

Documentation and Evaluation of SLM technologies in the Akagera TAMP: Case Studies in Rwanda



**BY
KAGABO DESIRE & GUY NGENZI
SLM SPECIALISTS,
RWANDA**

Contents



- 1. Background of SLM technologies in RWANDA**
- 2. Objectives of QT & QA**
- 3. Methodology of SM technology documentation and evaluation**
- 4. Case studies of SM technology documentation and evaluation**
- 5. Problems, pitfalls and possibilities (lessons)**

Mandate of the study



Documentation of Best SLM Technologies in six districts under TAMP area mandate Using QT and QA of WOCAT

Covered district are:

Nyagatare, Kayonza, Kirehe, Bugesera, Kamonyi and Rulindo

Documented technologies and districts



		Technologies
1	Kanyonza	1 Tied Ridging 2 Tumbukiza pits 3 Zero tillage
2	Bugesera	1 Infiltration Ditches 2 Trash lines 3 Ridging
3	Kirehe	1 Mulching 2 Ridge and Furrow system 3 Trench farming
4	Rulindo	1 Radical terraces 2 Contour stone bands/ditches 3 Grass strips
5	Kamonyi	1 Contour bands 2 Compost and Manure 3 Hedgerow intercropping
6	Nyagatare	1 Cover crop 2 Water Ponds 3 Roof water harvesting

Methodology



1. Sites for the survey were selected in advance by the Akagera TAMP coordinating Unit in Kigali
2. 18 SLM technologies across six districts were planned to be documented using WOCAT tools.
3. Prior to the documentation process, SLM technologies were identified through an extensive review of existing SLM technologies in Rwanda.
4. In each district three SLM technologies were surveyed, but only two technologies are reported here.
5. Due to technical difficulties encountered during the survey at least in each district 2 technologies ($2 \times 6 = 12$ technologies).

Methodology



1. Selection of enumerators:

- In total 12 enumerators were selected based on their background in SLM.
- Other 6 SLM experts from different ministerial departments were also trained
- 2 enumerators were assigned in each district
- Enumerators were required to complete 1 QT and QA in 2 days
- Only 6 days were allocated to enumerators to complete the survey of 3 technologies and 3 approaches.

2. A training workshop of enumerators:

- 2 days for training
- 1 day for pre-testing of QT and QA questionnaires , data collected during the pre-testing process were thoroughly corrected by supervisors here referred as SLM experts.
- Thereafter a plenary session was organised for questions, concerns and final briefing.

Methodology



- 1. The training had the following objectives:**
 - i. Introduction to WOCAT tools and methods,
 - ii. Use of WOCAT Questionnaire Technology (QT) and Approach (QA) for data collection
 - iii. Examination of the contents of QT & QA and clarifications of ambiguous or 'difficult' questions,
 - iv. Explain what to do when data were lacking

Results in Summary sheets



See attached word document

Problems, pitfalls and possibilities (lessons)



- QT & QA ask many questions that are difficult to answer quantitatively.
- Enumerators have never had any kind of exposure to WOCAT, so the training was more of a teaching/indeed a hard exercise.
- Poor level of quantitative knowledge among field soil and water conservation specialists/ district agriculture specialists.
- Collected figures by enumerators in the questionnaires were inaccurate or simply inconsistent leading to several cross-checking, and referred back to the enumerators until a reasonable level of credibility was achieved
- Several of the enumerators found the questionnaires long and tiresome.
- Scarcity of information

Lessons



1. First lesson:

1. There must be enough time dedicated to the training of enumerators
2. An experienced SLM expert should be available to work hand in hand with field enumerators or simply hire SLM specialists do conduct the survey.
3. There was inadequate time allocated to the completion of questionnaires in the field.

2. Second lesson:

1. Data must be carefully cross-checked after submission of questionnaires by experienced SLM specialist since there are always a number of dubious answers given, and sometimes there are obvious contradictions and in some cases some questions are simply overlooked.

3. Third lessons:

1. Lack of readily available facts or figures may lead to the problem of inaccurate estimates and guesses

Recommendation:

WOCAT methodologies/approaches should be imbedded in the project to ensure that relevant data are gradually collected rather than being demanded abruptly and with inadequate preparation

Bench terraces development in Rwanda, Musanze-Rwaza

