



ACGG FRAMEWORK

SITE SELECTION

This is the first in a series of frameworks designed to guide in the development of standard protocols across the ACGG country teams. This framework is focused on the selection of program sites.

ACGG FRAMEWORK

SITE SELECTION

Overview

This first framework is designed to support countries in the initial selection of ACGG sites where activities will take place. **It is a live document which will be updated to reflect the final process followed by countries and site lists.** The overall goal of the ACGG program is to empower more than 7,500 smallholder farming households, most of whom will be women. To achieve this goal, these households must be strategically selected from multiple agro-ecological zones in Tanzania, Nigeria, and Ethiopia.

ACGG will encompass 5 sub-national areas per program country. Within these sub-national zones, 2-5 smaller ‘districts’ per area will be selected. If these ‘districts’ are large and it is not possible for the team to work across the whole area then a number (1-2) of village clusters (‘sub-districts’) will be selected. The clusters will be geographical areas that should contain no more than 30 – 40 villages, and capture the agro-ecological variation (in terms of chicken production system, agro-ecological zone (AEZ)) of the district; these clusters may be a lower level of administrative division within the country. Within these clusters, 2-4 villages will be randomly selected. See the Summary section below for details of the process.

Activities within the program sites include baselining and on-farm testing and monitoring. An initial baseline in ACGG sites will be followed by on-farm testing involving approximately 2,500 households per country. ACGG country teams will ensure that the participation of these households will be based on interest to participate in the project through prior informed consent, willingness to participate in the data collection schemes, and ability to provide the basic husbandry and scavenging feed resources.

ACGG FRAMEWORKS

This is the first in a series of frameworks to guide the work of the ACGG country teams. These frameworks will contain the information and protocols necessary to enable the ACGG country teams to follow standardized protocols. This standardized approach will allow for cross-country comparison, and most importantly, the protocols are a critical tool for developing a comprehensive and comparable dataset within each country, enabling comparisons across sub-national areas, districts, households, etc.

Level of selection (proposed numbers in brackets)	Nigeria	Tanzania	Ethiopia
Sub-national Area	State (5)	Region (5)	Region (5)
District (no. per SN area)	SD (3)	District (4)	Zone (2-5)
Village Cluster (< 30-40 villages) (no. per ‘district’)	LGA (2)	N/A	Woreda (1-2)
Villages (no. per ‘village cluster’)	Village (2)*	Village (4)	Kebele (2-3)
Total villages (see embedded xls)	60	80	63

*Nigeria villages may be small so a ‘village’ can be a small cluster which holds 200 – 500 households

TARGET POPULATION & GEOGRAPHICAL COVERAGE

The vision of this program is to catalyze smallholder chicken productivity growth as a pathway out of poverty in sub-Saharan Africa. Therefore, smallholder poultry producers in Nigeria, Tanzania, and Ethiopia are the target beneficiaries. This work will directly target low-input chicken farmers living off of less than \$2.00 per day, with an emphasis on impacting farmers living on less than \$1.25 per day. With a per capita income of \$470 in Ethiopia and \$695 in Tanzania (World Bank), there is little risk of targeting beneficiaries that fall outside of the targeted income range. The baseline survey will be conducted on a random selection of chicken producing households. However, for the on-farm testing and monitoring phase we expect that within the target of poor farmers there will be a self-selection aspect where farmers who are willing and able to participate in the project (e.g. can manage 20 or more chickens, have some ability to meet additional chicken house / supplementary feeding needs of differing breeds) and have potential to become more market orientated will be involved. Ideally, our on-farm testing households will also include some of the baselined households to give more opportunities for intra-village analysis of changes over the ACGG program duration. More details about the select of both baseline and on-farm monitoring households will be described in greater detail in their respective framework documents.

The methods and criteria applied to select sub-national areas and districts below implies that results from the program are generally applicable across all similar agro-ecological situations (e.g. relatively high chicken population, relatively high percentage of production from smallholders rather than commercial and sufficiency of feed supplies) within each country.

Below is a guideline for how to manage the process of ACGG site selection and the use of these guidelines will enable ACGG to facilitate a similar methodology across all three ACGG countries. Note that this program has decided not to identify 'control' sites of villages and households to provide the with / without counterfactual, although we recognize that the baseline activities and any follow-up end-year survey will therefore only demonstrate the before / after assessment of changes in program sites. However, our primary focus is on on-farm testing and monitoring the performance of different chicken breeds; and ultimately making recommendations of the best performing in different situations. The design of this on-farm testing will incorporate elements of random allocation of breeds to households (similar to an RCT) providing the appropriate counter-factual (with/without and before/after) for this program.

N.B. A key change from the previous version of this document is that all ACGG program villages will be utilized for both baseline activities and on-farm testing. As the program involves large amounts of village sensitization and other inter-linked activities it would be overly challenging to baseline only a subset of program villages. However, if sufficient households for on-farm testing are not found within program villages then the country teams together with the ACGG program team should discuss including neighbouring (to program) villages, with similar agro-ecology, and treating these paired villages as a single unit, the additional logistics and sensitization costs of this should be minimal due to closeness and linkages between these villages.

Sub-national Area Selection

After discussions during the ACGG planning workshop in May 2014 the recommended number of sub-national areas in each country are five. While this number can be adjusted to suit the individual needs of each country team, the general recommendation is five due to the perceived cost/benefit of maintaining diversity while still prioritizing efforts on high-potential areas. As discussed, sub-national selection is critical, and the country teams should strive to maintain diversity within the selected sites while also remaining cost effective. Below are the suggested criteria for sub-national area selection:

- i. **NUMBER OF CHICKEN:** The inclusion of this metric is to ensure that there is an active chicken sector in the selected zones. A large number of birds will enable ACGG to reach scale, more easily facilitate smallholder access to inputs, and attract private sector engagement. *Data source may be global spatial (GIS) layers for chicken population and/or country livestock census data.*
- ii. **NUMBER OF (SMALLHOLDER) HOUSEHOLDS REARING CHICKEN:** Similar to the metric above, the number of households rearing chicken will enable ACGG to reach scale and capture private sector interest and engagement in the region. In addition, considering the number of households rearing chicken will ensure that ACGG focuses on areas where smallholders are dominant. Therefore, the prioritized sub-nationals should have both a relatively high number of chicken, a high number of households rearing chicken and local market opportunity. *Data source may be a combination of population census information (or global spatial GIS layer for population or number of households) and regional estimates of percentage of households rearing chicken.*
- iii. **PERCENT CONTRIBUTION OF CHICKEN TO HOUSEHOLD INCOME/NUTRITION:** While a focus on only chicken at the smallholder level is rare, it is important that households are already considering chicken as an income generating activity. While this contribution may be relatively low, this work will be much more successful if ACGG is working with participants that acknowledge the value of chicken, and therefore, are interested in providing the necessary inputs for testing. An additional indicator related to this may be a cultural ranking of the importance of chicken to the household and community. *Data source for this may be nutritional briefs and/or research reports.*
- iv. **PERCENT MARKET SHARE CAPTURED BY SMALLHOLDERS:** This metric is to ensure that there is an existing level of market potential for smallholders while at the same time considering the level of domination of the commercial sector in the area. While the future potential for smallholder growth is important, there needs to be an existing market opportunity for the program to leverage. *Data source for this likely to be key-informant estimation of the level of dominance by the commercial section in area.*
- v. **AVAILABILITY OF FEED RESOURCES FOR A GROWING CHICKEN INDUSTRY:** Due to the potential for an increase in feed demands as improved breeds are introduced, there should be sufficient levels of access to feed inputs. These feed resources can be grown, imported, etc., but there needs to be a level of existing access to ensure that chicken and humans are not competing for extremely scarce resources. *Data source for this factor may be general production figures for relevant grain-domestic commodity reports and/or FAOStat.*

- vi. **DIVERSITY ACROSS SUB-NATIONALS:** In the interest of diversifying testing across a number of production environments and geographies in each country, it is advised that the selected zones should represent a minimum of two agro ecological zones and if possible, five agro ecological zones.

Once the sub-national areas have been prioritized, the project teams need to strategically finalize the sub-national selection. For example, consider issues in the final selection such as whether or not the program teams can cost effectively access the selected zones, consider security concerns, distance from headquarters, and other such logistical issues. These aspects are to be added to the ranking of areas for selection.

District Selection

District selection should follow a similar methodology as sub-national level selection. Districts should be prioritized by the above criteria i-vi plus additional considerations. Once prioritized, country teams should apply country specific criteria for the final selection. For example, districts should be strategically selected to be reasonably accessible and safe for research teams to work. Districts will likely be selected as high potential areas within a zone because if the project is successful, these five districts will likely serve as the zone “hubs” for a more comprehensive second phase of work.

Village Selection

The procedure for sub-national and district selection should be highly strategic. While this level of strategic thinking should be integrated and considered when selecting village clusters and villages within these, relationship building will be critical in the success of village selection as well as maintaining an element of random selection to ensure representativeness and potential for scaling-out initiatives later.

It is recommended that teams first select clusters of villages (‘sub-areas’) within districts. A cluster is likely to be the lowest level of administrative unit larger than a village and should contain no more than 30 – 40 villages. The clusters should represent the variation in agro-ecological situation within a district and hence if more than one agro-ecological situation occurs in a district then at least one cluster should fall in each situation.

A long-list of villages should then be randomly selected within this cluster (at least twice as many as will be needed in the project). The criteria which can be used to assess which village from this list should become an ACGG village are: accessibility and interest of the village heads and elders. Accessibility may also be considered but the team should be cautious in excluding a village with low accessibility as this usually translates into low access of market. Key activities of ACGG involve connecting households to market and therefore our sites should include all types of villages and especially so those with currently low access. The process for dropping villages from the long-list should be carefully documented and evidenced (e.g. if dropping a village because the village head and elders are not wanting to work with the project should be done AFTER meeting with them and explaining the project).

Remarks!

As discussed above, this document provides guidelines for site selection, but each country team will likely need to modify and adjust their methodology/approach as is appropriate for the nature of their country of focus. Therefore, the planned procedure of each country team should be discussed with the ACGG program team prior to implementation, documented for transparency, and as always, use the ACGG program team as a resource for support.

Once selection is complete, the ACGG program team together with country teams will design baseline activities (household level and focus group discussions (FGD)) on factors dictating chicken germplasm choices, husbandry practices, current breed diversity and preferences, chicken on-farm performance, and socio-economic data. This baseline will characterize the production systems, gender targets, etc., and the results of this baseline survey will be critical in informing the on-farm testing implementation plan.

Throughout this process of site selection, baseline data collection, and on-farm testing, each country team should maintain thorough and up-to-date documentation of their methodologies and implementation procedures. Such recording will result in transparency, contribute to good governance, and will enable our teams to appropriately record, analyze, and report against the program data.

Summary

Process Steps	Criteria	Target number
Select sub-national areas	Scored criteria	5
Select districts within sub-national areas	Scored criteria	2 - 5 per sub-national area (depending on size of area)
Select clusters of villages (sub-districts) <u>if required</u>	Random*	2 – 3 per 'District'
Select long list of villages	Random	6 - 10 per cluster
Select final list of villages	Random	3 - 2 per cluster (i.e. opposite of village cluster)

*If a district varies in its agro-ecology then first divide the district into different agro-ecologies and then ensure at least one cluster is selected from each. The 2 – 3 cluster range is applicable in cases where there are 3 agro-ecologies in a district, if only 2 then for logistical purposes it will be adequate to take only 2 clusters of villages, each with 3 villages.

Total number of ACGG villages should aim to be between 60 and 80 villages

The embedded spreadsheet may be used to track ACGG site selection:



ACGG-SiteSelection
Info_28Dec15.xlsx