

Experience with applying the Legume CHOICE tool

1. When did you most recently apply the tool? In which communities and with how many farmers?

- We have applied/tested the LC tool at Diga sites from 7th and 9th November, 2015. A total of 32 farmers (9 low resource, 13 medium resource, and 10 high resource) from Lalisa-Dimtu, and 18 farmers (8 low resource, 5 medium resource and 5 high resource) from Fromsa were participated.
- We couldn't get enough representation of female farmers at Fromsa (only 2) but 9 women farmers were represented in Lalisa-Dimtu.

2. How did it go? Was the tool easy to apply and were the instructions clear? What difficulties were encountered?

- The instructions are clear and understandable, and the discussion went well.
- As most of the discussion is done in separate groups (men and women), and three farmer groups (by typology), it requires at least 6 expertise at a time (3 facilitator and 3 note taker) which is very intensive in terms of time and cost when its long term applicability assumed. Doing the discussion with expertise fewer than 6 also consumes more time.
- We conducted all the three steps (Qualitative diagnosis of the farming system, Context Assessment, and the Community Need Assessment continuously)-but it takes around 4 hours on average – boring. Therefore, doing the qualitative diagnosis on first day and the remaining context and community need assessments the next day as it was already proposed on the tool seems good.
- The order of legume functions on Participatory Matrix Scoring – farmer data sheet and its summary data sheet is not the same with that on Legume Choice prototype tool. This can cause miss leaded the data entry into the prototype.

3. Did application of the Legume CHOICE tool help to inform the current set of legume interventions that are being applied in field sites? If not, give an indication of why this is.

- Yes, it helped to indicate intervention areas related to current activities under way in field sites but there was some inconsistencies between the result of summary context score given by both farmers and experts, and the final output of legume option attributes. For example, lack of market and seed supply are among the key constraining attributes identified on the discussion but legume options identified from the tool does not necessary indicate this. This might have been happened as a result of the non-representativeness of the global scores given to different legume options.

4. What do you see as the next steps in refining the Legume CHOICE tool and making it more useful?

- More refinement of the tool is required through more populating the legume options and rescoring their sensitivity to various legume use and/or production constraints, as well as rescoring the functions that they deliver to the community.

5. Would there be merit at this stage in conducting trainings on the use of the tool with external stakeholders? If not, when should we conduct trainings and what needs to happen before we carry out trainings?

- Starting training with external stakeholders would be good after the points indicated in number 4 above will be finalized. More populating the legume options and rescoring their functions and constraints with participation of more legume experts should be conducted first.