

## Report on stakeholder evaluation of adaptation guidelines

Authors: Piet Stevens, Mohamed Ouessar, Hamado Sawadogo, Kifle  
Woldearegay, Silenga Wamunyima



Date: 20-04-2016

Report number 42

Deliverable 5.4

Series: Scientific Reports

This report was written in the framework of the WAHARA project – [www.wahara.eu](http://www.wahara.eu)





# Report on stakeholder evaluation of adaptation guidelines

WAHARA Work Package 5 deliverable 4

Authors:

Piet Stevens, Mohamed Ouessar, Hamado Sawadogo, Kifle Woldearegay, Silenga Wamunyima

2016

## Contents

1. Introduction .....	2
2. Method .....	2
3. Results.....	3
3.1. Burkina Faso.....	3
3.2. Ethiopia .....	4
3.3. Tunisia .....	5
3.4. Zambia.....	6
References .....	8
Appendix 1. Forms for Stakeholder evaluation of draft guidelines for WH adaptation.....	9

## 1. Introduction

This document follows through on WAHARA Work Package 5 deliverable 3 (Stevens et al, 2016c), which provided guidelines for adaptation of water harvesting technologies. D5.3, in turn, was based on findings resulting from an integrative analysis of results from all 4 WAHARA study sites, as reported in D5.1 (Stevens et al, 2016a), and on an analysis of critical biophysical and socio-economic conditions for WH adaptation (D5.2; Stevens et al, 2016b).

WH adaptation is the innovative process of farmers making novel water harvesting concepts work for them, or making existing ones work better or respond better to changing working conditions. One of the observations made was that there can be no WH adoption without WH adaptation. Not only is a good adaptability of WH technologies critical for their successful outscaling, but also for their robustness under altering natural or socio-economic conditions. WH adaptation, i.e. making WH technologies suitable, should help productivity increases in African rainfed agriculture to come about quickly enough and make them last long enough.

As mentioned in D5.3, the first and most important guideline for WH adaptation is: use common sense. The second would be: use local know-how. To ensure that the guidelines presented in D5.3 matched the needs of the stakeholders in the different study sites, the guidelines were to be evaluated by stakeholders, including farmers, extension workers and other service providers. Feedback from stakeholders would be used to finalise the guidelines (D5.3) and to write the current report about the stakeholder evaluation (D5.4).

## 2. Method

To facilitate the evaluation process, terms of reference were developed by the WP5 leader, as follows.

### *Objective:*

Guidelines for adaptation of water harvesting technologies broadly accepted by stakeholders

### *Approach:*

1. Draft guidelines circulated among the stakeholders
2. Evaluation of the draft guidelines and feedback by the stakeholders:
  - a. Local stakeholders by way of a meeting at each of the four study sites convened by the WAHARA study site coordinators, or by interaction with a smaller number of targeted stakeholders
  - b. The WAHARA researchers outside the study sites through direct response from each of them or their teams (e.g. by WAHARA partner organisation)
3. Finalization of the guidelines using the feedback received from the stakeholders meetings and WAHARA researchers (WP5 deliverable 3)

### *Evaluation meeting at the study sites:*

- The study site coordinators convene and lead the stakeholders meeting
- The agenda of the meeting would include the following items:
  - Introduction, explanation of:
    - § The objective and programme of the meeting
    - § The intended purpose of the guidelines
  - Step-by-step explanation of the guidelines
  - Evaluation by the participants:
    - § Formulation of comments in writing, possibly in small groups
    - § Presentation by each group

- § Plenary discussion
- § Consolidation of the participants' feedback, i.e. listing of the resolutions and formulation of explanatory and additional comments.

The study site coordinators are requested to produce a report of the meeting using the evaluation form (5 sheets included in Appendix 3), by returning the completed set (which should also be filled in by the WAHARA researchers outside the study sites). The completed evaluation sheets should provide a clear reflection of the meetings outcomes. They must be filled in completely and include any significant additional feedback from the meeting, possibly with explanatory notes accompanying the feedback where necessary.

The above terms of reference were provided to the study sites as a guide, together with the draft report with WH guidelines. Apart from the original English version, a translation in French was supplied to the study sites in Burkina Faso and Tunisia as well.

### 3. Results

All study sites discussed the draft guidelines with some stakeholders. However, a dedicated evaluation meeting with all relevant stakeholders was only held in Burkina Faso before the end of the project. In Ethiopia and Zambia such meetings were held after the official end of the project, while in Tunisia a more restricted meeting was held with some stakeholders, but no farmers. The outcomes of the stakeholder evaluation from Burkina Faso have been included in the final text of WP5.3. The feedback from the other sites was received after the end of the WAHARA project, and is given in the sections below.

#### 3.1. Burkina Faso

As Table 1 shows, a total of 76 stakeholders took part in this meeting, representing various categories of stakeholders. Their comments and the action taken were as follows:

- In the *Selection* paragraph of chapter 3 (Steps in adaptation), the sentence '*The technology should be replicable (with similar results), within the reach of many and not causing unsurmountable conflicts in the community*' should be included. This was done in the final text of D5.3.
- In chapter 4 (Selecting a WH technology for adaptation), the possible application levels that affect the range of WH options, were elaborated to include household, block or group, village and community levels. This was taken over in the final text of D5.3.
- In table 1 (Scoring WH technologies for local suitability), the 'Fight against Striga' was mentioned as an additional Benefit criterion. As the table is merely an example to be adapted to local requirements, this specific point was left out from the final text of D5.3.
- In Appendix 1 (Checklist of indicators for the suitability of a WH technology) some additional indicators were mentioned and introduced in the final text of D5.3:
  - Risk of fungal diseases and nematodes (Indicator type: Wildlife)
  - Level of organization of the agricultural sector and of empowerment of farmers (Indicator type: Agricultural system)
  - Drought resistant/tolerant (Indicator type: Production types)
  - Groundwater recharge (Indicator type: Production types)
  - Activities in competition with farming (e.g. gold panning, migration) (Indicator type: Socio-economic objectives)
  - Policy balance between food and cash crops (Indicator type: Formal system)

- Microfinance and credit institutions, warrantage (inventory credit) (Indicator type: Services)
- Competing claims (e.g. between farmers and herders) (Indicator type: Trade-offs and spin-offs)
- The most important aspects to be covered by the guidelines are:
  - Technical aspects: feasibility and effectiveness of the technologies, verifiable improvements of agricultural yields
  - Socio-economic aspects: affordable costs, realistic rewards, low drudgery, reduction of conflicts between land users

Table 1. Participants in Burkina Faso evaluation meeting.

<b>OVERVIEW OF PARTICIPANTS</b>		
Country of WAHARA study site: <b>Burkina Faso</b>		
<i>Category of stakeholders</i>	<i>Total number of representatives (male plus female)</i>	<i>Number of female representatives only</i>
Farmers	58	22
Extension officers/community workers	5	1
Local authorities	1	0
Researchers	7	1
Traders/stockists/processors	2	2
NGO/development project	3	0
<b>ALL</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>26</b>

### 3.2. Ethiopia

**Date and Place of the meeting:** May 06, 2016, Wukro, Ethiopia

**Number of percipients and represented organizations:**

A total of 23 participants have attended the one day meeting. Represented institutions include: Mekelle University (MU), Tigray Bureau of Agriculture and Rural Development (TBoARD), Relief Society of Tigray (REST), Wukro Saint Mary College, Tigray Bureau of Water Resources (TBoWR), Tigray Agricultural Research Institute (TARI), and representatives from farmers, and woreda administrations within Genfel watershed (mainly Klite Awlaelo, and Hawzien woredas).

**Objectives and approaches of the stakeholder evaluation:**

To get feedback from stakeholders on the guidelines for adaptation of water harvesting technologies.

In order to get a better feedback from the participants, the developed guideline as well as the checklist for evaluation of the guidelines was distributed to them one week earlier. Participants were also given enough time to discuss on the issue during the one day meeting.

### Results of the stakeholder evaluations

#### *(a) Overall positive opinion/feedback:*

- § All the workshop participants have highly appreciated the guideline in terms of its comprehensiveness, applicability and relevance and they acknowledged for the highly important document.
- § The percipients have also mentioned that the document is so timely as it will help to design and implement different WHT as part of the on-going drought resilient interventions in the region.
- § The participants have highly appreciated the inclusion of social and environmental factors in the guideline which is often not considered.

#### *(b) Comments given for further considerations:*

The participants have indicated the following points to be looked at:

- § In the **steps for WH adaptation** four points are mentioned: 1. consultation, 2. Selection, 3. Planning, and 4. Implementation. The participants have indicated to include fifth point which is **participatory monitoring/evaluation**.
- § In the section "**participation, facilitation and learning**", the participants have suggested to include "**stakeholder analysis as well as the power dynamics as well as interest of each stakeholder in WHT adaptation**".
- § The participants have stressed **power dynamics and political will** as one of the most important factors to be considered in WHT adaptation.
- § Farmer representatives in the meeting have stressed the need to have strong **trust among partners for adaptation** as farmers are reluctant to invest on new technologies if it comes from un-trusted ones.
- § Though it is a bit outside of our scope, farmers have stressed the need to include: "**water use efficiency, water productivity, water accounting and policy influence**" as integral part of the guidelines.
- § Another timely issues raised by farmers was prioritization of WHT to create resilience to droughts. The question was which technology is best for drought resilience?
- § The participants have stressed the need to look at the **interconnections of the different technologies along the landscape** as the guideline deals with individual technologies.
- § Stakeholders have indicated the need for drawings, if possible, as part of the guideline.

### 3.3. Tunisia

IRA's team organized a restricted meeting with some key stakeholders (without farmers) to carry out stakeholders evaluation of guidelines for adaptation (WP5 deliverable 4). The meeting was attended by eight (8) participants (4 researchers, 2 representatives of NGOs, 2 participants from the technical services of WSC in the regional directorate of agriculture of Medenine).

The following approach was carried out:

- i. Introduction to the meeting (aim of the meeting ; evaluation checklist, organization of the meeting)
- ii. Draft guidelines presented and discussed (some clarifications were given by the coordinator to have a common understanding)

### iii. Evaluation of the draft guidelines and feedback by the stakeholders

The general opinion of the participants was that the guideline is useful for NGOs and technical services, but too complicated for farmers. For use by farmers simplifications would be needed & the guidelines should be made more practical. Therefore participants of this restricted workshop thought it was not useful to discuss the current version of the guidelines in a stakeholder workshop with farmers. Hence, in Tunisia, no farmers were consulted to evaluate the guidelines.

As the guidelines are based on the premise that there are no simple WH adaptation prescriptions (a major conclusion of WP5) and that instead a general approach should be followed in combination with a precise and in-depth knowledge and understanding of the particular local bio-physical and socio-economic conditions, adaptation is indeed not simple, but just because of this, an evaluation by all relevant stakeholders would have been beneficial.

### 3.4. *Zambia*

The stakeholders' meeting was held on 20/6/2016 in Magoye-Zambia to evaluate or assess the Guidelines for adaptation of water harvesting technologies. The meeting was interactive in nature as was the guidelines were presented step by step, the meeting can be classified as a success because the objective was achieved by the end of the day.

#### **Important Outcome of the Meeting:**

The stakeholders accepted the guidelines and have made the following comments:

- 1) They feel the document should include Monitoring and Evaluation after the implementation of WH Technology under the topic: Steps in WH adaptation on page 4 of the document.
- 2) Mr. Valentine Muuka emphasised the importance of putting into consideration the social and cultural/traditional aspect of the local people in the adaptation process. He also made a comment on women involvement "women are quick learners, grasp the principals easily, stick to detail and easily adopt and adapt. Therefore, the priority target beneficiaries should be women in case of WH technologies that focus at farm level or individual level" he said.
- 3) The guidelines seem too technical for a layman but are applicable in real terms. They however, thanked the study site leader for the explanation/teaching/ understanding of the guidelines.
- 4) Brief description of what stone lines are, on page 8.
- 5) Point number 5 on page 12 to read (changes): Traditional leadership (headmen and headwomen), local authorities and government services that are needed for official permits, oversight and other formalities as well as for their specialist expertise and facilitation.
- 6) More meetings held during the consultation stage are needed to ensure full understanding of the local situation.

#### **Summary of the most important aspects that should be in the guidelines:**

- Time frame in the adaptation stages

#### **Observation by the rapporteur:**

- 1) Traditional leadership, social and cultural/traditional aspects of the locals came out as one of the most important aspects that should be taken into the report. WH technologies that may ignore or not recognise traditional leadership and cultural norms have a high percentage of failure.



- 2) One question that came out repeatedly was “what is the time frame for the WH adaptation process?”

All in all the guidelines are ok, user friendly and will be a useful tool to would be users in adapting WH technologies. The critical part will be to understand the document fully, the professionals will have to spend some good time to read study and know the content for them to efficiently use the document.

See the representation list in table 2 below.

Table 2. Participants in Zambia evaluation meeting.

<b>OVERVIEW OF PARTICIPANTS</b>		
Country of WAHARA study site: Zambia/GART		
Category of stakeholders (change and add categories as required)	Total number of representatives (male plus female)	Number of female representatives only
Farmers	5	2
Extension officers/community workers	1	1
Local authorities	1	0
National government	1	1
Researchers	1	0
Traders/stockists/processors	1	0
Farmers association/union	1	1
Total	11	5

## References

- Stevens, P., Ouessar, M., Sawadogo, H., Woldearegay, K., & Wamunyima, S. (2016b). *Report on Critical Biophysical and Socioeconomic Conditions for WH Adaptation. WAHARA deliverable 5.2, WAHARA Report number 34.*
- Stevens, P., Ouessar, M., Sawadogo, H., Woldearegay, K., & Wamunyima, S. (2016c). *Guidelines for Adaptation of Water Harvesting Technologies. WAHARA deliverable 5.3, WAHARA Report number 35.*
- Stevens, P., Ouessar, M., Sawadogo, H., Woldearegay, K., Wamunyima, S., Hessel, R., Grum, B., Fleskens, L., Kirkby, M., Irvine, B. (2016a). *Integrative analysis of results from the four countries. WAHARA deliverable 5.1, WAHARA Report number 33.*

## Appendix 1. Forms for Stakeholder evaluation of draft guidelines for WH adaptation

### *Evaluation form checklist:*

#### SHEET 1: General appraisal

- Overall, the guidelines need to be appraised on whether and how much they are: Practical, (2) Clear and (3) Complete
- Indicate which parts of the guidelines are not well formulated and need to be IMPROVED on any of the above three criteria. So no need to comment on the parts that are just OK.
- Furthermore, indicate the parts of the text that are irrelevant or unnecessary and therefore should be REMOVED

#### SHEET 2: Changes

- For the text parts that were marked in the previous sheet to be IMPROVED (not relevant, not clear and/or not complete): list these again and indicate what the changes should look like

#### SHEET 3: Additions

- What is missing in the draft text? This could be small details but also important new aspects. Indicate what exactly should be ADDED where in the text

#### SHEET 4: Highlights and comments

- In summary, indicate what are the most important aspects that should be well covered by the guidelines? There may be recommendations about the contents of the guidelines and/or about the way it is presented, or any other aspect that the meeting wishes to highlight
- Provide any other feedback from the stakeholders that may help to improve the guidelines
- The rapporteur is requested to provide other useful details as well, i.e.:
  - The date, venue and agreed agenda of the meeting
  - Their observations explaining or commenting on (some of) the meeting's outcomes

#### SHEET 5: Overview of representatives

- Provide the number of participants at the stakeholder evaluation meeting by their function and also indicate how many women were among them in each category.

**WP 5.4 – evaluation of water harvesting technology adaptation guidelines, SHEET 1 – GENERAL APPRAISAL**

Indicate in the first two columns the parts of the guidelines that need to be <b>IMPROVED</b> or be <b>REMOVED</b> Mark in the other columns with an X if the text part needs to be <b>IMPROVED</b> because it is not relevant, not clear and/or not complete, or should be <b>REMOVED</b> So no need to comment on the parts of the text that are just OK					
Page	Text part that needs to be improved or removed	Put an X if: <b>NOT RELEVANT</b>	Put an X if: <b>NOT CLEAR</b>	Put an X if: <b>NOT COMPLETE</b>	Put an X if: <b>TO BE REMOVED</b>

**WP 5.4 – evaluation of water harvesting technology adaptation guidelines, SHEET 1 – GENERAL APPRAISAL**

Indicate in the first two columns the parts of the guidelines that need to be <b>IMPROVED</b> or be <b>REMOVED</b> Mark in the other columns with an X if the text part needs to be <b>IMPROVED</b> because it is not relevant, not clear and/or not complete, or should be <b>REMOVED</b> So no need to comment on the parts of the text that are just OK					
Page	Text part that needs to be improved or removed	Put an X if: <b>NOT RELEVANT</b>	Put an X if: <b>NOT CLEAR</b>	Put an X if: <b>NOT COMPLETE</b>	Put an X if: <b>TO BE REMOVED</b>

**WP 5.4 – evaluation of water harvesting technology adaptation guidelines, SHEET 1 – GENERAL APPRAISAL**

Indicate in the first two columns the parts of the guidelines that need to be <b>IMPROVED</b> or be <b>REMOVED</b> Mark in the other columns with an X if the text part needs to be <b>IMPROVED</b> because it is not relevant, not clear and/or not complete, or should be <b>REMOVED</b> So no need to comment on the parts of the text that are just OK					
Page	Text part that needs to be improved or removed	Put an X if: <b>NOT RELEVANT</b>	Put an X if: <b>NOT CLEAR</b>	Put an X if: <b>NOT COMPLETE</b>	Put an X if: <b>TO BE REMOVED</b>
Refer to the text parts from sheet 1 that needed improvement (i.e. those parts of the guidelines that were marked not relevant, not clear and/or not complete) Indicate for each how the changes should look like (write the new text in full or highlight the kind of changes required)					

Page	Text part that needs to be changed	How should the text be changed?

WP 5.4 – evaluation of water harvesting technology adaptation guidelines, SHEET 3 - ADDITIONS

Indicate what else needs to be added (write the new text in full or explain the subject or content that is missing)		
Page	Where on the page?	What should be added?



**WP 5.4 – evaluation of water harvesting technology adaptation guidelines, SHEET 4 – HIGHLIGHTS AND COMMENTS**

Summarize the most important aspects that should be in the guidelines (related to the contents, presentation or any other aspect):

Any other feedback from the stakeholders that may help to improve the guidelines:

Date, venue and agreed agenda of the meeting:

Observations by the rapporteur explaining or commenting on the meeting's outcomes:

WP 5.4 – evaluation of water harvesting technology adaptation guidelines, SHEET 5

OVERVIEW OF PARTICIPANTS		
Country of WAHARA study site:		
Category of stakeholders (change and add categories as required)	Total number of representatives (male plus female)	Number of female representatives only
Farmers		
Extension officers/community workers		
Local authorities		
National government		
Researchers		
Traders/stockists/processors		
Farmers association/union		
NGO/development project		
Other service providers		
Media		
...		
...		
...		
...		
...		
...		
...		
...		
ALL		

