

Activity 3 Synthesis and Reporting

Work Package 1

Abuja, Nigeria, March 2019

Hale TUFAN, Cornell University, New York, USA

Lora FORSYTHE, National Resources Institute (NRI), University of Greenwich, UK



This report has been written in the framework of RTBfoods project.

To be cited as:

Hale TUFAN, Lora FORSYTHE, (2019). *Activity 3 Synthesis and Reporting. Work Package 1*. New York, USA: RTBfoods Project Report, 21 p.

Ethics: The activities, which led to the production of this manual, were assessed and approved by the CIRAD Ethics Committee (H2020 ethics self-assessment procedure). When relevant, samples were prepared according to good hygiene and manufacturing practices. When external participants were involved in an activity, they were priorly informed about the objective of the activity and explained that their participation was entirely voluntary, that they could stop the interview at any point and that their responses would be anonymous and securely stored by the research team for research purposes. Written consent (signature) was systematically sought from sensory panelists and from consumers participating in activities.

Acknowledgments: This work was supported by the RTBfoods project <https://rtbfoods.cirad.fr>, through a grant OPP1178942: Breeding RTB products for end user preferences (RTBfoods), to the French Agricultural Research Centre for International Development (CIRAD), Montpellier, France, by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF).

Image cover page © LAJOUS P. for RTBfoods.

CONTENTS

Table of Contents

1. Activity 3 Output.....	6
2. Activity 3 WP1 Product Profile	8
3. Results Synthesis: Bringing It All Together	10
4. Guidance and Reporting Template	14
5. Timeline	17



WP1: Activity 3 Synthesis and Reporting

Hale TUFAN, Cornell University

Lora FORSYTHE, NRI

RTBfoods 1st Annual Meeting, March 2019, Abuja, Nigeria

© D. Dufour

- Activity 3 output
- Activity 3 WP1 Product Profile
- Results synthesis: bringing it all together
- Guidance and reporting template
- Timeline

1. ACTIVITY 3 OUTPUT

Activity 3 output

- Report in the template provided - It will help with consistency between partner reports and synthesising the results across countries.
- Structured according to themes that run across the tools
 - Guidance document will help 'speed up' the synthesis: defines the themes and the tool + questions that correspond to the theme.
- Separate chapter for market data
- Start with the Activity 3 WP1 Product Profile (Day 1) – see next slide

2. ACTIVITY 3 WP1 PRODUCT PROFILE

Activity 3 Product Profile for the report

- Analyse characteristic data from individual interviews
- Analysis results in approx. four tables (women, men, region x, region Y). Depending on the number of characteristics, you may want to separate the tables by category of characteristic (raw, processing, final etc)
- Analyse the FGD characteristics questions and compare and contrast against the tables
- The tables will then need to be interpreted – because there may be contradictions in findings or difficulty with prioritisation.
- We don't think one approach can be made – therefore once you have your tables, please forward to Lora and we can organise a 'clinic' over skype to go through the tables together – perhaps drawing on other stakeholders (e.g. WP2, product champions, breeder etc and agree on final list and prioritisation (taken into account gender and socio-economic priorities)

3. RESULTS SYNTHESIS: BRINGING IT ALL TOGETHER

Results synthesis: bringing it all together

- Structured according to themes that run across the tools, for example:
 - Social segmentation
 - Gender and decision making
 - Important characteristics
 - crop, the raw material for the product, processing and final product
 - Good and bad varieties
- Using more than one tool for 'similar' questions allows for triangulation of the results– but can raise issues if the results disagree!
- Disagreement in the data is important to document as it tells us about how well our methods worked and also different opinions among communities – which is bound to happen!
 - If there are differences in opinions it is a valuable finding and has important implications for breeding

Example: social segmentation

Social segmentation*

- KII Q2 description of different groups in the community and proportion.
- KII Q3 community wealth categories and socio-cultural demographics.
- FGD Q3 different wealth categories in the community and socio-cultural demographics
- FGD Q4 farming practices and social segmentation
 - Differences in the way people farm and their relation to different social segments
 - Farm management and gender (shared or separate plots), similarities and differences

‘Good’ crop characteristics (in general) and multiple use*

- FGD Q7 characteristics make it a good crop in general (open) and rank.
- FGD Q9 decision making of crop when it is used for multiple purposes
- II Q14 characteristics make it a good crop in general (open) and rank. Same as spouse?
- II Q17 decision making of crop when it is used for multiple purposes

*Question numbers may differ

Results synthesis: bringing it all together

I would approach by working theme by theme:

- Identify the questions relevant to the theme and decide how the results needs to be analysed (qual or quant)
- Analyse results for all of the questions under the theme
- Compare and contrast responses and use questions in the guidance to help interrogate the data
- Write up and move to the next theme

**PLEASE USE THE GUIDANCE AND THE
TEMPLATE**

4. GUIDANCE AND REPORTING TEMPLATE

FINDINGS: SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONTEXT AND PRODUCT PREFERENCES

Livelihood, gender and social segmentation

KII Q2 Discuss social segmentation in the communities + FGD Q2 Discuss livelihood activities in the communities:

- Provide table and supportive text on proportions if available
- What were the similarities between communities?
- What were the differences?
- Why may there be differences between the communities? e.g. communities in the southern region may have said that migrant/non-migrant were important social segments, as that region had experienced high migration from a country on the south border.
- Provide examples and quotes to provide evidence
- Highlight briefly in this section why this influenced (or not) food/product characteristics

FARMING

KII Q3

- Provide table and supportive text on different types of farmers and proportions if available
- What were the similarities between communities? What were the differences? Why?
- Provide examples and quotes to provide evidence
- How does this influence the relationship to the crop, product and their preferences? The latter

Marketing system – community perspective

- Background to marketing system (focus on community/rural level)
 - General information (also based on literature)
 - Socio-economic information
- Proportion of crop sold (Q15)
- During transport and storage what are the important characteristics that affect the product (Q25)
- Drivers of change, regarding (a) demand for product in general, (b) major characteristics of product (Q27)
- Demographics of demand (consumer segments) (Q29)
- Preferred crop characteristics for main demand (Q30)

5. TIMELINE

Timeline

- We need to improve our adherence to timelines as a work package
- This information is required for WP2 and should inform activity 4 and 5 work.
- A full report is required - not just characteristics! Market and gender analysis complete too!
- If there is dedicated staff time, it is feasible to submit the first full draft for Activity 3 report by **1 May 2018**
- Final reports due by **1 June, 2018**
- Talk to Hale if this is not feasible to discuss possible revisions to the timeline



Thank you!

Contact:

Lora Forsythe
l.forsythe@gre.ac.uk



Discussion

The numbers of the questions can vary depending on the country.

This is priority information. At the end of the day, all the questions need to be analysed.

Adjust questionnaire if needed.

If possible, ensure that half of the interviewees are women, and half are men.

If needed, collect the information again from traders, who are knowledgeable and prepared to share the information (8 traders at village level; 4 traders in medium sized towns; and 4 traders in big cities).

If there are contradictions (e.g. with other report sections), try to interpret why this is the case.

Use Powerpoint (of 19/03/2019) for further clarification on data collection and analysis.



Institution: Cirad – UMR QualiSud

Address: C/O Cathy Méjean, TA-B95/15 - 73 rue Jean-François Breton - 34398
MONTPELLIER Cedex 5 - France

Contact Tel: +33 4 67 61 44 31

Contact Email: rtbfoodspmu@cirad.fr