

## **Experience with applying the Legume CHOICE tool – summary of experiences to date (Dec 2015)**

### **1. Recent application of the tool**

The latest version of the tool has now been applied in all project sites in Ethiopia (Nov 2015), Kenya (June 2015) and DRC (May 2015). In some cases it was difficult to get sufficient farmers but in general farmer participation was good.

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

In all sites users found instructions to be clear enough and the discussions seemed to go well. In Ethiopia the need for separate facilitators for each group (2 x gender, 3 x types) made the process a bit cumbersome and we may need to revisit the methodology a bit. Splitting the exercise into two days was also suggested. In Kenya, the time required to implement was also found to be excessive. The pairwise ranking and participatory matrix scoring results were found to give similar answers so we could drop the pairwise ranking perhaps. In DRC there were a few difficulties in pairwise ranking but this would improve with experience with the tool. Also in DRC, the concept of nitrogen fixation was new to farmers and some time was needed to discuss it.

### **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.**

In general users reported that application of the Legume CHOICE tool had helped to inform selection of interventions. In most cases the tool helped in developing a short list of intervention options that then needed to be prioritized and refined through discussion with farmers. A key issue was that the tool sometimes proposed options which were unsuitable to the agro-ecology. Thus a next phase in tool development could be an agro-ecological suitability filter. In Ethiopia there seemed to be some discrepancy between the findings of the FGD and the scores emerging from the tool. This may have related to problems with some of the expert scores in the spreadsheet.

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

There was general agreement on the next steps. Firstly, the list of legume options needs to be expanded and made more comprehensive. Secondly, there needs to be further scoring of any added legume options and possibly some revisiting of existing scores. Thirdly, an agro-ecological suitability filter needs to be incorporated into the methodology

### **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?**

Users were in general agreement that further refinement of the tool is needed before proceeding to training

of external users. The DRC team felt that some training within the project might be useful because of turnover of personnel in the past few months.

Alan Duncan  
3/12/15