

# **Complex systems, simple solutions? Evaluating technologies for sustainable intensification in Northern Ghana** Mirja Michalscheck and Jeroen Groot (WUR)

### Key messages

Investigating inter- and intra-household differences provides **new insights** on technology adoption



- High investment costs incapacitate low resource endowed (LRE) households (HHs) to reach more profitable farm configurations
- Within HHs: Women were more positive than men; while there  $\checkmark$ was a greater match of model results with the male perspective

# **Objectives and approach**

Farming systems are diverse and not all technologies are equally suitable for each farm(er). To better understand the individual suitability we systematically visited farm HHs in Northern Ghana. We used **typologies**, **whole-farm modelling** (n=9) and a **weighted** scoring technique to quantify differences in views and benefits among and within local smallholder farms.

## **Key results**

Table 1: Africa RISING (AR) technology packages (2015/2016)					
AR Technologies at Baby Trial Stage	Upscaled AR Technologies				
P1: Optimized Fertilizer Application on Maize	P4: Maize-Legume Rotations				
P2: Optimized Spraying Regimes on Cowpea	P5: Maize-Legume Strip Cropping				
P3: Integrated Soil Fertility Management on Soybeans					



The communities recommended to "ask the male household head, his wife and the oldest son or daughter. They are like the three stones under a fire.

#### Table 2: Weighted scoring technique for an evaluation by individual HH members

Why? How does the technology perform in your view in terms of						ns of (-10 to ·	+10)		
Africa RISING technology	-10 = very poor, -1 = slightly negative, 0 = neutral compared to other tech's +1 = slightly positive and +10 = excellent/or								
rando nisinta recumology	Affordability	Labour	Acceptability	Accessibility	Ease of application	Increase of yields	Improvement of soil fertility	Improveme in product quality	
How important are these aspects for you?									
0 = not important									
1= low importance	3	3	1	3	2	3	2	1	
2= medium importance									
3 = high importance	X	×	×		×	×	×	×	
P1: NPK/SA on maize	-2	-5	0	5	8	10	7	6	
P2: Spraying on cowpea									
P3: ISFM Soybean									
	V	Ý	V	4	↓ ↓	V	4	↓	
P5: Maize-legume Strip Cropping	-6	-15	0	15	16	30	14	6	

Mal		Male HHH/Son	Wife/Female HHH	Oldest Son/Daughter Evaluation by Son		
		Evaluation by HHH	Evaluation by Wife			
		300	80	80		
	ш					

Farm HHs were classified along a gradient of resource endowment (LRE, MRE and HRE). The model assessment projects LRE HHs to **benefit most** (%) from the technology packages, provided that investment costs are procured. MRE HHs were most and HRE HHs least positive about the AR packages. Farmers reported to **adopt** techniques rather than technologies. Broadly adopted techniques include row planting, techniques and timing for fertilizer application, crop spacing and the use of green manures.

# Significance and scaling potential

A better understanding of **farm and farmer diversity** allows **efficient** targeting and a nuanced impact assessment of technologies (technical) and techniques (managerial). The approach is useful **for** development projects and businesses that want to test or promote new technologies or techniques among smallholder farmers.















NTERNATIONAL FOOD POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE



Farming Systems

Ecology Group (WUR)



We thank farmers and local partners in Africa RISING sites for their contributions to this research. We also acknowledge the support of all donors which globally support the work of the CGIAR centers and their partners through their contributions to the <u>CGIAR system</u>



This poster is licensed for use under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Licence. January 2017



