# **Understanding farmers' indicators** in Climate-Smart Agriculture **Prioritization**

in the Southern Agricultural Growth Corridor of Tanzania (SAGCOT)







### CIAT

The International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT) – a member of the CGIAR Consortium – develops technologies, innovative methods, and new knowledge that better enable farmers, especially smallholders, to make agriculture eco-efficient – that is, competitive and profitable as well as sustainable and resilient. Headquartered near Cali, Colombia, CIAT conducts research for development in tropical regions of Latin America, Africa, and Asia. www.ciat.cgiar.org

CGIAR is a global research partnership for a food-secure future. Its science is carried out by the 15 research centers that are members of the CGIAR Consortium in collaboration with hundreds of partner organizations. www.cgiar.org

# **Understanding Farmers' Indicators** in Climate-Smart Agriculture **Prioritization**

in the Southern Agricultural Growth Corridor of Tanzania (SAGCOT)

Kelvin M. Shikuku Caroline Mwongera Leigh Winowiecki Jennifer Twyman Peter Läderach









Agriculture and Food Security

Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical International Center for Tropical Agriculture Headquarters and Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean Apartado Aéreo 6713 Km 17 Recta Cali–Palmira. CP 763537 Cali, Colombia Phone: +57 2 4450000 Fax: +57 2 4450073 Website: www.ciat.cgiar.org

CIAT Publication No. 415 ISBN: 978-958-694-157-0 E-ISBN: 978-958-694-158-7 March 2016

Shikuku KM; Mwongera C; Winowiecki L; Twyman J; Läderach P. 2016. Understanding farmers' indicators in climate-smart agriculture prioritization in the Southern Agricultural Growth Corridor of Tanzania (SAGCOT). International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT), Cali, Colombia. 43 p.

*Kelvin M. Shikuku* is a PhD student at the department of Development Economics, Wageningen University, the Netherlands, supported by CIAT. k.m.shikuku@cgiar.org

Caroline Mwongera is a Farming Systems and Climate Change Scientist at CIAT, Nairobi, Kenya. Email: c.mwongera@cgiar.org

Leigh Winowiecki worked as a Soil Scientist at CIAT until December 2015. In January 2016, she joined the World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF), headquartered in Nairobi, Kenya. Email: l.a.winowiecki@cgiar.org

Jennifer Twyman is a Social Scientist at CIAT, Cali, Colombia. j.twyman@cgiar.org

Peter Läderach is a Senior Climate Change Specialist at CIAT, Cali, Colombia. p.laderach@cgiar.org

The International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT) leads the CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS), which brings together the world's best researchers in agricultural science, development research, climate science, and Earth System science, to identify and address the most important interactions, synergies and trade-offs between climate change, agriculture, and food security.

Key words: Prioritization; climate-smart agriculture; practices; indicators; Tanzania.

#### Copyright © CIAT 2016

This report on understanding farmers' own indicators to prioritize climate-smart agriculture in the Southern Agricultural Growth Corridor of Tanzania has been prepared as an output for the CIAT-led project "Increasing Food Security and Farming System Resilience in East Africa through Wide-Scale Adoption of Climate-Smart Agricultural Practices," financed by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), and has not been peer reviewed. This study was conducted under the CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS). Any opinions stated herein are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the policies or opinions of CCAFS, donor agencies, or partners.

CIAT encourages wide dissemination of its printed and electronic publications for maximum public benefit. Thus, in most cases, colleagues working in research and development should feel free to use CIAT materials for noncommercial purposes. However, the Center prohibits modification of these materials, and we expect to receive due credit. Though CIAT prepares its publications with considerable care, the Center does not guarantee their accuracy and completeness.

All images remain the sole property of their source and may not be used for any purpose without written permission of the source.

### Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA) Faculty of Agriculture and the Bureau for Agricultural Consultancy and Advisory Services (BACAS), especially Dr. Abel Kaaya and Mr. Nassir Mbiki. We also appreciate Eliapenda Yusuf, Martina Kimaro, Mkali Mlanzi, Shabani Mchopi, Jackline Mmari, Enesia Choga, Sweetness Kileo, Godfrey Mroto, Abdul Mayanda, and Nuru Chota for their great support in facilitating the workshops, translations, and note taking. We value the support of Kilolo and Mbarali District Executive Directors, Agriculture Officials, Ward, and Village heads. Thank you also to Amos Ndabila, Moses Logan, and Michael Mwaisondola, who helped with mobilizing farmers to attend the workshops. Finally, thanks to all the farmers who participated in the workshops. We value the time they took from their busy schedules and their willingness to share information.

### Acronyms

| ACT    | African Conservation Tillage Network   |
|--------|--|
|        | A file of the second seco |
| AEZ    | Agro-ecological zone   |
| AGRA   | Alliance for Green Revolution in Africa  |
| CCAFS  | CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture, and Food Security   |
| CIAT   | International Center for Tropical Agriculture  |
| CSA    | Climate-smart agriculture  |
| CSA-RA | Climate-smart agriculture rapid appraisal  |
| IFAD   | International Fund for Agricultural Development  |
| MAWAKI | Maendeleo ya Watu wa Kilolo [Association for the Development of Kilolo District]   |
| Μάνι   | Muunganisho was Ujasirimali Vijijini   |
|        | [Rural Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises Support Programme]  |
| RUDI   | Rural Urban Development Initiative   |
| SAGCOT | Southern Agricultural Growth Corridor of Tanzania  |
| SILC   | Savings and Internal Lending Communities   |
| SUA    | Sokoine University of Agriculture  |
| ТАР    | Tanzania Agricultural Partnership  |
|        |  |

# Contents

| Summary  | 2           |
|--|-------------|
| Introduction   | 4           |
| Methodology  | 5           |
| Results and Discussion   | 7           |
| Farmers' perception of the status of soil fertility  | 7           |
| Reasons for burning and observed consequences  | <b>11</b> 9 |
| Classification and characterization of agro-ecological zones                               | 10          |
| Workshop held with upland farmers in Mbarali   | 10          |
| Lowlands, Mbarali  | 12          |
| Uplands, Kilolo  | 13          |
| Lowlands, Kilolo   | 14          |
| Awareness and use of agricultural practices  | 15          |
| Awareness and use of agricultural practices in Mbarali District                            | 15          |
| Awareness and use of agricultural practices in Kilolo District                             | 20          |
| Selected most relevant practices and prioritization, by district and agro-ecological zones | 24          |
| Selected practices in uplands, Mbarali   | 24          |
| Selected practices in lowlands, Mbarali  | 26          |
| Prioritization of practices using pairwise matrices, Mbarali                               | 28          |
| Selected and prioritized practices in Kilolo District                                      | 29          |
| Indicators that farmers use to select practices  | 31          |
| Demonstration plots  | 34          |
| Demonstration plots in uplands, Mbarali  | 34          |

| E september |   |    |
|-------------|---|----|
|             | The second states in the second   | 2  |
|             |   |    |
| Demor       | nstration plots in lowlands, Mbarali  | 35 |
| Demor       | nstration plots in Kilolo   | 36 |
| Demor       | nstration plots in lowlands, Kilolo   | 36 |
| Experts'    | workshop results  | 37 |
| Expert      | s' workshop in uplands. Mbarali   | 37 |
| Expert      | s' workshop in lowlands. Mbarali  | 38 |
| Export      | ' workshop in uplande. Kilolo   | 20 |
| Expert      | s workshop in uplands, kilolo   | 41 |
| Expens      | s workshop in towtands, kiloto  | 41 |
| Conclusi    | ons   | 42 |
| Referenc    | es  | 43 |
|             |   |    |
| Tables      |   |    |
| Table 1.    | Reasons why farmers perceive the status of soil fertility as poor                                 | 8  |
| Table 2.    | Reasons for burning   | 9  |
| Table 3.    | Observations with use of burning  | 10 |
| Table 4.    | Characteristics and main challenges in the farmer-classified agro-ecological zones in Kilolo      | 13 |
| Table 5.    | Characteristics and main challenges in the farm-classified agro-ecological zones in <b>Kilolo</b> | 14 |
| Table 6.    | Relevant practices selected by the men's group from the uplands, Mbarali                          | 24 |
| Table 7.    | Relevant practices selected by the women's group in uplands, Mbarali                              | 25 |
| Table 8.    | Practices selected by the women's group in the lowlands, Mbarali                                  | 26 |

 Table 9.
 Practices selected by the men's group in the lowlands, Mbarali

 Table 10.
 Prioritized agricultural practices in upland and lowland AEZ in Mbarali District, by gender

27

29

| 1 States Constant States  |   | Sinte Lot |
|---|---|-----------|
| Table 11.   | Practices selected by the women's group in the uplands, Kilolo                                | 30        |
| Table 12. Practices selected by the women's group in lowlands, Kilolo       3 |   |           |
| Table 13.   | Prioritization of agricultural practices in Kilolo District                                   | 31        |
| Table 14. I   | ndicators that farmers use to select agricultural practices in uplands, Mbarali               | 32        |
| Table 15.   | ndicators that farmers use to select agricultural practices in lowlands, Mbarali              | 33        |
| Table 16.   | ndicators that farmers use to select agricultural practices in uplands, Kilolo                | 33        |
| Table 17. I   | ndicators that farmers use to select agricultural practices in lowlands, Kilolo               | 34        |
| Table 18. I   | Existing demonstration plots in uplands, Mbarali  | 35        |
| Table 19.   | Existing demonstration plots in lowlands, Mbarali   | 36        |
| -   |   | -         |
| Figures   |   |           |
| Figure 1.   | Farmer-identified agro-ecological zones in, Mbarali   | 11        |
| Figure 2.   | Identified agro-ecological zones by participants from the uplands, Mbarali                    | 13        |
| Figure 3.   | Awareness and use of agricultural practices by men participants from the uplands,<br>Mbarali  | 16        |
| Figure 4.   | Awareness and use of agricultural practices by women participants from the uplands, Mbarali   | 17        |
| Figure 5.   | Awareness and use of agricultural practices by men participants from the lowlands,<br>Mbarali | 18        |
| Figure 6.   | Awareness and use of agricultural practices by women participants from the lowlands, Mbarali  | 19        |
| Figure 7.   | Awareness and use of agricultural practices by men in uplands, Kilolo                         | 20        |
| Figure 8.   | Awareness and use of agricultural practices by women in uplands, Kilolo                       | 21        |
| Figure 9.   | Awareness and use of agricultural practices by men's group in lowlands, Kilolo                | 22        |
| Figure 10.  | Awareness and use of agricultural practices by women's group in lowlands, Kilolo              | 23        |



### Summary

In order to increase the uptake of climate-smart agriculture (CSA) technologies, it is important to understand the contexts in which farmers operate. Farmers use different indicators to decide whether or not to implement, what to implement, and where to implement specific technologies. Identifying and understanding such indicators can be helpful to efforts aiming to scale out adoption. The purpose of this study was to identify indicators that farmers use to prioritize agricultural innovations, in general, and CSA, in particular.

Kilolo and Mbarali Districts lie in the Southern Agricultural Growth Corridor of Tanzania. Four participatory workshops, in the form of focus group discussions, were conducted in these two districts. In each district, a separate workshop was held with farmers from each agro-ecological zone (AEZ). Separate workshops were held with farmers and experts to explore differences between stakeholders and across the districts regarding perceptions of the status of soil fertility, prioritized practices, and ranking of indicators for prioritizing practices. Characterization of the AEZ, prioritization of practices, identification of indicators for prioritizing CSA, and selection of practices for demonstration as well as sites for the demonstration plots were done separately with men and women groups. Practices were prioritized using pairwise ranking, while indicators were scored on a rating scale from least important (1) to most important (5).

Results showed that, both in Kilolo and Mbarali Districts, farmers perceive the status of soil fertility as poor. Up to 60 % of the workshop participants were not satisfied with the status of soil fertility in their farms. More than 80% of workshop participants in each of the four workshops reported that they practiced burning. The main reasons for burning were to save labour and time and to reduce crop–livestock conflict.

The men's group in the upland zone in *M*barali District ranked mulching, water harvesting, improved varieties, and crop rotation as the most important practices in respective order. In the lowlands, both men and women groups selected irrigation, chemical fertilizer, and crop rotation as most relevant practices. Awareness and use of the practices was low among participants in the two workshops.

The most prioritized practices by the women's group in the uplands, Kilolo District, were improved breeds and improved varieties. Intercropping was the least prioritized practice. The men's group prioritized improved varieties and pesticides application, while irrigation and fertilizer application ranked lowest. In the lowlands, men's and women's groups prioritized irrigation, inorganic fertilizer and improved varieties as most important. Mulching and herbicides ranked as least prioritized. In addition, the men's group from the lowland zone ranked pesticide application among the most important practices, while farmyard manure and zero grazing were ranked as least important.

Important indicators that farmers identified to prioritize agricultural practices across the two districts included yield, income, cost, labour, availability of inputs, the status of soil fertility, and knowledge about the practices.

Several practices were selected for the proposed CSA demonstration plots. The women's group in the uplands zone in Mbarali prioritized improved crop varieties, water harvesting, mulching, and fertilizer application. The men's group chose irrigation, herbicides, inorganic fertilizers, and seed selection. In the lowlands, improved crop varieties, inorganic fertilizer, farmyard manure, and mulching were selected by women. Men preferred seed preparation, right use of fertilizers (i.e., rate and type), integrated pest management, and improved storage. The selected important practices for demonstration in the uplands in Kilolo District were minimum tillage, soil testing, improved varieties, fertilizer application, and

irrigation. Farmers in the lowlands chose production of clean seeds of different crops, such as tomatoes, beans, maize, and chillies. In addition, they were interested in learning about fertilizer application, pesticides application, and preparation and application of compost manure.

The findings of this research have several implications for policy. First, there is need to increase awareness of farmers about CSA practices, particularly those that they prioritize. The finding that farmers perceive poor soil fertility but do not prioritize soil fertility management practices implies the need to promote adoption of such technologies. Thirdly, a bottom-up approach that involves working with farmers to prioritize agricultural practices suitable for their specific AEZ and preferred by either the men or women is important to inform investment of limited resources to increase food security and resilience to climate risks while minimizing trade-offs. The findings highlight indicators that influence farmers' adoption of agricultural practices as well as constraints to implementation.



### Introduction

Several agricultural technologies exist that can be classified as climate smart based on their potential to increase food security, adapt and enhance resilience to climate change, and reduce or remove greenhouse gases. By definition, climate-smart agriculture (CSA) is multidimensional – food security, resilience, and mitigation. Implementation of CSA is, however, very context specific. Together, the multidimensionality and context-specific approach of CSA implies that not only benefits and synergies may exist with its implementation but also trade-offs.

Prioritization of CSA technologies is a fundamental first step towards identifying locally appropriate CSA practices and understanding the trade-offs that adoption might bring. Prioritization is based on indicators that are important to the stakeholders. In this study, we focus on farmers and local experts to identify the indicators that they use to prioritize CSA practices. There is a paucity of knowledge on such indicators and how farmers use them to rank agricultural practices in general and CSA technologies in particular. An individual farmer's choice of a technology and ultimate use might depend on the attributes that farmers favor or disfavor about the technology or the perceived impact of the technology on their welfare. The specific objectives of the study were to:

- Understand the criteria that farmers use to prioritize agricultural practices in general and CSA in particular;
- Understand the level of awareness and adoption of agricultural practices;
- Identify existing agricultural demonstration plots;
- Develop a prioritized list of CSA practices that farmers would like to implement in demonstration plots; and
- Establish suitable geographical locations for future CSA demonstration plots, including the CSA practices to highlight.



### Methodology

The study was conducted in Mbarali and Kilolo Districts of Tanzania and is a follow-up to a recent Climate-Smart Agriculture Rapid Appraisal (CSA-RA) exercise in the Southern Agricultural Growth Corridor of Tanzania (Mwongera et al., 2014). Mwongera et al. (2014) provide a detailed description of the study site, including farming systems; constraints to agricultural production; perceptions on climate variability; and crop, land, soil, and water management practices. Participatory workshops in the form of focus group discussions were conducted separately with farmers and experts. A total of four farmers' workshops (two in each of the districts) and four expert workshops were conducted.

Based on the study site's agroecological setting, we held separate workshops with farmers representing the lowlands and uplands. Each farmer workshop had approximately 40 participants. Effort was made to generate a representative sample of workshop participants based on gender, agro-ecologies and age groups. The CIAT research team involved graduates from Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA) to help with facilitation, note taking, and translations. Workshops started at approximately 9:00 a.m. and ended at 4:00 p.m. Below we describe the methodology used in the workshop both with farmers and experts.

### Activity 1

Farmer workshops began with an icebreaker on perceptions of soil fertility. Each participant was provided with a blue and yellow card. Blue cards were used to indicate good soils, and yellow cards poor soils. Farmers could only select one of the two options and this was done separately for men and women. Care was taken to ensure that participants of different gender types did not compete to raise their cards. It was explained clearly that the exercise was not a competition between the group with the most cards of a given color, and that we were interested in learning what they thought about the status of soil fertility. A guick count of the raised card was then done. Followup questions asked farmers for reasons why they perceived the status of soil fertility to be good (for those who raised the blue card) and why they perceived the status of soil fertility to be poor (for those who raised the yellow card). The icebreaker ended with farmers' perceptions of the benefits and consequences of practicing burning.

#### Activity 2

Immediately after the icebreaker, a mapping exercise to characterize the agro-ecological zones (AEZs) was done, based on the variability in vegetation, soils, climate, and other distinct features. These farmeridentified AEZs were used in subsequent sessions of the workshops.

#### Activity 3

Prioritization of CSA technologies began by asking farmers to name and briefly describe agricultural practices that they knew about. For each of the mentioned practices, farmers were asked to raise their hand if they had heard about the practice. A quick count by gender of the participants was then done. Similarly, farmers were asked to indicate, by a show of hands, how many were currently (present and last season) using the practice. A follow-up question asked about the benefits associated with each practice that farmers indicated they were using. Participants were further asked about any practices that they had abandoned. The facilitator then probed for the reasons why the practice had been abandoned. In cases where the gap between awareness and use was evident, farmers were asked for reasons why. To make sure that the list of practices was as extensive as possible, a pre-prepared list of relevant agricultural practices was compared with the farmers' list to check for any missing practices. In case of any, the missing practice was described, a photo was shown to the farmers and a question asked to confirm that they were not aware of the practice. The practices were then added to the list generated by farmers and the proportion of awareness indicated as zero upon confirming that indeed farmers were not aware of the practice. Finally, farmers were asked about the factors that they consider when deciding whether or not to use each of the practices that they were aware of and were using. This exercise generated what we refer to as a "master" list for each workshop.

#### Activity 4

With the master list of agricultural practices and the indicators that farmers use to select practices, participants were grouped into smaller groups based on the identified AEZ and by gender. Starting with the master list, farmers in the smaller groups were asked to identify specific practices that were relevant for their respective AEZ. This exercise generated a shorter list of practices. Farmers were then asked for the benefits of such practices and why they selected the practices as the most relevant for their AEZ. Follow-up questions asked about constraints to implementation and what farmers would need in order to implement the practices. A pairwise matrix was created to compare a single practice to another to generate a ranking of the practices selected for the AEZ.

#### Activity 5

Next, each farmer was provided with five seeds for scoring the indicators that they use to prioritize agricultural practices. One seed was used to denote that the indicator is least important while five seeds would mean that the indicator is most important. A brief discussion followed to understand why farmers choose a particular score for an indicator.

#### Activity 6

Finally, farmers in the respective smaller groups were asked to identify practices that they would like to try in a demonstration plot. A follow-up discussion focused on understanding whether there were any existing demonstration plots, what practices were being demonstrated, location of existing demonstration, how previous and existing demonstration plots were managed, whether there were any challenges in running the demonstration plots and how such challenges were resolved. For the new practices that were selected for demonstration, workshop participants were asked about their preferred locations for the demonstrations. They further suggested their preferred approach of managing the demonstration plots.

The detailed methodology is described in Mwongera et al., 2015.



### **Results and Discussion** Farmers' perception of the status of

# soil fertility

Across the Mbarali and Kilolo districts, most participants indicated that they were not satisfied with the status of soil fertility in their farms. A hundred percent of the participants from the lowlands in Mbarali indicated that soil fertility was poor. Sixty percent of participants from the uplands in both districts also reported poor soils. From the lowlands of Kilolo, 50% indicated poor soils. Table 1 presents indicators for the perceived soil fertility at each workshop.

The main indicator for low soil fertility, consistently mentioned by farmers in all the workshops, was a decline in yield. Farmers observed that, without fertilizer application, the realized yields were very low. Decline in soil fertility was mainly attributed to continuous cultivation. Farmers referred to their soils as "tired." An observation was that, in addition to observing poor harvests, farmers also learnt about poor status of their soils from messages by agricultural experts. In Kilolo, for example, it was reported that persistent communication from extension officers about the need to intercrop cereals and legumes influenced farmers' perceptions on the soil fertility status.

Farmers who reported good soil fertility in the uplands of Mbarali indicated that they could obtain 10-12 bags (120 kg/bag) of maize per acre. They indicated that

the major constraint to agricultural production was inadequate amount of water for irrigation. In Kilolo, farmers outlined that soil fertility was poor when they practiced monoculture, but intercropping improved soil fertility. Below we quote a few statements from the farmers:

"I have been a maize farmer since 2007. When I started farming, I practiced mainly monocropping – which makes the soil tired. Until recently, when I started following and implementing agricultural advice from the extension officer, yields were very low – 4 bags per acre. Since I moved from monocropping to intercropping and application of fertilizer, the yield is satisfactory. I get 12 bags of maize per acre." Female farmer, Kilolo District, lowland zone.

"The soil is good because even without using fertilizer, I grow maize and harvest 5 bags per acre. When I apply fertilizer I harvest more (15 bags)." Female farmer, Kilolo District, lowland zone.

"I started farming in 1993. After 4 years of continuous farming, the soil became tired. When I started following instructions from the extension officer, I changed my farming and introduced intercropping. Now the soil has regained fertility." Male farmer, Kilolo District, lowland zone.

#### Table 1. Reasons why farmers perceive the status of soil fertility as poor.

| Uplands, Mbarali  | Lowlands, Mbarali   | Highlands, Kilolo  | Lowlands, Kilolo  |
|---|---|--|---|
| In 3 acres, a farmer can only<br>produce 18 bags (120 kg<br>each) of paddy – with good<br>soil fertility, the same size of<br>land should yield 60 bags | The decline in yield of<br>paddy shows that the soil<br>is tired. They said that they<br>used to harvest 30 bags<br>of paddy without fertilizer<br>application, but currently<br>they are only getting 3 bags | The soil is tired due to<br>continuous cultivation over<br>many years                                      | Stunted growth in maize   |
| A lot of weeds  | The soil is salty and<br>negatively affects growth of<br>paddy and maize  | Soil erosion   | Low yield of maize, i.e.,<br>2–3 bags in an acre<br>(40 m x100 m) |
| The soil is stony and sandy   |   | Without applying fertilizer,<br>you cannot harvest<br>anything   |   |
| The soil is tired   |   | Overcultivation of maize for<br>a long time because farm<br>sizes are small                                |   |
|   |   | Reliance on experience in farming, hence fertilizer is applied without knowledge of the limiting nutrients |   |
|   |   | Lack of knowledge on<br>the types and amounts of<br>fertilizer that is required                            |   |
|   |   | The advice they receive<br>about intercropping<br>with legumes in order to<br>increase soil fertility      |   |

In lowlands, Kilolo, where 50% of the farmers perceived their soils to be fertile, several reasons were given, which include good harvest even without applying fertilizer and good water holding capacity. Below we quote statements from the farmers:

*"If you plant without fertilizer, the crop still grows well and, in an acre, you can harvest ten bags of maize."* 

*"I grow onions and apply fertilizer twice in a season. When I harvest onions, I rotate with maize. I do not apply fertilizer on the maize crop and still obtain good yields."* 

"Ours soils here are mostly clay. The soils can, therefore, hold water for a longer time for the crop to use."

# Reasons for burning and observed consequences

Burning is a common practice among farmers across the two districts. More than 80% of workshop participants in each of the four workshops reported that they practiced burning. Two types of burning are common: one where farmers collect the crop residue or vegetation in a pile and burn, and another one where the whole field is set on fire. Table 2 presents the main reasons for burning, by district and agro-ecology. The main reason given for burning was to clear the land for ploughing. Farmers found this practice to be time and labor saving during land preparation. Conflict between pastoralists and crop farmers also led to the choice of burning the fields to get rid of crop residues. This was particularly reported by participants from the uplands in Mbarali and lowlands in Kilolo. The same finding is reported by Mwongera et al. (2014).

Rice farmers, especially from the lowlands in Mbarali, indicated that crop residues from paddy have thorns,

which if not burnt can be injurious during land preparation in the subsequent season. In the upland zone of Kilolo, farmers felt that maize stumps remain even when fields are grazed. Some farmers in Kilolo indicated that crop residues attract pests, and burning helps to control pests. Again, these responses raise important policy questions about the importance of understanding the drivers of farmers' decisions to implement agricultural practices and the trade-offs associated with introducing alternatives.

Although only a few farmers reported not to burn, the reasons given in favour of the practice were that crop residues are an important source of livestock feed, increase soil fertility when incorporated in the soil, and that burning destroys the soil. In the uplands in Mbarali, farmers who were not burning their fields said that the soils were salty and burning would have a negative effect by increasing the salt levels.

| Mbarali  | District  | Kilolo, District  |  |
|--|---|---|--|
| Uplands  | Lowlands  | Uplands   | Lowlands   |
| To destroy thorns in paddy<br>after harvest                          | To clear land during land preparation                                     | Increased soil fertility from the ashes                             | To kill pests such as termites   |
| To make it easier to plough,<br>especially using the power<br>tiller | Paddy has thorns that can<br>injure the farmer during<br>land preparation | To clear fields for land preparation                                | To clear fields for the next<br>season   |
| To control livestock   |   | Incorporation of crop<br>residues brings pests that<br>damage crops | Ploughing is mostly done<br>using oxen, hence it is<br>important that the fields are<br>clean before ploughing       |
|  |   | Culturally and traditionally,<br>burning has been going on          | Because if you do not burn,<br>livestock keepers will bring<br>their livestock to your farm<br>and destroy your soil |

#### Table 2.Reasons for burning.

#### **Table 3.**Observations with use of burning.

| Mbarali   | District  | Kilolo,  | District  |
|---|---|--|---|
| Uplands   | Lowlands  | Uplands  | Lowlands  |
| After burning, the crops grow very well.  | The soil dries up and<br>hardens, making it difficult<br>to plough          | Crops yield more in the<br>burnt spots and, when the<br>whole field is burnt, harvest<br>for maize and beans is high | Crops yield more in the<br>burnt spots as a result of<br>ashes, which increase the<br>fertility |
| The next season after<br>burning, crop yield is higher<br>in the burnt spots but,<br>in the following season,<br>yields decline – the same is<br>observed among farmers<br>who apply Sulphate of<br>Ammonia (SA). | The yield is higher at the<br>burnt spots especially for<br>paddy and maize | Burning increases yields<br>only in the first season of<br>burning; in the subsequent<br>seasons, yield declines     | Burning reduces soil fertility  |
| The soil also dries up and<br>becomes hard – the same is<br>observed when they apply<br>SA  | Kills stubborn weeds  | The soil becomes lighter and prone to soil erosion   |   |
|   |   | Burning makes it easier to<br>plough because the soil<br>becomes soft  |   |

# **Classification and characterization** of agro-ecological zones

### Workshop held with upland farmers in Mbarali

Figure 1 shows the different AEZs that were identified by farmers from the uplands. As shown, farmers identified two main zones: (1) uplands and (2) lowlands. A number of challenges were identified for each zone. In general, participants said that the largest area in the district was lowlands. Below are the specific challenges that were identified for each AEZ.



Figure 1. Farmer-identified agro-ecological zones in Mbarali.

| Uplands   | Lowlands  |
|---|---|
| Construction of too many bunds and ridges reduces land availability for crop production | Poor infrastructure (i.e., without floods, they cannot produce rice)  |
| Soil erosion  | Lack of water for irrigation  |
| Very high run-off, hence limited amount of water in the upland                          | During periods of heavy rainfall farmers are unable to control surface run-off, hence crops are washed away |
| Pests, especially termites  | Farmers do not know the types of fertilizer required in their area because soil testing is not done         |
| Usually this zone has a lot of stones reducing the size of land under cultivation       |   |

Farmers in the lowlands reported that they harvest more yields compared to those in the uplands because all the soil minerals that are washed from the uplands are deposited in their farms. On average, in a good harvest, farmers said that they harvest 18 bags of 150 kg each of paddy per acre. In a bad season, they reported 9–10 bags. In the uplands, farmers said that a good harvest can yield 9–10 bags of paddy per acre. This might reduce to 4 bags in a bad season. Farmers in the

uplands, however, believed that they benefited more than those in the low land zone when the rain was less because they would block the water from reaching the flat lands.

On climate change, farmers in the lowlands reported that they had witnessed frequent droughts that resulted in production declines. Paddy and maize were the most affected crops. Other climate-related challenges include unpredictable rainfall, reduced flow of water in rivers, and increased pest and disease incidences. Farmers attributed the irregular patterns of rainfall to increased deforestation. They further believed that industries were manufacturing a lot of chemicals that contributed to reduced rainfall.

Experts in the lowlands, Mbarali, identified several challenges to farming. These included:

- Unpredictable rainfall; the patterns of rainfall are irregular and even the intensity of the rainfall varies.
- Declining soil fertility and shallow soil depth in Kongolo ward.
- Changes in the cropping calendar.
- Increased pests (aphids, armyworms) and diseases (fungi, rust, bacterial – e.g., Fusarium wilt and bacterial wilt).
- Poverty among farmers.
- Poor infrastructure such as road and irrigation.
- Delay in planting by farmers.
- Lack of willingness among farmers to adopt improved varieties.
- Low use of improved inputs.
- Lack of capital for investment in agriculture.
- Limited access to credit combined with poor utilization of the loan.
- Inadequate extension services.
- Low prices for agricultural produce.
- Conflict between farmers and livestock keepers.
- Livestock diseases such as contagious bovine pleuro pneumonia, foot and mouth, light chain deposition disease, Newcastle disease, and African swine fever.

They also identified changes as a result of climatic factors. Such changes related to increased pest incidences and decline in yield especially in water melon, cucumber, and sesame.

### Lowlands, Mbarali

Figure 2 shows farmer-classified agro-ecological zones by farmers from the lowlands, Mbarali. As shown, the eastern and northeastern parts are mountainous and forested, while the western and southern parts are lowlands. Most of the workshop participants were from the lowland zone. Characteristics given by farmers of the lowland:

- The soils are mainly clay and more fertile than the mountainous zone.
- Typically all crops are cultivated but mainly maize and rice.
- There are microcatchments that feed water into Ruaha River.
- The zone is bushy.
- Livestock keeping is common.

Main challenges in the lowland zone related to climate variability were identified as unpredictable rainfall, delayed rainfall, less rainfall, and prolonged drought. Similar to farmers from the uplands, farmers in the lowlands associated the climatic challenges with increased deforestation. When asked for the causes of deforestation, farmers reported charcoal burning to diversify household income. It was further indicated that livestock keepers cut trees to fence grazing areas and shelter for their animals, while farmers who experienced declining soil fertility mostly cut trees in an effort to extend crop production. Beside climatic challenges, farmers identified obstacles to agricultural productivity as poor infrastructure, pests and diseases, destruction of crops by birds, lack of storage infrastructure forcing farmers to sell their produce immediately after harvesting at very low prices, rudimentary tools for cultivation, high cost of herbicides and pesticides, and unavailability of chemical fertilizers.



Figure 2. Identified agro-ecological zones by participants from the uplands, Mbarali.

### Uplands, Kilolo

In the upland zone of Kilolo, farmers identified two AEZs: lowlands and highlands. Table 4 presents characteristics of the two AEZs.

| Characteristics of the different AEZs in Kilolo |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| Uplands   | Lowlands   |  |
| It is forested and slopy                        | Fertile soils because all the soil that is washed from the mountainous areas ends up there |  |
| The soils are loamy                             | The rainfall is lower compared to the mountainous areas                                    |  |
| The zone is humid                               | Main crops are maize, sunflower, cabbage, beans, and tomatoes                              |  |
| The zone receives good rainfall                 | High temperatures  |  |
| All crops grow well                             |  |  |

 Table 4.
 Characteristics and main challenges in the farmer-classified agro-ecological zones in Kilolo.

| Main challenges for the different AEZs in Kilolo   |                                     |  |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| Uplands  | Lowlands                            |  |
| It is difficult to plough using oxen or tractor hence most activities are manual.                          | Irregular rainfall                  |  |
| The soil is lighter due to soil erosion hence the harvest is not as good as that of farmers in the lowland | Lack of capital                     |  |
| Transportation of produce is very difficult, forcing farmers to carry produce on their heads               | High cost of fertilizers            |  |
| High pest incidences   | Low prices for agricultural produce |  |
| Soil erosion   |                                     |  |

### Lowlands, Kilolo

Participants broadly identified two zones: midlands and lowlands. Table 5 presents the characteristics of the two zones and the main challenges experienced in each one.

 Table 5.
 Characteristics and main challenges in the farmer-classified agro-ecological zones in Kilolo.

| Characteristics of the different AEZs in Kilolo       |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| Midlands  | Lowlands   |  |
| Free grazing  | It is surrounded by rivers, such as Msoswa, Ruhua, Lukosi,<br>Mnadaira, and Nyanzo |  |
| Main crops are tomatoes and maize                     | Udizungwa game reserve   |  |
| Less rainfall   | Main crops are maize, tomatoes, chillies, and sunflower                            |  |
| Most farmers do not apply fertilizer, hence low yield | Irrigation is a common practice  |  |
| There are a lot of stones                             |  |  |

| Main challenges for the different AEZs in Kilolo |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| Midlands   | Lowlands   |  |
| Low soil fertility                               | High crop disease and pest (mice) incidences                             |  |
| High cost of chemical fertilizers and manure     | High soil erosion caused by livestock keepers due to large<br>herd sizes |  |
| Inadequate amount of water                       | Drought  |  |
| Unavailability of labour                         |  |  |
| Unpredictable rainfall                           |  |  |
| High crop disease and pest (mice) incidences     |  |  |

Soil erosion

Specific challenges related to climate in the midlands were reduced rainfall, rise in temperatures, and unpredictable rainfall. Farmers in the lowlands mentioned decline in yields due to less amount of rainfall, and reduction in the volume of water in the rivers. Farmers blame the increased deforestation as the main cause of climate variability.

# Awareness and use of agricultural practices

## Awareness and use of agricultural practices in Mbarali District

Figures 3 and 4 show the practices that farmers in Mbarali upland zone were aware of and implementing. Several important messages can be derived from the figures. First, awareness of some practices both among men and women is very low. These include strip cropping, bunding, contour ploughing, rotational grazing, cover cropping, and agroforestry. Second, there is a gap in awareness between men and women. The percentage of male participants who knew about rotational grazing, improved breeds of livestock, compost manure, crop residue retention, mulching, fallowing, and manure application was higher compared to that of women. Third, there was a gap between the proportion of farmers who knew about agricultural practices and those who actually used the practice. Among men, this gap was seen in practices such as rotational grazing, improved breeds, integrated pest management, green manure, compost, farmyard manure, and fallowing. The percentage of male participants who indicated that they used these practices was much lower compared to those who said they were aware of the practices. Among female participants, a similar gap was seen in crop rotation, farmyard manure, green manure, and improved breeds.

We therefore asked for the reasons why some practices were not being practiced although a number of farmers were aware of the practices. Small herd sizes hence unavailability of adequate quantity of manure; rapid growth of weeds hence increasing labour burden for manual weeding; high cost of transporting manure; the perception that manure releases nutrients slowly; and the opinion that when exposed to sunlight for long periods manure loses its nutrients, all constrain uptake of manure. Farmers mentioned lack of knowledge and reduction in the area of land available for cultivation as barriers to implementation of agroforestry. increases crop yield. They further indicated that herbicides reduce amount of labour required for manual weeding. In addition, they said that weeds killed by herbicides can be incorporated to increase soil fertility.

Farmers expressed demand for improved farming practices. They reported that fertilizer application

| Mbarali upland<br>zone men |           |            |                               |           |             |
|----------------------------|-----------|------------|-------------------------------|-----------|-------------|
|                            | Awareness | Use        |                               | Awareness | Use         |
| Agroforestry               | 16%       | <b>5</b> % | Improved<br>livestock breeds  | 29%       | 13%         |
| Compost<br>manure          | 26%       | 5%         | Improved<br>varieties         | 35%       | 19%         |
| Contour bunding            | 10%       | 0%         | Integrated pest<br>management | 26%       | 10%         |
| Contour ploughing          | 26%       | 0%         | Intercropping                 | 23%       | 19%         |
| Cover crops                | 6%        | 6%         | Irrigation                    | 39%       | <b>23%</b>  |
| Crop<br>residue retention  | 16%       | 13%        | Manure<br>application         | 48%       | 15%         |
| Crop rotation              | 19%       | 15%        | Minimum<br>tillage            | 35%       | 35%         |
| Early land preparation     | 45%       | 39%        | Mixed<br>cropping             | 35%       | <b>26</b> % |
| Early planting             | 39%       | 35%        | Mulching                      | 19%       | <b>13</b> % |
| Fallowing                  | 29%       | 3%         | Pesticides application        | 32%       | <b>29%</b>  |
| Fertilizer application     | 19%       | <b>19%</b> | Rotational grazing            | 29%       | 19%         |
| Green manure               | 32%       | 6%         | Seed<br>selection             | 42%       | 39%         |
| Herbicide application      | 35%       | 29%        | Water<br>harvesting           | 32%       | 16%         |

Figure 3. Awareness and use of agricultural practices by men participants from the uplands, Mbarali.

**Notes:** Awareness and use are computed as a percentage of the total number of workshop participants. For example, 19% of workshop participants had heard about crop residue retention, while 16% of the total number of participants who were present had actually retained crop residues in their farming.

| Mbarali upland<br>zone women |           |           |                               |           |     |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------------------------|-----------|-----|
|                              | Awareness | Use       |                               | Awareness | Use |
| Compost<br>manure            | 6%        | 5%        | Integrated pest<br>management | 19%       | 3%  |
| Contour<br>bunding           | 3%        | 0%        | Intercropping                 | 26%       | 15% |
| Contour ploughing            | 6%        | 0%        | Irrigation                    | 39%       | 25% |
| Crop<br>residue retention    | 6%        | 5%        | Manure<br>application         | 16%       | 3%  |
| Crop rotation                | 16%       | 5%        | Minimum<br>tillage            | 19%       | 10% |
| Early land preparation       | 42%       | 39%       | Mixed<br>cropping             | 26%       | 23% |
| Early planting               | 35%       | 32%       | Mulching                      | 3%        | 0%  |
| Fallowing                    | 6%        | 0%        | Pesticide application         | 19%       | 15% |
| Fertilizer application       | 16%       | 15%       | Rotational grazing            | 3%        | 3%  |
| Green manure                 | 23%       | <b>5%</b> | Seed<br>selection             | 35%       | 35% |
| Herbicide application        | 29%       | 25%       | Strip<br>cropping             | 6%        | 0%  |
| Improved<br>livestock breeds | 13%       | 5%        | Water<br>harvesting           | 23%       | 23% |
| Improved<br>varieties        | 29%       | 29%       |                               |           |     |

Figure 4. Awareness and use of agricultural practices by women participants from the uplands, Mbarali.

Notes: Awareness and use are computed as a percentage of the total number of workshop participants. For example, 23% of workshop participants had heard about water harvesting, while the same proportion of the total number of participants who were present had actually practiced water harvesting.

In the lowlands, Mbarali, although there was no much difference in awareness about agricultural practices between men and women, Figures 5 and 6 show important awareness–use gap. This gap was mostly observed in improved varieties, zero grazing, green manure, cover crops, crop rotation, intercropping, fallowing, and application of farmyard manure.

Farmers gave several reasons why some practices were not being implemented even though they were aware of them. They particularly reported that improved varieties were expensive and susceptible to pest attacks. Farmers further believed that in case of shortage of rainfall, the loss was much higher with improved varieties than with local varieties. Farmyard manure was not common because most farmers either did not own livestock or the herd sizes were very small. Farmers also said that they preferred chemical fertilizer to manure because the latter takes a longer time to release nutrients. Transportation costs was also reported to hinder use of manure. Some farmers further reported that because most of the land was rented, they did not apply manure because they were unwilling to improve fertility of land that did not belong to them. Shortage of land also explained why farmers did not practice fallowing. They further indicated that leaving the rented land fallow was a great economic loss.

The main reason why crop rotation was not practiced is because rice is the main crop in the lowlands. Farmers indicated that it is not easy to rotate another crop with rice. Moreover, inadequate amount of rainfall makes it difficult for farmers to rotate crops.

| Mbarali lowland<br>zone men  |           |            |                     |           |     |
|------------------------------|-----------|------------|---------------------|-----------|-----|
|                              | Awareness | Use        |                     | Awareness | Use |
| Agroforestry                 | 35%       | 15%        | Intercropping       | 31%       | 8%  |
| Compost<br>manure            | 8%        | 0%         | Irrigation          | 46%       | 35% |
| Contour ploughing            | 27%       | 0%         | Live<br>fences      | 8%        | 0%  |
| Cover<br>crops               | 23%       | 12%        | Mixed<br>cropping   | 46%       | 19% |
| Crop<br>residue retention    | 19%       | 8%         | Monocropping        | 46%       | 23% |
| Crop rotation                | 19%       | 8%         | Ridging             | 38%       | 23% |
| Fallowing                    | 46%       | 15%        | Rotational grazing  | 15%       | 0%  |
| Farmyard<br>manure           | 42%       | 4%         | Terracing           | 8%        | 0%  |
| Fertilizer                   | 46%       | 46%        | Tethering           | 38%       | 0%  |
| Green manure                 | 27%       | 8%         | Water<br>harvesting | 42%       | 15% |
| Improved<br>livestock breeds | 8%        | 0%         | Zero<br>grazing     | 46%       | 12% |
| Improved<br>varieties        | 31%       | <b>12%</b> |                     |           |     |

Figure 5. Awareness and use of agricultural practices by men participants from the lowlands, Mbarali.

Notes: Awareness and use are computed as a percentage of the total number of workshop participants. For example, 35% of workshop participants had heard about agroforestry, while 15% of the total number of participants who were present had actually practiced agroforestry. Practices such as compost manure, contour ploughing, improved livestock breeds, and rotational grazing had no single participants reporting their use.

| Mbarali lowland<br>zone women |           |             |                               |            |             |
|-------------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------------------------|------------|-------------|
|                               | Awareness | Use         |                               | Awareness  | Use         |
| Agroforestry                  | 46%       | 38%         | Integrated pest<br>management | 54%        | 38%         |
| Compost<br>manure             | 15%       | 0%          | Irrigation                    | 54%        | 50%         |
| Contour ploughing             | 42%       | 0%          | Live<br>fences                | 12%        | 12%         |
| Cover<br>crops                | 46%       | <b>12</b> % | minimum<br>tillage            | 4%         | 0%          |
| Crop<br>residue retention     | 4%        | 0%          | Mixed<br>cropping             | 54%        | <b>46%</b>  |
| Crop rotation                 | 54%       | 4%          | Monocropping                  | <b>42%</b> | 31%         |
| Fallowing                     | 42%       | 4%          | Mulching                      | 4%         | 0%          |
| Farmyard manure               | 54%       | 8%          | Ridging                       | 54%        | <b>46</b> % |
| Fertilizer                    | 54%       | 54%         | Strip<br>cropping             | 8%         | 0%          |
| Green manure                  | 35%       | 15%         | Terracing                     | 8%         | 0%          |
| Improved<br>breeds            | 8%        | 0%          | Tethering                     | 54%        | <b>4%</b>   |
| Improved<br>varieties         | 48%       | 19%         | Water<br>harvesting           | 50%        | 50%         |
| Intercropping                 | 31%       | 8%          | Zero<br>grazing               | 54%        | 8%          |
|                               |           |             |                               |            |             |

Figure 6. Awareness and use of agricultural practices by women participants from the lowlands, Mbarali.

Notes: Awareness and use are computed as a percentage of the total number of workshop participants. For example, 45% of workshop participants had heard about crop rotation, but only 4% of the total number of participants who were present had actually practiced it. Practices such as compost manure, crop residue retention, improved livestock breeds, reduced tillage, and mulching had no single participants reporting their use.

### Awareness and use of agricultural practices in Kilolo District

Similar to Mbarali, the proportion of farmers who were aware about agricultural practices was low in Kilolo (Figures 7–10). Very few farmers in the uplands are aware of mulching, reduced tillage, agroforestry, composting, and improved breeds. The proportion of farmers implementing improved agricultural practices was low even when farmers were aware of these practices.

| Kilolo upland<br>zone men |            |            |                               |            |             |
|---------------------------|------------|------------|-------------------------------|------------|-------------|
|                           | Awareness  | Use        |                               | Awareness  | Use         |
| Agroforestry              | 13%        | 0%         | Intercropping                 | <b>48%</b> | <b>22</b> % |
| Contour ploughing         | 35%        | 13%        | Integrated pest<br>management | <b>52%</b> | <b>26</b> % |
| Cover crops               | <b>52%</b> | 26%        | Minimum<br>tillage            | 17%        | 9%          |
| Crop<br>residue retention | 48%        | 17%        | Mixed<br>cropping             | 52%        | 22%         |
| Crop rotation             | <b>48%</b> | 30%        | Mulching                      | 13%        | 4%          |
| Fallowing                 | 57%        | 17%        | Rotational grazing            | 39%        | 4%          |
| Farmyard<br>manure        | 57%        | 30%        | Silvopastoral<br>systems      | 9%         | 4%          |
| Fertilizer<br>application | <b>48%</b> | <b>48%</b> | Terracing                     | 26%        | 4%          |
| Herbicide application     | 43%        | 17%        | Water<br>harvesting           | 35%        | 13%         |
| Improved breeds           | 13%        | 0%         | Zero<br>grazing               | <b>52%</b> | <b>4%</b>   |
| Improved varieties        | 52%        | 48%        |                               |            |             |

Figure 7. Awareness and use of agricultural practices by men in uplands, Kilolo.

Notes: Awareness and use are computed as a percentage of the total number of workshop participants. For example, 48% of workshop participants had heard about crop residue retention, while 17% of the total number of participants who were present had actually practiced it. Practices such as improved livestock breeds and agroforestry had no single participants reporting their use.

|                          |           | Kilo        | elo upland<br>Ne women   |           |            |
|--------------------------|-----------|-------------|--------------------------|-----------|------------|
|                          | Awareness | Use         |                          | Awareness | Use        |
| Agroforestry             | 22%       | 4%          | Improved<br>varieties    | 43%       | 35%        |
| Burning                  | 43%       | 30%         | Intercropping            | 35%       | 17%        |
| Contour ploughing        | 35%       | 9%          | IPM                      | 43%       | <b>26%</b> |
| Cover<br>crops           | 39%       | <b>26</b> % | Minimum<br>tillage       | 4%        | 0%         |
| Crop<br>esidue retention | 35%       | 26%         | Mixed<br>cropping        | 43%       | <b>26%</b> |
| Crop rotation            | 39%       | 30%         | Mulching                 | 9%        | 0%         |
| Fallowing                | 43%       | 13%         | Rotational grazing       | 30%       | 4%         |
| Farmyard<br>manure       | 43%       | 22%         | Silvopastoral<br>systems | 13%       | 4%         |
| Fertilizer application   | 43%       | 43%         | Terracing                | 30%       | 9%         |
| Herbicides application   | 35%       | 0%          | Water<br>harvesting      | 35%       | 13%        |
| mproved breeds           | 17%       | 4%          | Zero<br>grazing          | 43%       | 4%         |

Figure 8. Awareness and use of agricultural practices by women in uplands, Kilolo.

**Notes:** Awareness and use are computed as a percentage of the total number of workshop participants. For example, 35% of workshop participants had heard about intercropping, while 17% of the total number of participants who were present had actually practiced it. Practices such as reduced tillage and mulching had no single participants reporting their use.

| Kilolo lowland<br>zone men |           |           |                            |           |           |
|----------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|-----------|-----------|
|                            | Awareness | Use       |                            | Awareness | Use       |
| Compost                    | 2%        | 0%        | Integrated pest management | 8%        | 8%        |
| Construction<br>of ditches | 0%        | <b>5%</b> | Intercropping              | 8%        | 4%        |
| Contour<br>bunding         | 8%        | 2%        | Irrigation                 | 7%        | <b>6%</b> |
| Contour ploughing          | 4%        | 0%        | Manure<br>application      | 12%       | <b>5%</b> |
| Controlled<br>burning      | 9%        | 1%        | minimum<br>tillage         | 4%        | 0%        |
| Cover<br>crops             | 9%        | 3%        | Mixed<br>cropping          | 15%       | 10%       |
| Crop<br>residue retention  | 14%       | 0%        | Mulching                   | 10%       | 10%       |
| Crop rotation              | 15%       | 10%       | Pesticide application      | 16%       | 10%       |
| Fallowing                  | 16%       | 3%        | Rotational grazing         | 13%       | <b>2%</b> |
| Fertilizer<br>application  | 16%       | 13%       | Silvopastoral<br>systems   | 2%        | 0%        |
| Green manure               | 8%        | 3%        | Terracing                  | 10%       | 1%        |
| Herbicide application      | 15%       | 2%        | Water<br>harvesting        | 10%       | 9%        |
| Improved<br>varieties      | 17%       | 14%       | Zero<br>grazing            | 13%       | 1%        |
|                            |           |           |                            |           |           |

Figure 9. Awareness and use of agricultural practices by men's group in lowlands, Kilolo.

Notes: Awareness and use are computed as a percentage of the total number of workshop participants. For example, 17% of workshop participants had heard about improved varieties, while 14% of the total number of participants who were present had actually planted improved varieties.

| Kilolo lowland<br>zone women |           |           |                            |           |           |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|-----------|-----------|
|                              | Awareness | Use       |                            | Awareness | Use       |
| Agroforestry                 | 1%        | 0%        | Improved<br>varieties      | 5%        | 4%        |
| Compost                      | 1%        | 1%        | Integrated pest management | 3%        | 3%        |
| Construction<br>of ditches   | 2%        | 1%        | Intercropping              | 4%        | 3%        |
| Contour<br>bunding           | 3%        | <b>2%</b> | Irrigation                 | 3%        | <b>2%</b> |
| Contour ploughing            | 1%        | 1%        | Manure<br>application      | 4%        | 1%        |
| Controlled<br>burning        | 2%        | <b>2%</b> | minimum<br>tillage         | 1%        | 0%        |
| Cover<br>crops               | 4%        | <b>2%</b> | Mixed<br>cropping          | 5%        | 3%        |
| Crop<br>residue retention    | 4%        | 0%        | Mulching                   | 3%        | 2%        |
| Crop rotation                | 4%        | 4%        | Pesticide<br>application   | 3%        | 3%        |
| Fallowing                    | 5%        | 3%        | Rotational<br>grazing      | 2%        | 1%        |
| Fertilizer application       | 4%        | 4%        | Silvopastoral<br>systems   | 1%        | 1%        |
| Green manure                 | 2%        | 1%        | Terracing                  | 2%        | 1%        |
| Herbicide<br>application     | 4%        | 3%        | Water<br>harvesting        | 2%        | 1%        |
| Improved<br>breeds           | 1%        | 1%        | Zero<br>grazing            | 5%        | 3%        |
|                              |           |           |                            |           |           |

Figure 10. Awareness and use of agricultural practices by women's group in lowlands, Kilolo.

Notes: Awareness and use are computed as a percentage of the total number of workshop participants. For example,
 4% of workshop participants had heard about cover crops, while 2% of the total number of participants who were present had actually planted cover crops.

In this particular workshop, the total number of female participants was very low compared to the other workshops.

# Selected most relevant practices and prioritization, by district and agro-ecological zones

### Selected practices in uplands, Mbarali

Farmers were asked to select, from the master list, practices that they thought were most relevant for their zones. Table 6 shows the practices that were selected by the men's group in the uplands, Mbarali, as the most relevant and the benefits associated with each practice. Table 7 presents results of the women's group in uplands, Mbarali. Crop rotation was commonly selected by both men and women. The main reasons for selecting crop rotation were because it increases soil fertility and that it allows the farmer to identify suitable crops for specific plots.

Another practice that was common between men and women was herbicides application. The main reasons why farmers selected herbicides were related to reduction in the workload and time associated with manual weeding. The implication of this finding to policies on CSA is that efforts to introduce alternative approaches for weed control must address the labour and time constraints. There were important challenges that were raised by the men's group about application of herbicides, namely lack of knowledge on application of herbicides, high cost of the input, and the problem of fake chemicals.

The findings reported in Tables 6 and 7 show that farmers could understand the benefits of agricultural practices but barriers to adoption remain. The results further indicate that adoption is not without tradeoffs. Mulching, for example, was reported to create a favorable warm environment for seed germination, improve soil texture, and conserve soil moisture. However, constraints such as unavailability of mulch, competition for use as livestock feed, and increased pest incidences were reported to limit uptake.

| Practice               | Benefits   |
|------------------------|--|
| Early land preparation | Better yields; allows for proper planning of activities; to prepare for the rains; reduces workload  |
| Early planting         | Better yields; more income; to prepare for the rains   |
| Seed selection         | To select good-quality seeds that are disease free, high yielding, disease resistant; marketable produce   |
| Intercropping          | The intercrop might provide vegetables; conserves<br>moisture; increased soil fertility; crop diversification hence<br>reduced risk of crop failure; reduces cost of renting land as<br>different crops can be grown in a plot |
| Fertilizer application | Increased yield  |
| Herbicide application  | Reduces cost of weeding; increases soil fertility; reduces the amount of time and effort required to weed  |
| Crop rotation          | Increases soil fertility; controls diseases; farmers are able to know which crop performs best in what plot  |
| Irrigation             | Guaranteed harvest compared to rain-fed farming;<br>increased food security due to more production   |

#### **Table 6.**Relevant practices selected by the men's group from the uplands, Mbarali.

(continues)

(continued)

| Practice              | Benefits                   |  |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--|
| Pesticide application | More yield; controls pests |  |
| Fallowing             | Increased soil fertility   |  |

### Table 7. Relevant practices selected by the women's group in uplands, Mbarali.

| Practice               | Benefits  | Challenges   |
|------------------------|---|--|
| Early land preparation | To prepare for the rains; better yields;<br>more income; to plant in time; good<br>prices because of early harvesting;<br>labour is available when you prepare<br>land early                            | -  |
| Improved varieties     | High yielding; reduced risk of crop<br>failure; marketable produce; disease<br>resistant  | Lack of access to fertilizer; lack of<br>knowledge about improved seeds<br>and where to find them  |
| Livestock manure       | Increases soil fertility; the soil does not get tired; can release nutrients for a long time  | High costs of transportation   |
| Stop burning           | The soil does not get tired; increased<br>soil fertility; when vegetation<br>decomposes, it brings useful<br>microorganisms; vegetation reduces<br>surface run-off; vegetation controls<br>soil erosion | Pastoralists will bring their cattle<br>to your farm if you do not burn;<br>neighbours sometimes burn other<br>people's fields                                     |
| Herbicide application  | Makes it easier to weed; the soil<br>becomes good; increases soil fertility;<br>reduces the amount of time spent in<br>the garden weeding   | Lack of knowledge on herbicide<br>application; high cost of the input;<br>adulterated chemicals  |
| Water harvesting       | If the rain stops when the crop is still<br>tender, you can irrigate; gardens next<br>to the harvested water are moist; the<br>ponds can also be used to rear fish                                      | The area is very stony; conflicts<br>between pastoralists and crop farmers<br>- pastoralists use a lot of water for their<br>livestock                             |
| Crop rotation          | The soil does not get tired because<br>of inclusion of crops that enhance<br>soil fertility in the rotation; diversified<br>production; the soil becomes easier to<br>cultivate                         | Drought makes it difficult to grow<br>more crops; unavailability of seeds to<br>plant another crop when you harvest<br>one; unavailability of good quality<br>seed |
| Mulching               | Creates warmth that allows seeds<br>to germinate earlier; improves soil<br>texture; conserves soil moisture   | Unavailability of mulching material<br>because burning is common;<br>competition for the mulching material<br>by livestock keepers; increased pest<br>incidences   |

### Selected practices in lowlands, Mbarali

Table 8 shows the practices that were selected by the women's group in the lowlands, Mbarali, and the associated benefits. Table 9 shows the practices that were selected by the men's group. Both men and women chose irrigation, chemical fertilizer, and crop rotation as most relevant practices in the lowlands. The benefits given for these practices are related to the major constraints identified by farmers for this zone, namely low soil fertility and inadequate amount of water for irrigation. The proportion of farmers that were aware about irrigation and chemical fertilizer was slightly higher among women than men (Figures 5 and 6). More women were aware of crop rotation than men (Figures 5 and 6). Adoption of the prioritized practices was low even when farmers were aware of them.

#### Table 8. Practices selected by the women's group in the lowlands, Mbarali.

| Practice                   | Benefits   |
|----------------------------|--|
| Cover crop                 | <ul> <li>Protects the soil from direct sunlight</li> <li>They are vegetables</li> <li>Helps to conserve soil moisture</li> <li>Suppresses weeds</li> </ul>   |
| Chemical fertilizer        | <ul> <li>Increases soil fertility</li> <li>Increased yield</li> </ul>  |
| Bunding                    | <ul> <li>Controls soil erosion</li> <li>Makes it easier to implement irrigation</li> </ul>   |
| Integrated pest management | Reduces cost of pest control   |
| Irrigation                 | <ul> <li>Possible to produce crops when there is no rain</li> <li>Allows for cultivation of more crops</li> </ul>  |
| Livestock manure           | <ul> <li>Increases soil fertility</li> <li>Reduces cost of buying chemical fertilizer</li> <li>It is easy to obtain because even your neighbour can provide</li> <li>Releases nutrients for a longer time</li> </ul> |
| Crop residue retention     | <ul> <li>Increases soil fertility</li> <li>Reduces cost of buying chemical fertilizer</li> </ul>   |
| Crop rotation              | <ul> <li>Allows the soil to regain fertility</li> <li>Helps to control pests</li> <li>Conserves soil moisture</li> <li>Increases soil fertility because of growing different crops</li> </ul>                        |

### **Table 9.**Practices selected by the men's group in the lowlands, Mbarali.

| Practice           | Benefits   | Challenges   |  |  |
|--------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Irrigation         | <ul> <li>Guaranteed harvest and income</li> <li>Continued production even when<br/>there is drought</li> <li>Even livestock feed is available<br/>with irrigation</li> </ul>                   | <ul> <li>Inadequate amount of water for irrigation</li> <li>High cost of equipment such as water pump</li> <li>Poor irrigation infrastructure</li> <li>Lack of land to use for water harvesting</li> </ul> |  |  |
| Crop rotation      | <ul> <li>Increases soil fertility</li> <li>Increased income because farmers<br/>can plant several times</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>High cost of seeds especially<br/>during planting time</li> <li>Lack of knowledge</li> </ul>  |  |  |
| Mixed cropping     | <ul> <li>Diversified production per unit<br/>area</li> <li>Reduces weeding</li> <li>It is a way to cope with risk such as<br/>drought</li> </ul>   | The main crop is rice, which<br>occupies a lot of farm land, hence<br>reducing amount of land available<br>for diversified cropping  |  |  |
| Improved varieties | <ul> <li>Increased yield and income</li> <li>Drought tolerant</li> <li>Early maturing</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>High cost of improved varieties</li> <li>Lack of knowledge on growing<br/>improved varieties</li> <li>Easily attacked by diseases</li> <li>Fake seeds</li> </ul>                                  |  |  |
| Farmyard manure    | <ul> <li>It has long-term benefits</li> <li>Increases soil fertility</li> <li>Makes the soil easy to till</li> <li>Increases yield</li> <li>The cost is lower if you keep livestock</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>High transportation costs</li> <li>Lack of knowledge on application</li> </ul>  |  |  |
| Fertilizer         | <ul> <li>Increases yields</li> <li>It is easily available</li> <li>Increases income</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Without rain, application of<br/>fertilizers may cause a huge loss</li> <li>If used for a long time, it damages<br/>the soil</li> </ul>   |  |  |
| Row planting       | <ul><li>Increased yield</li><li>Makes it easier to weed</li></ul>  | <ul> <li>It is time consuming</li> <li>It is costly</li> <li>Lack of knowledge on proper spacing</li> </ul>  |  |  |



# Prioritization of practices using pairwise matrices, Mbarali

As explained in the methodology section, pairwise ranking was used to prioritize practices. In this section, we present results of the selected practices and pairwise ranking men's and women's groups in the different identified AEZs in Mbarali. As shown in Table 10 below, the men's group ranked mulching, improved varieties, water harvesting, manure application, and crop rotation as the five most important practices in respective order. We find that even for the prioritized practices, the percentage of farmers who were aware and using these practices was low (Figures 3 and 4). As presented in Tables 7 and 9, several constraints explain why farmers in the uplands and lowlands might not be able to implement the practices they prioritize. Strikingly, although a high percentage of farmers in Mbarali perceived the status of soil fertility as "bad," fertilizer and manure application was ranked at the bottom by both women and men, especially in the lowlands. Improved varieties and water management practices (irrigation and water harvesting) are prioritized in Mbarali.

| Uplands                |      |                               | Lowlands        |                 |      |
|------------------------|------|-------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------|
| Men                    |      | Wome                          | n               | Men             |      |
| Practice               | Rank | Practice Rank                 |                 | Practice        | Rank |
| Mulching               | 1    | Bunds                         | 1               | Correct spacing | 1    |
| Improved varieties     | 2    | Irrigation                    | Irrigation 2 Ii |                 | 2    |
| Water harvesting       | 3    | Integrated pest<br>management | 3 Crop rotation |                 | 3    |
| Manure                 | 4    | Crop residue                  | 4               | Irrigation      | 4    |
| Crop rotation          | 5    | Cover crops                   | 5               | Mixed cropping  | 5    |
| Early land preparation | 6    | Fertilizer                    | 6               | Farmyard manure | 6    |
| No burning             | 7    | Compost manure                | 7               | Fertilizer      | 7    |
| Herbicides             | 8    | Crop rotation                 | 8               | -               | -    |

Table 10. Prioritized agricultural practices in upland and lowland AEZ in Mbarali District, by gender.

# Selected and prioritized practices in Kilolo District

In the uplands, the women's group selected fertilizer application, intercropping, fallowing, improved breeds, improved varieties, contour ploughing, and agroforestry as the most relevant practices. The men's group selected improved varieties, pesticides, mulching, crop rotation, fertilizer, and irrigation. Table 11 presents the benefits that farmers associate with each of the practices selected by the women's group in the uplands, Kilolo.

In the lowlands, female participants selected herbicide application, improved varieties, fertilizer application, irrigation, mulching, and pesticides. Table 12 shows the benefits associated with the selected practices. As shown in Table 13, the most prioritized practices by the women's group in the uplands were improved breeds and improved varieties, while fertilizer application was the least prioritized. The men's group in the uplands prioritized improved varieties and pesticide application, while irrigation and fertilizer application were ranked lowest. In the lowlands, the women's group prioritized improved varieties, irrigation, and fertilizers; while mulching and herbicides were least prioritized.

Challenges identified by farmers were mostly related to the use of herbicides and irrigation. Farmers indicated that herbicides are non selective and, therefore, destroy other crops. Inadequate amount of water for irrigation was the main barrier for irrigation. When asked about why they were not implementing other practices that they were aware of, farmers reported that fallowing is not practiced because of the small sizes of land; lack of knowledge on modern technologies; agroforestry is not practiced because farmers lack access to tree seedlings. In order to implement such practices, farmers indicated that they would require training. They also suggested that the number of extension agents should be increased. The men's group in the lowlands ranked improved varieties, pesticides, and irrigation as most important, while farmyard manure and zero grazing were ranked as least important (Table 13).

#### Table 11. Practices selected by the women's group in the uplands, Kilolo.

| Practice               | Benefits  |
|------------------------|---|
| Fertilizer application | Increased productivity  |
| Intercropping          | Increased soil fertility  |
| Fallowing              | <ul><li>Increased soil fertility</li><li>Controls pests</li></ul> |
| Improved breeds        | Better production   |
| Improved varieties     | <ul><li>High yield</li><li>Marketable</li></ul>                   |
| Contour ploughing      | Controls soil erosion   |
| Agroforestry           | Conserves moisture for a longer time                              |

Table 12. Practices selected by the women's group in lowlands, Kilolo.

| Practice               | Benefits   |
|------------------------|--|
| Herbicide application  | <ul> <li>To control weeds, especially in onions; reduces cost of<br/>weed control; increased yield; more income</li> </ul> |
| Improved varieties     | Increased yield; increased income; marketable  |
| Fertilizer application | Healthy plants; high yields; conserves soil moisture   |
| Irrigation             | <ul> <li>Less rainfall especially in the lowlands; guaranteed<br/>harvest</li> </ul>                                       |
| Mulching               | To control pests such as locusts in tomatoes; to<br>conserve soil moisture; controls soil temperature                      |
| Pesticides             | Reduces pest damage  |

 Table 13.
 Prioritization of agricultural practices in Kilolo District.

|                    | Uplands | 3                     |      |                       | Lowla | ands                  |      |
|--------------------|---------|-----------------------|------|-----------------------|-------|-----------------------|------|
| Women              |         | Men                   |      | Womei                 | n     | Me                    | ən   |
| Practice           | Rank    | Practice              | Rank | Practice              | Rank  | Practice              | Rank |
| Improved breeds    | 1       | Improved<br>varieties | 1    | Improved<br>varieties | 1     | Improved<br>varieties | 1    |
| Improved varieties | 2       | Pesticides            | 2    | Irrigation            | 2     | Irrigation            | 2    |
| Fallowing          | 3       | Mulching              | 3    | Fertilizers           | 3     | Early<br>planting     | 3    |
| Contour ploughing  | 4       | Crop rotation         | 4    | Pesticides            | 4     | Pesticides            | 4    |
| Agroforestry       | 5       | Fertilizer            | 5    | Herbicides            | 5     | Correct<br>spacing    | 5    |
| Fertilizer         | 6       | Irrigation            | 6    | Mulching              | 6     | Fertilizer            | 6    |
| -                  | 7       | -                     | -    | -                     | -     | Crop<br>rotation      | 7    |
| -                  | 8       | -                     | -    | _                     | -     | Zero<br>grazing       | 8    |

# Indicators that farmers use to select practices

Farmers reported to use different indicators to select agricultural practices. As shown in Tables 20–23, the indicators selected are, in most cases, ranked very important. Such indicators are important because they help to identify not only barriers to uptake of the prioritized practices but also the trade-offs that adoption might bring. It can be seen that farmers rank yield and income as very important but are also most concerned about costs, farm size, availability of inputs, rainfall, and knowledge about the practice. 
 Table 14.
 Indicators that farmers use to select agricultural practices in uplands, Mbarali.

| Indicator                        | Men's group | Women's group |
|----------------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| Yield                            | 5           | 5             |
| Cost                             | 5           | 5             |
| Knowledge/Skills                 | 5           | 5             |
| Transportation, e.g., for manure | 5           | 5             |
| Weed infestation                 | 2           | 5             |
| Availability of inputs           | 5           | 5             |
| Farm size                        | 5           | 5             |
| Rainfall                         | 5           | 5             |
| Soil fertility                   | 5           | 5             |
| Indigenous knowledge             | 2           | 5             |
| Labour                           | 5           | 5             |
| Time                             | 5           | 5             |
| Income                           | 5           | 5             |

Note: Indicators were scored on a scale ranging from 1 "not important at all" to 5 "very important."



Table 15. Indicators that farmers use to select agricultural practices in lowlands, Mbarali.

| Indicator              | Women's group | Men's group |
|------------------------|---------------|-------------|
| Yield                  | 5             | 4           |
| Income                 | 5             | 5           |
| Soil fertility         | 5             | 5           |
| Sustainability of land | 5             | 5           |
| Availability of water  | 5             | 5           |
| Knowledge/skills       | 5             | 5           |
| Cost                   | 5             | 5           |
| Pests/diseases         | 5             | 4           |
| Farm size              | 5             | 5           |
| Type of seeds          | 5             | 5           |

Note: Indicators were scored on a scale ranging from 1 "not important at all" to 5 "very important."

 Table 16.
 Indicators that farmers use to select agricultural practices in uplands, Kilolo.

| Indicator              | Women's group | Men's group |
|------------------------|---------------|-------------|
| Yield                  | 5             | 3           |
| Income                 | 5             | 3           |
| Soil fertility         | 5             | 4           |
| Sustainability of land | 5             | 4           |
| Availability of water  | 5             | 5           |
| Knowledge/skills       | 5             | 3           |
| Cost                   | 5             | 5           |
| Pests/diseases         | 5             | 4           |
| Farm size              | 5             | 5           |
| Type of seeds          | 5             | 5           |

Note: Indicators were scored on a scale ranging from 1 "not important at all" to 5 "very important."

 Table 17.
 Indicators that farmers use to select agricultural practices in lowlands, Kilolo.

| Indicator                 | Women's group | Men's group |
|---------------------------|---------------|-------------|
| Yield                     | 5             | 5           |
| Income                    | 5             | 5           |
| Soil fertility            | 5             | 5           |
| Sustainability of land    | 5             | NS          |
| Availability of water     | 5             | 5           |
| Knowledge/skills          | 5             | 5           |
| Cost                      | 5             | 5           |
| Pests/diseases            | 5             | NS          |
| Farm size                 | 5             | 5           |
| Availability of seeds     | 5             | 5           |
| Availabiliy of labour     | NS            | 5           |
| Availability of equipment | NS            | 5           |

Notes:NS = indicator was not selected by the group.Indicators were scored on a scale ranging from 1 "not important at all" to 5 "very important."

### **Demonstration plots**

### Demonstration plots in uplands, Mbarali

The following practices were selected by the women's group for the CSA demonstration plots: early land preparation; improved crop varieties; water harvesting; mulching; and fertilizer application. Farmers identified four existing demonstration plots located in Kongolo, Nyasa, Chang'ombe, and Mashara. Table 24 presents the practices that were being implemented in the existing demonstration plots.

Farmers suggested that new demonstration plots should be located in Kongolo-Mswiswi. They further suggested that demonstration plots should be owned and managed by farmers themselves. They recommended that the Rural Urban Development Initiative (RUDI) and the village leadership should be involved. The men's group recommended that a demonstration plot be located in Mahongole, Ipatagwa. They would like the following practices to be demonstrated: irrigation; application of herbicides; application of chemical fertilizers; application of herbicides; and seed selection. They suggested that farmers should work with extension agents to form groups. They would also like farmers groups and different organizations such as RUDI to be involved. In Mahongole, the location that farmers selected for a new demonstration plot is a school located close to government offices. They recommended demonstration plots to be on farmers' individual farms. Table 18. Existing demonstration plots in uplands, Mbarali.

| Demo site  | Practice/activity  | Management   |
|------------|--|--|
| Kongolo    | <ul> <li>Growing improved varieties</li> <li>Using modern technologies</li> <li>Row planting</li> <li>Proper spacing</li> <li>Leveling of the garden</li> <li>Harvesting</li> <li>Improved storage techniques</li> </ul> | RUDI and the government working with farmers                         |
| Nyasa      | <ul> <li>Row planting</li> <li>Fertilizer application</li> <li>Transplanting paddy seedlings</li> </ul>  | RUDI   |
| Chang'ombe | <ul><li>Timely seed preparation</li><li>Use of improved varieties</li><li>Row planting</li></ul>   | RUDI<br>There is one demonstration plot<br>where all villagers learn |
| Mashara    | <ul> <li>Market access</li> <li>Modern technologies</li> <li>Not mixing harvested grains of<br/>different quality for maize and rice</li> <li>Improved storage</li> </ul>  | BRA working with extenson agents and farmers                         |

### Demonstration plots in lowlands, Mbarali

The following practices were selected by the women's group for demonstration: improved crop varieties; fertilizer application; application of farmyard manure; fallowing; mulching; and improved planting techniques. Table 25 presents existing demonstration plots and the practices in those demonstration plots.

Farmers suggested that new demonstration plots should be located in Ibohola, Mwakaganga, and Mwanavala. They prefer the demonstration plots to be owned and managed by a village agricultural organization "shirika la kilimo la kijiji." They further suggested that farmers should form groups and elect leaders. The selected members would go and learn from the demo then come back and train others. Village extension officers should manage the demonstration plots.

The men's group selected the following practices for demonstration: seed preparation; proper use of fertilizers (i.e., proper rates and type); integrated pest management; and improved storage. The recommended sites were Imarilo Songwe and Mwenda Mtitu. Farmers suggested that the demonstration plots should be located on village land and that management should involve the extension officer. Farmers further suggested that other organizations should be involved as well. No existing demonstration plot was identified by the men's group. 
 Table 19.
 Existing demonstration plots in lowlands, Mbarali.

| Demo site    | Practice/activity  | Management  |
|--------------|--|---|
| Ibohora      | <ul> <li>Improved/modern agricultural<br/>practices</li> </ul> | Individual farmer   |
| Mwenda mtitu | Row planting (rice)  | <ul> <li>Ushirika wa umwagiliaji<br/>Mwendamtitu</li> </ul> |
| Mwanavala    | Improved agricultural practices                                | Extension agent   |

### Demonstration plots in uplands, Kilolo

Farmers in the women's group from the flatlands identified an existing demonstration plot run by One Acre Fund and the African Conservation Tillage Network (ACT) under the Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA). Farmers are encouraged to work in groups. They learn from the demonstration plot and share the knowledge with their neighbours at home. Conventional versus modern technologies are compared, e.g., the use of fertilizer. One Acre Fund, in addition to training farmers, provides agricultural inputs on credit.

When asked where they would like to have new demonstration plots, farmers said that they would like the site to be selected by the District Council of Kilolo. They would like the demonstration plot to be managed by an organization, and that farmers should be encouraged to form groups. They recommended that every ward should have its own demonstration plot.

The men's group from the lowland and upland zones identified existing demonstration plots in Iramba, Mawambala, Kitowo, Lusinga, and Ngongwa. The demonstration plot in Iramba aims to provide farmers with training on farming including correct spacing and fertilizer use. The demonstrations are run by Savings and Internal Lending Communities (SILC) and are located around the ward offices. The demonstration plot in Mawambala aims to increase agricultural productivity among farmers. It was started by Clinton Foundation and is managed by an individual. The demonstration plot trains farmers on planting techniques, timely weeding, herbicide application, and use of improved varieties. The demonstration plot in Kitowo is mainly involved in providing farm inputs to farmers under One Acre Fund. Lusinga was started by an organization called Cheetah Development and aims to train farmers on sweet potato

production. In Ngongwa, the demonstration plot is managed under Clinton Foundation and trains farmers on improved farming practices.

The five important practices that were selected for demonstration by the men's group include: minimum tillage, soil testing, improved varieties, fertilizer application, and irrigation. Farmers identified Dabaga and Kitowo as the suitable locations in the upland and lowland, respectively. They would like farmers to organize themselves and work in groups and that an individual's land should be used. They would further like the following organizations to be involved: churches and mosques, Maendeleo ya Watu wa Kilolo (MAWAKI), and One Acre Fund.

### Demonstration plots in lowlands, Kilolo

The men's group in the lowlands identified an existing demonstration plot in Msosa. The demonstration plot trains farmers on onion production and also links farmers to export markets. Through the demonstration plot, farmers learn how to control pests.

Farmers in the men's group said that they would want to learn about production of clean seeds of different crops, such as tomatoes, beans, maize, and chillies. In addition, they were interested in learning about fertilizer and pesticide application, and preparation and application of compost manure.

The sites recommended for demonstration plots were Mlafu in the uplands – managed by elected members of the community; in every ward in the central zones – managed by extension officers. Farmers recommended that churches, such as Lutheran and organizations such as One Acre Fund should be involved.



### **Experts' workshop results** Experts' workshop in uplands, Mbarali

Experts in the uplands of Mbarali identified challenges related to unpredictable rainfall, low soil fertility, pests and diseases, low income, poor infrastructure, unwillingness among farmers to follow advice from extension agents, low adoption of improved technologies, lack of capital for investment in agriculture, limited access to credit, limited access to extension advice, emergence of human diseases, low market prices, and conflict between farmers and livestock keepers. Several practices had been abandoned by farmers in the uplands of Mbarali District. Such practices included labour-sharing during major farming activities, e.g., planting, weeding, and harvesting commonly known as "mgoe" or "mjanwa;" fallow cropping is no longer practiced because of the increase in population; shift from manual weeding to use of herbicides such as round up; shift to using power tillers as opposed to hand-hoe; change from using organic manure to the use of chemical fertilizers such as urea; increase in sunken beds; row planting using ropes as opposed to broadcasting "mchakamchaka." Farmers had abandoned the practices for several reasons: shortage of land due to population pressure makes it difficult to practice fallowing; harvest is large with little amount of seeds; large sizes of land encouraged the practice of labour-sharing but with the reduction in the size of land,

the practice has stopped; increased use of improved technologies; reduced labour demand and time for weeding when herbicides are used, e.g., round up and 24D; knowledge on the use of chemical fertilizers has expanded; there is increased yield with the use of chemical fertilizers; farmyard manure increases growth of weeds hence farmers do not like it; and combine harvesters cannot reach the sunken beds.

Common crop practices in uplands, Mbarali, were identified as increased use of fertilizers and inputs such as powertiller, improved seeds, combine harvesters, and integrated pest management. Experts further identified common livestock practices, including dip tanks and spraying to control pests, vaccination, improved breeds and artificial insemination services, reduced herd sizes, zero grazing, and mixed farming.

Important soil management practices that experts identified included farmyard manure; planting on ridges especially maize, sweetpotatoes, and sunflower; planting trees along River Bwili to control soil erosion; village by-laws which prevent inappropriate use of soil in the village, e.g., large herds of cattle; and crop rotation in maize production zones, especially in the scheme areas of Bwili, Ipatagwa, Moto Mbaya, Nyasa, Kapyo, Azimio, Kongolo Mswiswi, and Suhela.

When deciding whether or not to implement a practice, experts indicated that farmers care about generating more income, increased yield, and profits. The experts recommended soil testing, drip irrigation, farmyard manure, adapted varieties of crops, water harvesting technologies, conservation agriculture, education on fallowing, crop rotation, reduced use of chemical fertilizers, maintenance of irrigation canals, and intercropping. For livestock, integrated crop livestock production systems; zero grazing; destocking; keeping small livestock such as rabbits, chicken, and ducks; and construction of improved structures were recommended.

### Experts' workshop in Lowlands, Mbarali

Three zones were identified by the experts who attended the workshop in Ubaruku, namely llongo, Madibila, and Rujewa. Because the experts were from lowlands, subsequent activities focused on this zone. The experts identified several challenges to agricultural productivity in lowlands, Mbarali, including:

- Unpredictable/irregular pattern of rainfall.
- Less rainfall.
- Inadequate amount of water for irrigation.
- Soil erosion.
- Farmers rely a lot on their own indigenous knowledge and accumulated experience paying little attention to experts' advice.
- Except for rice, farmers do not apply chemical fertilizers on other crops, such as maize, beans, groundnuts, etc.; this is mainly because of unpredictable rainfall.
- Declining soil fertility.
- Poor roads and irrigation infrastructure.
- Experts are not well facilitated in their activities, e.g., lack of seminars and trainings.
- High temperature causing very high rates of evaporation.
- The soil dries and cracks, hence crops do not grow well.

- Poor postharvest handling techniques resulting in high postharvest losses, especially in rice.
- Lack of capital.
- Low market prices for agricultural produce, partly due to low quality of the produce; there are also no standard measures of output.
- Salty soils in some areas due to excessive evaporation.
- Lack of knowledge on pesticide application.
- High pest and disease incidences, especially in tomatoes, green pepper, and cucumber. Paddy is affected by leaf rust and rice gall midge.
- Conflict between crop farmers and pastoralists due to competition for resources.
- Poor quality of seeds and fertilizer.
- Strong winds cause losses among rice farmers who grow "Biriani" variety.
- Some rice varieties currently grown by farmers change colour to yellow after harvesting, thus reducing its value in the market.

Experts further identified practices that farmers used to implement but had abandoned. Such practices included: broadcasting of seeds, very little use of fertilizers and herbicides, use of local seeds, ploughing using handhoe, slash and burn, and mixed cropping. When asked why they had made changes in their farming, farmers reported that broadcasting was abandoned because row planting combined with proper spacing increased yield and reduced wastage of seed; knowledge of improved practices among farmers had improved; spraying with herbicides reduced the cost of land preparation compared to slash and burn; and combine harvesters and powertillers had replaced sickles for harvesting and hand-hoe for ploughing.

Important indicators identified by experts to select agricultural practices included: high yield, reduced workload, reduced cost of production, improved quality of produce, time-saving, and marketability of produce.



Several crop practices were recommended by experts for the lowlands of Mbarali, including greenhouse horticultural production, irrigation, improved varieties, farmyard manure, intercropping, and introduction of border crops to control diseases. In addition to croprelated practices, experts also recommended artificial insemination, zero grazing, improved pastures, pest control, and fish farming.

Experts identified an existing demonstration plot in Uhamila. The objectives of the plot were to train farmers on improved farming practices (farmer field school) and on production of fruit crops such as pawpaw, oranges, and mangoes. The demonstration plot was introduced by the government. Thirty farmers were selected for training, and seedlings were purchased from Morogoro and supplied to the farmers. The specific location was at Uhamila primary school in Uhamila village, Rujewa ward. The main challenges that were identified for the demonstration plot in Uhamila were related to the small size of land under demonstration, shortage of water, theft, insecurity, the demonstration plot was not fenced, poor attendance because people expected money, and lack of protective gears. For a new demonstration plot, experts selected Imalilosongwe ward, Ulunda village; Ubaruku ward, Mwakaganga village; and Rujewa ward, Uhamila village. The main crops grown in the district are paddy, maize, onions, groundnuts, sunflower, and Bambara nuts. They would like the demonstration

plots to be managed by the extension officers in each ward. Participatory methods were recommended for implementation. Experts further suggested that gender should be taken into consideration. Activities in the demonstration plot should follow the cropping seasons and be accessible to farmers. Important partners that were suggested include (Jyole Agricultural Research Institute (ARI-Uyole); district agricultural and development officers; township executive officer; township agricultural, irrigation, and cooperative officer; township livestock and fisheries development officer; and township planning officer.

### Experts' workshop in uplands, Kilolo

Kilolo District was classified by experts into three AEZs, namely Kilolo, Mazombe, and Ruaha Mbuyuni. Kilolo zone has two planting seasons. The challenges in this zone related to farming include: unpredictable rainfall that affects the time of land preparation and planting; stunted growth of crops due to irregular patterns of rainfall; disease and pest outbreaks; dry soil due to shortage of rainfall makes it difficult for crop residue to decompose.

Mazombe zone has one planting season. The challenges in this zone included shortage of rainfall causing crops to stunt, increasing disease and pest incidences, reduced pasture for livestock, and outbreak of human diseases such as malaria. The soil was perceived to be fertile but experts reported that the dryness as a result of less rainfall makes the soil not suitable for cultivation. The zone is hot.

Ruaha Mbuyuni-Mahenge also has one season. The soil is mainly sandy-loam. The main challenges in the zone included shortage of rainfall, delayed rainfall, high temperature causing high evaporation, outbreak of crop pests and diseases, and reduced pasture.

General challenges facing the district were identified by experts as income poverty; increased incidences of human diseases; limited knowledge of improved farming practices among farmers; farmers are not willing to adopt improved practices; unreliable market for agricultural products; poor road infrastructure; and inappropriate choice of inputs such as fertilizers.

Several changes in forest cover and river flow were reported, namely the land has become bare; loss of water catchment areas; reduction in the volume of water in rivers; increased deforestation; drying of rivers; and drying of wetlands.

Experts indicated that farmers were no longer planting on ridges because they wanted to conserve moisture and improve soil fertility by allowing crop residues to decompose, intercropping, e.g., maize and beans, mixed cropping, zero tillage, and fallowing. The main reasons why some practices had been abandoned included modern farming such as ploughing using tractors and ox-plough, high cost of weed and pest control, and the perception that intercropping reduces plant population per unit area resulting in low productivity, introduction of mechanization had also made farmers to abandon intercropping, diseases and pests have made farmers to stop practicing mixed cropping because different crops are attacked by different pests and diseases, zero tillage is not practiced because farmers and experts perceive that the soil is exhausted and that there is need to plough deep in order to mix the inner and upper soil, fallowing is not feasible any more due to reduction in land sizes.

Common crop management practices in Kilolo as reported by experts were: use of power tillers although hand-hoes are still common; crop rotation; use of herbicides and pesticides; mixing the soil with pesticides; large-scale farmers are using seeders for planting; improved varieties; farmyard manure is mainly used by farmers who plant local varieties; pest and disease control using local pesticides such as (Itupa, Lidupala, Linung'anung'a, and pepper; and chemical fertilizers such as DAP, CAN, and urea. There were also common livestock practices identified by experts, namely free grazing, tethering, zero grazing in the areas where dairy cattle projects have promoted the technology, e.g., in Mtitu, Lulanzi, and llamba, and pest and disease control. Beyond crop and livestock management, experts indicated that crop rotation, contour ploughing, e.g., in Lulanzi, fallowing, use of compost manure, and construction of ridges were common soil and land management practices.

Important indicators that farmers use to select agricultural practices as identified by experts in Kilolo included: yield, size of the household, capital, prices, land characteristics such as slope, location of the farm, and soil erosion.

Contour ploughing, construction of ridges, terracing, zero tillage, integrated pest management, drip irrigation, and soil testing were the practices recommended for Kilolo by experts. The main crops in the Kilolo District are maize, beans, green peas, Irish potatoes, sweetpotatoes, cabbage, tomatoes, rice, and sunflower.

Five demonstration plots were identified in Kiloloby experts: 1) One Acre Fund, on maize; 2) ClintonFoundation, on soy bean, maize, and sunflower;3) Briteen, on maize; 4) Tanzania Agricultural Partnership(TAP), on maize and vegetables; and Cheetar, on Irishpotatoes. Several challenges were identified with existingdemonstration plots. These were related to:

- Management of the plots and lack of follow up by the initiators.
- Lack of cooperation by extension agents.
- Feedback to farmers is low.
- Low trust for most of the organizations initiating demonstration plots.
- Lack of markets.
- Low participation by farmers.

Experts suggested that the following partners should be involved in new demonstration plots: extension officers, village leaders, and local government authority.

### Experts' workshop in lowlands, Kilolo

Experts in Ilula also classified Kilolo District into three main zones: Kilolo, Ilula, and Ruaha Mbuyuni. The main challenges in Ruaha Mbuyuni were reported as high temperature; frequent drought; high incidence of pests and diseases such as onion thrips, red mites, and caterpillars; strong wind, hence soil erosion because the zone has very little vegetation cover; and low soil fertility. For Ilula, Kilolo, the identified challenges related to less rainfall; unpredictable and delayed rainfall; hard pan of the soil after rains due to soil erosion; high incidence of pests and diseases such as maize stockborer, nematodes, red spider mites, etc.; low soil fertility; farmers are forced to use fertilizers in order to increase yields; loss of pastures; and inadequate amount of water for irrigation.

There were several practices that farmers in Ilula had abandoned. These included storage of seeds using local knowledge of hanging the crop in the kitchen, trap crops, zero tillage, farmyard manure, recycling of seeds, storing maize with the stover, burning crop residue to control pests, use of local pesticides such as Manung'anung'a, cover crops, e.g., pumpkins, and planting more than one seed in a hole especially in maize, beans, and pumpkins. When asked why farmers had abandoned the practices, experts reported low yields observed when farmers planted more than one seed in a hole; extension agents have advised farmers not to use the above practices; it is difficult to weed when maize is intercropped with pumpkins as a cover crop; increased availability of chemical pesticides has reduced the use of local pesticides; unavailability of enough quantity of manure limits the use of the practice; farmers have moved to improved seeds because they mature faster and are also tolerant of climatic shocks; and availability of pesticides has made farmers stop growing trap crops.

Common practices in lowlands, Kilolo, include crop rotation; improved seeds; correct spacing; use of herbicides, pesticides, and fertilizers; irrigation, e.g., drip irrigation, furrow irrigation, etc.; improved storage; pest control in livestock; vaccination of livestock; improved breeds of livestock; improved feeding of livestock, e.g., concentrates; artificial insemination; agroforestry with fruit trees; construction of ridges and bunds; planting star grass to control soil erosion; and contour ploughing. When deciding what practices to implement, experts indicated that farmers consider high yields, markets, time, quality of produce, taste, and availability and accessibility of the technology. When asked about the practices that they would recommend for lowlands, Kilolo, experts reported: improved varieties, improved irrigation, improved breeds, artificial insemination, and water harvesting. The five main crops in lowlands include maize, tomatoes, onions, sunflower, beans, and sesame.

Participants identified one demonstration plot by Muunganisho was Ujasirimali Vijijini (MUVI), which focused on production of tomatoes. The organization worked with a farmer group called Faraja. Both men and women were involved. Main challenges were that participation by farmers was very low because farmers joined the demonstration plot expecting to be paid money; the demonstration plot was very far from the main road; and lack of / delayed delivery of inputs. For new demonstration plots, experts would like the village government, extension agents, farmers, and agro-dealers to be involved.



### Conclusions

CIAT conducted the current study with the purpose of gathering and documenting the indicators that farmers and experts use to prioritize CSA technologies. The study was conducted in Mbarali and Kilolo Districts in the Southern Agricultural Growth Corridor of Tanzania (SAGCOT) as part of the IFAD-funded study titled "Increasing food security and farming system resilience in East Africa through wide-scale adoption of climatesmart agricultural practices."

Using a participatory approach, the study finds that yield, income, cost, labour, availability of inputs and equipment, time, and knowledge are important indicators that farmers use to prioritize agricultural practices that they implement. Prioritization differs by agro-ecological zone and gender, reinforcing that CSA is very context specific. Across the districts, awareness on the prioritized practices, particularly related to soil and land management, was low. Adoption rates for most prioritized practices in both Kilolo and Mbarali was low. There were ongoing demonstration plots in both districts, but demand for new demonstration plots in specific geographical locations was expressed to increase farmers' knowledge on the prioritized practices. Addressing the demand for knowledge on CSA might be helpful to promote adoption and out-scaling. An important channel to achieve this objective is through demonstration plots, especially since there is demand from farmers.

Encouraging uptake will, however, ultimately require focus beyond yield and income to include other important indicators that farmers care about. From a qualitative standpoint, promoting labour-saving, yieldenhancing technologies and making these technologies available is important. From a quantitative point of view, there is need to gather and analyze quantitative data in order to empirically assess factors that explain uptake of CSA as well as to quantify the magnitude of the tradeoffs that adoption of CSA might create.

CIAT is currently collecting data to perform such analysis. Working through local partners, CIAT is also setting up demonstration plots to train farmers on the practices that they prioritize in specific agro-ecological zones.

### References

Mwongera C; Shikuku KM; Winowiecki L; Okolo W; Twyman J; Läderach P. 2014. Climate-Smart Agriculture Rapid Appraisal Report of the Southern Agricultural Growth Corridor of Tanzania. Available at: http://bit.ly/1RjeIj8

Mwongera C; Shikuku KM; Winowiecki L; Twyman J; Läderach P; Ampaire E; van Asten P; Twomlow S. 2015. Climate-smart agriculture rapid appraisal (CSA-RA): A prioritization tool for outscaling CSA – Step-by-step guidelines. International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT). Cali, Colombia. 44 p. (Publication CIAT No. 409). Available at: http://bit.ly/1V9ElTj

### **CIAT Publication No. 415**

Design and layout Production editing Photos

Laura Duque Victoria Eugenia Rengifo Caroline Mwongera, Kelvin M. Shikuku, and CIAT Flickr www.flickr.com/photos/ciat/

Cali, Colombia



ISBN: 978-958-694-157-0 E-ISBN: 978-958-694-158-7