



## ***COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE WORKSHOP GUIDE***

***IMPLEMENTORS: including NGOs, COMMUNITY FACILITATORS***



**ANNE KURIA, MARY CROSSLAND, ANA MARIA PAEZ VALENCIA, ESTHER  
KIURA, CHRISTINE MAGAJU, JOHN NYAGA, AND LEIGH WINOWIECKI, WORLD  
AGROFORESTRY CENTRE (ICRAF)**

**February 2018**

## Table of Content

Introduction, purpose and aim of the Community of Practice(CoP) guide for implementers.....	3
Objectives of the CoP Workshop.....	4
Section A: Feedback from Farmer Communities of Practice .....	4
Section B: To understand aims of the PCs from the implementers’ perspective.....	4
Section C: To understand the performance of the land restoration options from the implementers’ perspective .....	5
Section D: To understand gendered perspectives of the land restoration options.....	5
Section E: Feedback from PC Results from data analyzed.....	6
Section F: Assessing the Research in Development Approach .....	6
Section G: Next Steps, Capacity Needs and Suggestions of Smooth Field Operations .....	6

This guide is produced within the IFAD- EC funded ‘Restoration of degraded land for food security and poverty reduction in East Africa and the Sahel: taking successes in land restoration to scale’ project (<http://www.worldagroforestry.org/project/restoration-degraded-land-food-security-and-povertyreduction-east-africa-and-sahel-taking>).

Suggested citation:

Kuria, A., Crossland, M.,Paez-Valencia, AM., Kiura, E., Magaju, C., Nyaga, J. and Winowiecki, LA. 2018. *COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE WORKSHOP GUIDE: IMPLEMENTORS: including NGOs, COMMUNITY FACILITATORS*. World Agroforestry Centre 7 pgs.

## Introduction, purpose and aim of the Community of Practice(CoP) guide for implementers

The main objective of this Implementers' Communities of Practice (CoP) guide is to provide CoP facilitators with a check-list of questions that they can use. This entails getting views and perspectives on whether the PCs are achieving the targeted goals, assessing what is working and not working (how's and why's); what the impacts of the land restoration options are to farmers and suggestions on how to improve on their performance. It also entails exploring ways to improve synergies and attain better collaboration amongst the implementers, including identifying challenges the implementers are facing and devising ways of addressing such challenges. It is also meant to assess the progress of research activities and come up with 'next steps' to ensure that all actors are working together and cohesively towards achieving a common goal.

Points to note:

- ✓ This Implementers CoP should ideally be held after undertaking Farmers CoP. This is in order to share farmers feedback to enable the implementers have a chance to address some of the key issues that need immediate action and also learn from the farmers
- ✓ The exercises can be combined with other participatory exercises as deemed appropriate such as the perspective sharing, Bao game of scoring, ranking exercises, using colored cards etc.
- ✓ This exercise will require resources such as multi-coloured cards, flip charts, marker pens

This guide may be adapted to other projects wishing to elicit implementers feedback on the performance of technologies.

### Objectives of the CoP Workshop

The main objectives of the Communities of Practice (CoP) workshop held with Community Facilitators (CFs) were:

1. Share experiences from the CoP, farmers, CFs, NGOS, and Researchers
  - a. Share a detailed report of CoP farmer report with the CFs
  - b. Receive additional feedback on the CoP with farmers.
  - c. Share the powerpoint of the preliminary results of the Planned Comparisons (PCs)
2. To understand the aims of the land restoration interventions from the CF perspective
3. Understand how the CFs have addressed the challenges expressed in October workshop
  - a. Check the status on utility of the enumerators
  - b. Identify suggestions for smooth operations in the field
4. To gather perspectives on what the CFs have learned from this engagement with farmers
  - a. Including gendered perspectives
5. To register capacity needs of the CFs
6. To introduce Mary Crossland to the project team and explore gendered perceptions of the restoration options
7. Discuss and finalize the harvest protocol
8. Schedule community of practice with NGOs

### Section A: Feedback from Farmer Communities of Practice

This section involves the facilitators of the CoP presenting key highlights and feedback from the farmers' CoP workshops. This step is critical as it is meant to allow for reflection and identification of key pressing issues raised by farmers, which require action by implementers. Key questions in this section include:

1. Are the key issues raised by farmers during the workshop captured accurately in the report?
2. Are there issues or perspectives that were not captured?
3. How have you addressed the key issues presented by farmers and what additional support is needed/
4. What aspects do you feel need to be addressed during this meeting? *(This will open up a discussion and brainstorming on solutions and way forward amongst the implementers)*

### Section B: To understand aims of the PCs from the implementers' perspective

5. Is there any aspect of any PC treatment you observed farmers are struggling to achieve or adhere to? Have you attempted solving the challenge or what suggestions do you have?
6. Have you as implementers personally learnt any lesson from your engagement with farmers implementing the PCs? *(Yes, Neutral, No)*? Give reasons for your answers

### Section C: To understand the performance of the land restoration options from the implementers' perspective

*Here, the implementers will be requested to discuss each restoration option separately (planting basins, tree planting) separately.*

7. According to your views, have the land restoration options implemented on farm had a positive, neutral or negative impact? (*Positive, Neutral, Negative*)? Give reasons for your answers.
8. According to your views, do you think farmers have benefited from the land restoration options? (*Yes, Neutral, No*)? Give reasons for your answers.
9. Are there gender-specific aspects affecting the outcomes of the land restoration options that you have observed? If any, how can they be addressed?
10. Are there other critical emerging issues that you feel should be addressed or prioritized? Have you attempted to address them?

### Section D: To understand gendered perspectives of the land restoration options

Introducing Mary Crossland's PhD thesis. Particularly her interest in how basins, tree planting, and other possible land restoration options affect men's and women's time and labour constraints, their access to income, and can strengthen household food security. I would like to know your perspectives on this and what you have observed in the field and through interacting with the farmers. Together as a group we will talk through and discuss the following questions on the control and management of the PCs, use of labour and time, and the different advantages and disadvantages of using planting basins for men and for women.

Control and management of the options:

11. Who do you think makes the decisions on which PCs to test? (Trees, basins, species)
12. Who do you think makes the decision on where the PC plots will be put?
13. Who do you think makes decision on how many pits to dig?
14. Who have you observed digging the planting basins?
15. When people hire labour, whom do they hire?

Labour and time:

16. Have planting basins reduced or increased time working on the farm?
17. If increased, has this affected farmers' ability to perform other tasks?
18. How does this differ for men and women?
19. Have other activities been redistributed in time and in space? (For example, field preparation can happen earlier with the basins? Rather than waiting for use of plough or tractor).

Advantages and disadvantages:

20. Who (men or women) do you think is the most suited to adopt planting basins? And why?
21. What are the advantages of planting basins for women?
22. What are the advantages of planting basins for men?
23. What are the disadvantages of planting basins for women?
24. What are the disadvantages of planting basins for men?
25. How can the challenges (disadvantages) identified above be resolved
26. What other technologies/ options could the project explores?
27. What other options are the farmers already trying on their farm for improved land health and livelihoods.

### Section E: Feedback from PC Results from data analyzed

*This section entails the CoP facilitators sharing with the implementers, key findings from the data already analyzed from the PCs.*

28. Are there any key results shared that you find presents a new perspective on what you already know about the PCs?

### Section F: Assessing the Research in Development Approach

29. What are some of the challenges you are facing as implementers in operating in the 'Research in Development' approach? E.g., NGOs and ICRAF
30. What recommendations do you have to improve this process?

### Section G: Next Steps, Capacity Needs and Suggestions of Smooth Field Operations

31. What activities are in the pipeline- immediate activities
32. Do you need any other form of support? Give reasons?
33. Do you require additional skills to improve the performance of your activities?

## REFERENCES

- Bellon, M. R. (2001). Participatory research methods for technology evaluation: A manual for scientists working with farmers. CIMMYT.
- CIMMYT Economics Program. 1993. The adoption of agricultural technology: A guide for survey design. [cimmyt@cgiar.org](mailto:cimmyt@cgiar.org) CIMMYT, Apdo. Postal 6-641, Mexico 6 DF, Mexico 88 pp.
- Coe, R., Sinclair, F., & Barrios, E. (2014). Scaling up agroforestry requires research 'in' rather than 'for' development. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 6, 73-77.
- Fals-Borda, O. (2006). Participatory (Action) Research in Social Theory: Origins and Challenges. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of Action Research* (pp. 27-37). London: Sage Publications.
- Franzel, S., Denning, G. L., Lillesø, J. P. B., & Mercado, A. R. (2004). Scaling up the impact of agroforestry: lessons from three sites in Africa and Asia. *Agroforestry systems*, 61(1), 329-344.
- Hall, B. (2005). In From the Cold? Reflections on Participatory Research From 1970 - 2005. *Convergence*, 38, 5-24.
- KFPE (1998). Guidelines for Research in Partnership with Developing Countries: 11 Principles. Swiss Commission for Research Partnership with Developing Countries
- Kuria A., Lamond G., Muthuri C., Mukuralinda A. and Sinclair F. (2013). Local knowledge study on the role of trees and associated management on food security in Gishwati, Rwanda- under the 'ACIAR Trees for Food Security' project

- Place, F. 1995. An ex-ante impact analysis of selected agroforestry technologies in the SALWA network. ICRAF. 16 pp.
- Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. (Eds.). (2006). Handbook of Action Research. London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Shore, N. (2006). Re-Conceptualizing the Belmont Report: A Community-Based Participatory Research Perspective. *Journal of Community Practice*, 14(4), 21.
- Sinclair, F.L. and Walker, D.H. (1998). Acquiring qualitative knowledge about complex agroecosystems. Part 1: Representation as natural language. *Agricultural Systems*, 56(3): 341-363.
- Winterford, K. (2017). How to Partner for Development Research, Research For Development *Impact Network*, Canberra, Australia