions are less relevant for your case.

✓ Skip survey questions that are not relevant in your specific context of work and briefly explain why.

### Review of existing data

Reviewing and cross-checking existing data and project documents enables you to get a clearer picture of expenses and the time required for the field phase. Expenditures for the self-assessment can be minimised by making use of available information.

✓ Go through your selected set of survey questions and

- mark the ones for which information is already available and indicate the sources (reports, planning documents, etc.),

Selection of appropriate survey questions
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- check the identified documents to see if they provide sufficient information regarding the survey question; use information from these documents for your self-assessment report (under the respective headings),
- mark the survey questions with insufficient information, i.e., contradictory or missing altogether; document them in an extra file.

You can take out the required set of survey questions from the loose-leaf and copy them if required.

### Detailed planning of further working steps

Detailed planning of time and personnel requirements, as well as of other activities at field and management level smoothes implementation of self-assessment, as it gives you an orientation before and during the process and ensures its completeness.

- Prepare a detailed timetable / work plan for further working steps, especially for data collection and documentation, and for analysis and report writing. The following table gives you a rough idea of the personnel and time requirements of the self-assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS</th>
<th>TIME REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIELD PHASE</td>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>3-5 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCALING UP ANALYSIS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPORT WRITING</td>
<td>1 (-2)</td>
<td>10-15 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In total: 40 working days

The figures above are calculated for an organisation that has not yet documented any of the required information and wishes to conduct the entire survey (as outlined in chapter C1 to C11). To calculate the actual time needed, take data availability and a possible reduction in survey questions into consideration. If you have time or resource constraints, consider the possibility to have the self-assessment stretched over a longer period (e.g. one month), where you assess the practices in the course of your on-going field work.
D2 Self-assessing good practices

Preparation for the field phase

The field phase provides most of the data on your good practices in sustainable agriculture, since it relies mainly on meetings and interviews with project beneficiaries. Preparing this phase ensures an efficient and productive procedure.

- Inform local project staff of the planned self-assessment date and respective activities; if possible request the amount of personnel support needed and send the selected survey topics and questions in advance.
- Select members for a field survey team (at least three) and clarify their roles (interviewer/moderator, documenter, observer). Selection criteria are:
  - The team should consist of men and women (as most of the survey topics and questions address gender-specific issues).
  - Team members should have different professional backgrounds (including if possible both agricultural and social science backgrounds).
  - The team should include someone who is locally well-known and trusted (e.g., a well-respected farmer who has successfully adopted sustainable agricultural practices, or a field coordinator).
- Conduct a preparatory meeting of all team members and consider the following aspects:
  - Introduce the survey questions – explain aspects that have already been answered by consulting project documents, what needs to be cross-checked once again, and what information still has to be gathered.
  - Discuss open survey questions, proof available data and adapt questions to the local context.
  - Address sensitive topics such as gender issues and the inclusion of the marginalised, figure out how their participation can be guaranteed; e.g., by separate interviews or group discussions.
  - Select and prepare data collection methods for each survey question, including interview questions, visualisation tools, and documentation patterns.
  - Discuss the working mode (field hours, team meetings, etc.).
  - Elaborate a timetable for the entire field phase (as shown in the example on the next page).
Our field experience has shown that in assessing larger case study areas it is helpful to work in two parallel teams. We suggest spending approximately three hours in a village, thus ensuring enough time for each field-day’s wrap-up and next day’s preparation. You should adapt the working steps according to your self-assessment approach; the work plan below is an example of how to conduct the complete field survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>MORNING</th>
<th>AFTERNOON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | - Elaborate timetable/work plan  
- Teambuilding and briefing of assessment team  
- Planning of afternoon field visit | - Village meeting  
- Introduction of assessment purpose  
- Assessment: local conditions  
- Preparation of next day’s field visit |
| 2   | - Meeting with farmers and other stakeholders  
- Assessment: changes in agricultural practices, technical appropriateness and environmental friendliness | - Documentation / analysis of findings  
- Preparation of next day’s field visit |
| 3   | - Meeting with farmers (male and female), elders/traditional leaders  
- Assessment: economic viability and social and cultural acceptance | - Documentation / analysis of findings  
- Preparation of next day’s field visit |
| 4   | - Meeting with farmers and women’s groups  
- Assessment: impact (food and nutrition security, poverty)  
- Meeting with local institutions initiated by the project (VDCs, SHGs, WDCs, etc.)  
- Assessment: viable institutions and their scaling-up activities | - Documentation / analysis of findings  
- Preparation of next day’s field visit |
| 5   | - Visit to areas and villages not covered by the project  
- Assessment: spontaneous replication  
- Project village meeting  
- Presentation and discussion of findings with local stakeholders | - Documentation / analysis of findings  
- Reflection on findings and process  
- Agreement on and preparation of further steps |

The table on the next page gives you an overview of the questions you should discuss with different groups in the village. Numbers in brackets refer to questions, which are only necessary for cross-checking.
### Organising the Self-Assessment Field Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmers (men and women)</td>
<td>3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 6.3, 6.4, 6.7, 7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Conventional’ farmers</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>7.8, 8.1, 8.2, 8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual farmer’s household</td>
<td>3.1, 6.1, 6.2, 6.5, 6.6, 7.6, 7.8, 8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginalised / landless</td>
<td>3.2, (6.3), (6.4), 8.1, 8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily wage labourers, unemployed, employers</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big farmers</td>
<td>(6.3), (6.4), 7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elders / traditional leaders</td>
<td>(5.7), (6.7), (4.1), 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.9, (8.1), (8.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local institution</td>
<td>(8.3), 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 10.4, 10.5, 10.6, 10.7, 10.8, 10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water user group</td>
<td>(5.3), (5.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village leaders</td>
<td>(2.1), (2.2), 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 3.1, 3.2, (4.1), 4.2, 5.6, 5.7, 6.3, (6.4), 6.7, 7.2, 7.4, 7.5, 7.9, (8.1), (8.2), (8.3), (8.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project staff</td>
<td>1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, (1.5), (1.6), (1.7), (1.8), (1.9), (1.10), 4.2, (4.4), (5.1), (5.2), (6.4), 7.9, (8.4), (10.1), (10.2), (10.3), (10.4), (10.5), (10.6), (10.7), (10.8), 10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture / forest officers</td>
<td>(5.1), (5.2), (5.5), (5.6), (9.1), (9.2), (9.3), (9.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural banks, cooperatives, local government</td>
<td>(6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers outside the project area, e.g. in neighbouring village</td>
<td>9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Documentation**

Documenting your findings during the field survey allows you to review the data with regard to completeness and significance, and thus recognise the possible need to cross-check. Moreover, your field notes are the basis for analysing and reporting the results.

- Review your field notes and observations each day with the team.
- Identify missing details and/or contradictions you have to cross-check in the next few days - integrate these points into the field survey plan.
Should there be survey questions you cannot answer, please explain why. Based on our field experience, documentation takes twice or three times as much time as data collection.

**Analysing results**

The field survey would be incomplete without an initial on-the-spot analysis, when findings and observations are still fresh and different interpretations can be discussed effectively.

- After completing the data collection on a certain survey topic, discuss the results with your team. Share your experience and highlight the lessons learnt regarding this specific topic (e.g., the most successful agricultural practices). Guiding questions could be:
  - What aspects were new for you?
  - How do you interpret the answers given by the interviewees, where do you agree / disagree, and why?
  - Did you have a key experience during the assessment process or during your day’s work on this topic?
- Once the data collection process in the field has been completed, analyse your findings with your team, and present and discuss them with your target groups in the case study area.

You can use the results of your analysis to summarise and conclude each survey topic (under the respective headline in the report).
D3 Self-assessing scaling-up strategies

Preparation of the SWOT analysis

The analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) is an appropriate instrument to assess your scaling-up strategies and activities. Proper preparation of the required workshop and meetings is mandatory, particularly if you have a large organisation.

- Decide on the participants (technical and administrative staff, field staff, senior management, etc.) you need for the individual aspects and phases of the SWOT analysis.
- Decide on the events required for the analysis (SWOT workshop, board meeting, ordinary working sessions, etc.) and how they can be linked.
- In larger organisations or projects, inform the various departments / staff of the date and location of the workshop or meeting, the selected scaling-up topics and planned activities; in larger organisations, each department should select one participant for the workshop.
- Ask the participants to prepare a brief presentation of their (or their department’s) scaling-up activities in the relevant / selected areas of work, e.g., networking, public relations, fundraising / resource mobilisation.
- In the case of subsequent separate meetings (e.g., with senior management), forward the documentation of the first workshop to the participants for comment at least two weeks in advance.

You should adapt the workshop concept suggested in chapter C11 to the size and set-up of your organisation or project: in a smaller organisation, a joint half-day meeting with management, office staff and field coordinators may be sufficient.

SWOT workshop and meetings

For further information on how to conduct a SWOT analysis and for a sample moderation plan see the annex.

- Start the workshop with an introduction on the purpose of the workshop: ‘Why is scaling up of interest to our organisation?’; explain the term “scaling up” and its objective to disseminate “good practices”.
- Ensure appropriate documentation.
SWOT ANALYSIS

Organising the Self-Assessment

- Invite the representatives of the different departments to present their scaling-up activities and to highlight their most prominent activities and experiences.
- From the list of scaling up activities, select those for an in-depth SWOT-analysis, which are either a) most successful, b) most interesting for your organisation to analyse or c) most unique, and thus interesting for others for replication.
- For each scaling up activity (e.g. lobbying) do a SWOT analysis, using one SWOT-matrix for each activity. If necessary, form working groups.
- In the end of each SWOT analysis of a single scaling up practice, draw conclusions, lessons-learnt and discuss future plans.
- Reach a conclusion among the participants on “What are the fostering and hampering factors for the most relevant of the institution’s scaling-up activities?” and “What are the future plans of the institution for scaling up?”.

In larger organisations with different hierarchy levels, a separation between a “Departments/Staff Workshop” and a “Management Meeting” (as shown in the chart below) helps to ensure more equal participation. If possible include field coordinators in the Departments/Staff Workshop, since they can contribute their experience in grass-root scaling-up activities.

- In the “Departments/Staff workshop”, focus on the ‘internal’ aspects of strengths and weaknesses involved in a specific activity (e.g., networking), but do also – at least briefly – address the ‘external’ aspects of opportunities and threats.
- In the “management meeting” with a limited timeframe of (at least) 2-3 hours, discuss, analyse and draw conclusions on workshop results in a meeting with the heads of departments, director(s), and board members.
Start the meeting with an introduction to the outputs of the “Departments/Staff Workshop” and highlight the points to be discussed in detail.

Focus the discussion on the ‘external’ aspects of opportunities and threats and the organisation’s future plans in scaling up.

**Documentation and cross-checking**

The documentation of the SWOT workshop provides the basis for writing the scaling-up chapter of the report. Cross-checking is important to validate assessment results.

- To document the SWOT workshop, use notes taken and charts elaborated (SWOT matrices, timelines etc.).
- Assign 2-3 note takers to document the management meeting.
- Cross-check data, discussion points and conclusions from the workshop and the meetings in order to assemble a draft report on the scaling-up strategies of your organisation or project.
- Clarify possible contradictions, delete overlapping issues, and include any additional information.

To cope with the bulk of information more effectively, you should consider the possibility of and willingness to use video documentation. In this case you need to take into account the enormous amount of time needed for copying and evaluation.
**D4 Reporting, learning and sharing**

**Report writing**

Report writing is a decisive step in self-assessment processes – regardless of its frequent neglect. It enables you to share your good practices and scaling-up strategies both in and outside of your organisation. The writing itself is not done in one go but involves repeated drafting and review.

- Clarify responsibilities of report writing (at least one or two people should be involved in the writing process).
- Select and analyse data for a first report draft.
- Forward the draft to key persons within your organisation (experienced field staff, heads of departments, etc.) and ask them for comments.
- Discuss controversial comments to find a common understanding.
- Integrate comments and discussion results in the final draft of the report.
- Before publishing the report, forward it to key persons (particularly to the management) for final review and approval.

Before you start with report writing, you should familiarise yourself with chapter E of these guidelines, which contains more detailed information on the structure of the report format, guiding questions for proposed chapters, and detailed recommendations on the layout.

**Learning and sharing within your organisation**

Learning from successes and failures is a major objective of any evaluation and of self-assessments in particular. For lessons learnt to result in improved performance, assessment findings should not end up at the back of a drawer but be fed into a reflection and decision-making process within your organisation or project.

- Share your case study report across departments and projects, e.g., using intranet where available.
- Prepare and conduct a “Lessons learnt” Workshop (e.g., a half-day session during a retreat meeting) to present and discuss assessment findings.
- In addition or alternatively use occasions such as annual board meetings, monthly management and project officer meetings, village committee meetings etc., to review assessment results.
Based on assessment findings, identify fields of action in project planning and implementation, public relations, staff training, etc.

Develop 5 key arguments to scale up sustainable agriculture practices that reflect your experience (maybe from the case study) and position on scaling up sustainable agricultural practices and that you would like to share with Sustainet. For example: “Our experience with non-pesticide management shows that the success of a sustainable agriculture practices does not necessarily rely on high monetary inputs but can be achieved on a large extent by the transfer of knowledge and the provision of trainings.”

Integrate survey questions and methods you find particularly valuable into your M&E and reporting system.

Discussion of self-assessment results

**Sharing and learning with others**

The aim of Sustainet is to initiate strategy debates between its partners and with other actors involved in sustainable agriculture. Your assessment results and recommendations are of great value and can enrich these debates.

- Visit Sustainet’s groupware to look at case studies and recommendations of other network members.
- Participate in national and international strategy debates, including workshops and conferences organised by Sustainet.
- Use occasions such as network meetings, regional stakeholder meetings, conferences etc. to present and discuss selected findings.
Use meetings and negotiations with government officials to lobby for sustainable agriculture, supporting your arguments with facts established in your self-assessment.

Publish selected findings in brochures, leaflets, etc.

Put your case study report on the Internet, i.e., your website, the Sustainet groupware, etc.

Share findings with farmers in neighbouring / new project areas.
E Report format and layout

We developed this uniform report format to ensure comparability of case studies from various organisations. The report structure consists of three parts (you will find the detailed format at the end of this chapter):

- Part one gives you the opportunity to introduce your organisation or project and to briefly describe the self-assessment process;
- part two shows the results of your self-assessment along a structure you are kindly requested to follow closely; and
- part three provides space to document your conclusions.

We have also included some general recommendations on visualisation and the layout of your report.

INTRODUCTION

For part one – the introduction – we propose the following three chapters:

i Foreword
ii Organisation profile
iii Self-assessment process

Write (or ask your director to write) the foreword only when all chapters have been finalised.

Present your organisation briefly in the chapter organisation profile. You can use the available project documents (e.g., brochures) as sources of information. The following guiding questions may help you with writing:

- When and by whom was your organisation or project founded?
- What are your working fields and main activities / strategies?
- How long have you been working in the field of sustainable agriculture?
- Who are the beneficiaries of your projects?
- Who are your partner organisations?

Briefly depict the sources of information and methods applied in the chapter self-assessment process. You can use the following guiding questions:

- When and within what timeframe did you conduct the self-assessment?
- Who were the facilitators?
- Who was involved in the self-assessment process (farmers, local authorities, resource persons, field staff, management)?
- What good practices in sustainable agriculture did you select for the assessment and why?

The foreword should be an eye-catcher and therefore not exceed one page. Do not forget to include acknowledgements, a table of contents, a list of abbreviations and, if necessary, a glossary on key terms used in your report.
RESULTS OF THE SELF-ASSESSMENT

For part two – results of the self-assessment – we strongly recommend using the structure of the following eleven chapters:

1) Project approach and instruments to enable sustainable agriculture
2) Local conditions relevant to agriculture
3) Changes in agricultural practices and their technical appropriateness (includes questions 3.1 – 4.4)
4) Environmental friendliness
5) Economic and financial viability
6) Social and cultural acceptance
7) Viability of local institutions (includes questions 10.1 – 10.3)
8) Long-term impact
9) Spontaneous replication
10) Scaling-up strategies and activities of local institutions (includes questions 10.4 – 10.9)
11) Scaling-up strategies and activities of the organisation

Each chapter corresponds to the respective survey topic and is divided into sub-chapters according to the survey questions.

✓ Summarise and highlight your main findings at the end of each chapter. You can use the following guiding questions:
   ▪ For chapters 1-2: What are the key elements of your organisation’s project approach? What are the key framework conditions your organisation or project has/had to cope with?
   ▪ For chapters 3-9: What are your organisation’s major successes and failures? Where do you see potential for improvement? What are the main fostering and hampering factors?
   ▪ For chapters 10-11: What are the fostering and hampering factors for the most relevant of the institution’s scaling-up activities? What are the future plans of the institution for scaling up?

CONCLUSIONS

For part three – conclusions – we propose the following two chapters:

1) Lessons learnt and recommendations
2) Key arguments to scale up sustainable agriculture practices

✓ For the chapter “lessons learnt and recommendations”, analyse the summaries of all previous chapters under consideration of two main aspects:
   ▪ What are your “lessons learnt” and what are your future plans to integrate these consequences?
   ▪ What experience do you particularly want to share with Sustainet? What are your recommendations for the other members of Sustainet?
At the end of this chapter, present your key arguments to scale up sustainable agriculture practices, which Sustainet can use to lobby and influence policies (see D4 “learning and sharing within your organisation”).

For larger organisations it may be useful to write this chapter after the “Lessons learnt” Workshop” (see chapter D4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORT STRUCTURE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
<th>LETTER SIZE/TYPe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall structure</td>
<td>1 INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>Arial 14- big letters bold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter headline</td>
<td>1 Project approach</td>
<td>Arial 14 bold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-chapter headline</td>
<td>1.5 Local documentation</td>
<td>Arial 12 bold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>The local documentation</td>
<td>Arial 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visualisation headline</td>
<td>Table 1 – Local documentation</td>
<td>Arial 10 bold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of information</td>
<td>Source: farmers</td>
<td>Arial 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Choose visual aids from the field phase and scaling-up assessment (photographs, graphs, tables, etc.), provide them with a headline, explain them in the text, and give the source of information.

Document additional visualisations in the annex if there is no room in the main text.

Plan enough time for the layout of the report.

Suggestions for suitable visualisations are provided under each survey question in chapters C1-C11. These documentation tools were developed to facilitate data collection, but can easily be used for the report as well.

You can of course adapt certain aspects that seem impractical to you, but please keep to the suggested structure. It will be more helpful for research institutions cross-checking.

After finalising the content and layout of the report, compile a digital file for publication on the Sustainet platform.
## Annex 1  Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>GENERAL TERMS</strong></th>
<th><strong>WORKING DEFINITION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culture</strong></td>
<td>Integrated pattern of human knowledge, belief, and behaviour that is both a result of and integral to the human capacity for learning and transmitting knowledge to succeeding generations. Culture thus consists of language, ideas, beliefs, customs, taboos, codes, institutions, tools, techniques, works of art, rituals, ceremonies, and symbols.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic viability</strong></td>
<td>Improved - or at least stable - household and village / community income, considering all material (e.g. seeds) and non-material (e.g. time) inputs and outputs of production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental friendliness</strong></td>
<td>Improvement - or at least stabilisation - of soil fertility and productivity, water availability and quality, biodiversity of flora and fauna, and the micro-climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial viability</strong></td>
<td>Improved - or at least stable - monetary profit from production; this includes feasible negative cash flow during investment and independence of production from subsidies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus group</strong></td>
<td>Group of key informants on certain issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food security</strong></td>
<td>Self-reliant access, at all times, to nutritious food of sufficient quantity, with the ability to absorb the nutrients intake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good practice in sustainable agriculture</strong></td>
<td>Practices with measurable outputs and impact which should be replicable and which fulfil criteria for sustainability, i.e., environmental friendliness, economic and financial viability, technical appropriateness, social and cultural acceptance, and viable institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution</strong></td>
<td>Functional organisation (e.g. user association, saving and credit group) or mechanism (e.g. regulation, conflict resolving mechanism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marginalised groups</strong></td>
<td>Groups of people who due to their social, economical and health conditions are disadvantaged, e.g. single women, landless, people with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-assessment</strong></td>
<td>A continuous learning process with the aim to move towards an overall improvement through a process which gives space to recognise the views of all stakeholders, enabling the organisation to be in line with its stated vision, mission and goals; honesty and transparency are two basic tenets underlying the principles of self-assessment; the self-assessment process is completed within a stipulated time frame with clearly identified stakeholders from the beginning, and the organisation is able to hold itself accountable and assimilate the findings and impact, which makes the individuals self-responsible to the process and outcome of the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social and cultural acceptance</strong></td>
<td>Respect for existing traditional rights, beliefs and needs of every section of society; this includes gender sensitivity, respect to traditional / indigenous food habits, ceremonies and other cultural traditions, consideration of the needs of marginalised groups, different social strata (incl. castes), migrants, nomadic people (e.g. gypsies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tradition</strong></td>
<td>Cultural information passed on from one generation to the next.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL TERMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>WORKING DEFINITION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Triangulation</strong></td>
<td>Cross-check of information obtained from one source with other sources of information; application of different methods to obtain information on the same subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viable institution</strong></td>
<td>Form of organisation (e.g. village committee, women’s group, watershed management group) that due to its commitment to its objectives, its acceptance and support by the people and other organisations (civil society, government, private), and its availability of resources is highly likely to sustain in the long-run</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TERMS RELATED TO SCALING-UP</strong></th>
<th><strong>WORKING DEFINITION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decentralisation</strong></td>
<td>To spread responsibilities and power from the central level to lower levels; this includes the outsourcing of activities to third parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Horizontal activities</strong></td>
<td>Expansion in the number and diversity of the activities undertaken by linking e.g. agriculture to forestry, or by supplementing food security related activities with health education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increasing activities</strong></td>
<td>To widen the organisation’s project or programmes on a horizontal and vertical scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lobbying and advocacy</strong></td>
<td>To influence the government, agencies, companies and other organisations in order to change their policies (e.g. by declarations, advice, petitioning, through personal relationships)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobilisation</strong></td>
<td>Creating awareness for an issue at the right time and stimulating action (either promoting or protesting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Networking</strong></td>
<td>Non-permanent collaboration between various organisations (e.g. government, NGOs, research institutions) on issues of joint interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational growth</strong></td>
<td>To become a larger organisation and manage more funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational learning</strong></td>
<td>To share experience and make the most of the available knowledge of individuals for the betterment of the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outreach</strong></td>
<td>The operational area of an organisation that can increase by covering a larger geographical area and by reaching a greater number of people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public relations</strong></td>
<td>Activities undertaken to inform others about objectives and activities of one’s own organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource mobilisation</strong></td>
<td>To ensure a stable provision of financial resources by various sources / income-generating activities with the long-term goal of achieving self-sufficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scaling up</strong></td>
<td>Any effort to bring more quality benefits to more people over a wider geographical area more quickly, more equitably, and more lastingly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spontaneous replication</strong></td>
<td>Self-emerging adoption - without incentives, inputs and efforts - of successful agricultural practices, methods, technologies or institutions by a person or community, within or outside the area of operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vertical integration</strong></td>
<td>To add upstream (e.g. marketing, food processing) and downstream (e.g. seed banks) activities that complement and strengthen the original activities of a project or programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERMS RELATED TO AGRICULTURE</td>
<td>WORKING DEFINITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agro-climatic zone</td>
<td>The division of an area of land into smaller units, which have similar characteristics related to land suitability, potential production and environmental impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apiculture</td>
<td>Rearing of bees in artificial hives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bench terracing</td>
<td>Transforming relatively steep land into a series of level strips or plain forms across the slope of the land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio-pesticides</td>
<td>Utilization of botanical pesticides (e.g. oils of neem) and/or use of natural enemy. Bio-pesticides refer to substances which can be tolerated by each other and mixed with each other. Bio-pesticides such as Trichoderma are compatible with N-fixing bacteria such as Rhizobium. Only compatible fertilizers are used for making fertilizer mixtures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biotic pressure</td>
<td>Extensive use of land by human beings and animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contour bunding</td>
<td>Use of physical barricades on the surface of the earth across the slope and along the contour which break the flow of water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contour cultivation</td>
<td>The practice of tilling sloped land along lines of consistent elevation in order to conserve rainwater and to reduce soil losses from surface erosion. These objectives are achieved by means of furrows, crop rows, and wheel tracks across slopes, all of which act as reservoirs to catch and retain rainwater, thus permitting increased infiltration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover crops</td>
<td>Any plants that are planted to cover the surface of the soil (e.g. delichus lab lab, groundnuts, pulses, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cropping system</td>
<td>The kind and sequence of crops grown over a period of time on a given area of soil can be described as the cropping system. It may be a pattern of regular rotation of different crops or one of growing only one crop year after year on the same area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming system</td>
<td>Defining farming as a system implies its understanding as an integrated whole, which is making more efficient use of natural, economic, and social resources. Included in this concept are the goals of finding and adopting integrated and resource-efficient crop and livestock systems that maintain productivity, that are profitable, and that protect the environment and the personal health of farmers and their families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetic resources</td>
<td>Hereditary information of any living organism. Genetic resources provide the basis for maintaining biodiversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gully treatment</td>
<td>Stopping gully erosion by using e.g. a bamboo base (rush wood), loose boulders or gabions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated nutrient manage-</td>
<td>Application of all possible sources of nutrient fertilisers (organic manure, crop residues) based on economic conditions and the balance required for the crop in supplemented with chemical fertilisers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ment (INM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-cropping</td>
<td>Growing of two or more crops simultaneously on the same piece of land with a defined row pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed cropping</td>
<td>Growing of two or more crops simultaneously intermingled without any row pattern of seeds of different crops, which are mixed and sown in certain proportions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERMS RELATED TO AGRICULTURE</td>
<td>WORKING DEFINITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulching</td>
<td>Method of covering the surface of the soil with any decomposable material (grass, hay, paper, kitchen wastes, leaves, twigs, plant residues etc.) in order to prevent and/or restore soil degradation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple cropping</td>
<td>Growing of two or more crops on the same piece of land in one calendar year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic farming</td>
<td>A production system based on renewal of ecological processes and strengthening of ecological functions of the farm ecosystem to lastingly produce safe and healthy food; in contrast to modern systems, organic farming represents a deliberate attempt to make the best use of local resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percolation tank</td>
<td>A small sunken tank to recharge ground water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porosity</td>
<td>Percentage of pore / air space present in soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post harvest management</td>
<td>A special practice or technique used after harvesting of crops to increase its quality and storage life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relay cropping</td>
<td>Planting of the succeeding crop before harvesting the preceding crop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifting cultivation</td>
<td>Method of cultivation including the burning and clearing of forest vegetation before planting. The ash provides some fertilization. After several years of cultivation, fertility declines thus requiring an adequate fallow period, which should restore soil fertility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvi-pasture</td>
<td>Pasture land development along with high spacing tree plantation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil degradation</td>
<td>Loss of soil productivity through lowering its potential capability for the production of goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil erosion</td>
<td>Loss of soil due to wind, water and inappropriate land-use management; the balance between soil development and soil removal is disturbed and leads to a loss of the soil fertility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil fertility</td>
<td>Inherent capacity of soil to provide nutrients in adequate amounts and in proper balance for the growth of specified plants, when other growth factors such as light, water, temperature and the physical, biological, chemical conditions of the soil are favourable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strip cropping</td>
<td>A system of crops in which large and narrow strips of erosion resisting crops (close growing crops such as groundnut, horse gram, malu bean etc.) are alternated with strips of erosion permitting crops (erect growing crops such as sorghum, maize, millet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spill-over structure</td>
<td>A concrete structure for safe drainage of water in sloping agricultural land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trap crops</td>
<td>Certain plants attracting insects; when these are sown in the field or alongside, insects will gather on them and can thus be easily controlled (e.g. cotton ball worms prefer maize to cotton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetative barrier</td>
<td>Growing of grasses or any other vegetation along the field boundary to prevent soil erosion and/or to control wind velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water holding capacity</td>
<td>Capacity of soil to hold water per unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2 Reading material

Literature on Sustainable Agriculture


DEWAN, ARIF R. (w/o year): Improving Sustainable Agriculture Practices for the Poor. Dhaka: CARE Bangladesh / DFID


Literature on Impact and Poverty Assessment


STAHL, KARIN (w/o year): Evaluations as Learning Process - Participatory Evaluation Experiences of Bread for the World in Latin America.

Literature on Scaling-up


CARROLL, TOM; SCHMIDT, MARY; BEBBINGTON, TONY (1996): Participation through Intermediary NGOs. World Bank Social Development Papers No. 12, February 1996


Annex 3 Introduction to SWOT / sample moderation plan

What is SWOT?

SWOT stands for “Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats”. SWOT analysis was developed as a tool to describe and assess the performance of an organisation. The main characteristic of the SWOT analysis is its focus on the two dimensions in which an organisation is embedded: the internal side of the organisation with its strengths and weaknesses and the external side with its opportunities and threats. Both sides impact on the organisation’s overall performance but differ in the degree to which they can be influenced by the organisation itself. Whereas the internal side provides tremendous scope for change and thus the option of planning for improvement in the future, the external side must often be taken as given without much possibility of inducing change, at least in the short term. Since this situation is very similar to that faced by many organisations following analysis of their scaling-up performance, SWOT is an adequate tool for the analysis of experiences in scaling up and the lessons learnt an organisation can draw from in the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>internal</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Use them!**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>external</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Seize them!**

**Minimalise them!**

**Avoid them!**

How to use SWOT in analysing scaling-up strategies and activities?

For the “Departments/Staff Workshop” it is useful to split the analysis of your organisation’s scaling-up strategies and activities into two working groups that focus on different scaling-up activities (see Chapter B13 for a proposal on groups). For both groups, the respective department staff presentation on experience with, e.g., networking can serve as the basis for filling in the SWOT table on this topic. As a visualisation tool SWOT helps to differentiate between factors that foster and those that hamper, e.g., long-term contacts established with other organisations help with networking, while an atmosphere of competition between organisations can be hampering. Once filled in, the various boxes can be discussed and strategies on how to cope with these factors developed, e.g., how can your organisation strengthen contacts to other organisations. As a last step, the two working groups should present their findings and recommendations for the final synthesis of their work. This should be incorporated into the future planning of the organisation’s scaling-up strategies and activities.
Sample moderation plan for using the SWOT analysis for assessing a small to middle-sized organisation’s scaling-up practices

Preparation: Ask participants to prepare a presentation on the most relevant scaling-up practices of your organisation that have a relation to the good practice that you have selected in your self-assessment. Use the survey question C11.1 – 11.6 for reference.

Introduction: Start the workshop by introducing its purpose “Why is scaling up of interest to our organisation?” Explain the term “scaling up” and its objective to disseminate “good practices”

Presentation of your organisation’s scaling-up practices with focus on sustainable agriculture:

- To what extent has your organisation expanded in size and outreach since its foundation? Use timelines e.g., for number of staff members, the project budget, geographical coverage of the project area,
- What activities has your organisation taken up in addition to those originally planned? On horizontal level: new activities; on vertical level: adding of activities at different levels to those that already exist.
- How has your organisation broadened its indirect impact? E.g., networking, public relations, mobilisation of people, influencing government policies, lobbying, entry into politics, giving support to other organisations.
- How has your organisation strengthened its own sustainability? E.g., capacity building of staff through training, knowledge management activities, diversification of income sources.

Selection of scaling-up practice you want to analyse:

✓ Prioritise of your organisation’s scaling-up practices e.g., by ranking them with points, pick 2-4 activities for the SWOT analysis.

SWOT analysis for each scaling up practice:

✓ If necessary form working groups or start SWOT analysis with whole group.
✓ For every activity use one matrix. Ensure adequate documentation.
✓ Start with the “internal” strength of your organisation: “What are the strengths of our organisation with regard to e.g., networking?” Hand out cards for answers, collect and cluster them. Where necessary go into depth by asking for reasons, e.g., what are the reasons for financial / time constraints?
✓ Continue with the “internal” weaknesses of your organisation: “What are the weaknesses of our organisation with regard to e.g., knowledge management?”
✓ Change to the “external” field of the matrix by asking: “After having analysed our strengths and weaknesses, what opportunities exist to improve them? Which potentials exist?”
✓ Go to the “threats” box by asking: “If these opportunities exit, why do we not make use of them? Which threats exist? What are the constraining external factors?”
✓ Make participants draw conclusions by asking: “How can we deal with this situation? Which weaknesses or opportunities could be dealt with the easiest?” and “What are the future plans of our organisation for scaling up?”
## Annex 4 The Conceptual Workshop

### Timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th>(28/07-31/07)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction, team building, clarification of objectives and procedures, drafting conceptual framework</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>(02/08-07/08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development of survey topics, survey questions, drafting information collection methods and report structures</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td>(09/08-14/08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td>(16/08-18/08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14/02/2005
List of participants (in alphabetical order)

MR CHRISTIAN BERG, SLE Team Leader
Agricultural Economist, specialised in project planning, monitoring and evaluation

MR DANIEL BHASKER, SUSTAINET National Coordinator
Masters in International Relations, specialised in watershed and rural development

MR RASHID A. FARIDI, NAVDANYA Research Scientist
Agricultural Scientist, specialised in soil and plant research and horticulture

MR MIRCO GAUL, SLE Junior Consultant
Energy Engineer, specialised in renewable energies and appropriate technology

MR MANGLA RAM JAT, CECOEDENCO Field Project Coordinator
Agricultural Scientist, specialised in watershed management and NRM

MR KRISHNA KUMAR, CECOEDENCO Head of Policy Analysis and Advocacy Unit
Botanist, specialised in research and documentation

MS ROMY LEHNS, SLE Junior Consultant
Geographer, specialised in soil science and regional rural development

MS ASTRID MEYER, SLE Junior Consultant
Anthropologist, specialised in locally adapted land-use management and gender

MS FRANZISKA MOHAUPT, SLE Junior Consultant
Environment Engineer, specialised in soil protection and environmental politics

MS SANGEETA NAIK, AGRAGAMEE
Mathematician, specialised in management information systems

MR DARWAN SINGH NEGI, NAVDANYA Regional Coordinator
Specialised in farm management and farmers’ training

MR OMPRAKASH RAUTARAYA, AGRAGAMEE Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist
Agricultural Scientist, specialised in watershed management and NRM

MS MIRIAM SCHRODER, SLE Junior Consultant
Political Scientist, specialised in environmental politics and international relations

Mr P. VISWANADH, VIKASA / IGBP Executive Director
Horticultural Scientist, specialised in watershed management

Guests:

DR. VINOOD BHATT, NAVDANYA Deputy Director Biodiversity Conservation Project
Botanist, specialised in biodiversity conservation

MS TAMAR, REIJNEN, AIESEC International Exchange Programme Student
Agricultural Scientist, specialised in ecological pest management
# Annex 5 The Methodology and Reflection Workshop

## List of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. Kiran</td>
<td>Permaculture Association of India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Venkata Lakshmi</td>
<td>Permaculture Association of India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Puliaiah</td>
<td>R.W.D.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilda Grace</td>
<td>CRSD (R.W.D.P.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damodar Jena</td>
<td>Agragamee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamolini Devi</td>
<td>Agragamee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Raja Shekar</td>
<td>Centre for Sustainable Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Gangadhar</td>
<td>Centre for World Solidarity / Centre for Sustainable Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debabrata Giri</td>
<td>Ramakrishna Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. C. Chattopadhyay</td>
<td>Ramakrishna Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Nagaraj</td>
<td>FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Ramesh</td>
<td>SECURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gpyadhar Shial</td>
<td>CPSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Rane Kumar</td>
<td>CONARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siby V. Mathew</td>
<td>Peermade Development Society (PDS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabu M. Simon</td>
<td>Peermade Development Society (PDS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krishna Kumar</td>
<td>CECEOEDCON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arun Mondal</td>
<td>Sri Ramakrishna Ashram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utpal Maity</td>
<td>Sri Ramakrishna Ashram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Narasinga Rao</td>
<td>VIKASA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Gopi</td>
<td>VIKASA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivek Gour-Broome</td>
<td>Rural Communes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brig. J. Kaul (Retd.)</td>
<td>Rural Communes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadakshari T.S.</td>
<td>BAIIF Institute for Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith Bwanya</td>
<td>African Conservation Tillage Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Bhasker</td>
<td>Sustainet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>