

CIAT experience in eliciting adoption estimates of cassava varieties in Asia

Ricardo Labarta & Tesfamicheal Assfaw

SIAC meeting, Boston, USA

August 3rd 2016



How method improvised, what worked, what didn't?

- Some few adjustments were performed:
- Gathered secondary data available & contacted knowledgeable experts
- Followed three steps to elicit adoption estimates
 - Each expert ranked varieties in descending order for each geographical unit (shared list of improved varieties)
 - Experts split into groups according to geographical expertise & estimated area under each variety for 2014. Then aggregated estimates variety/geographical unit.
 - Experts came back into plenary to achieve consensus of adoption estimates at national level

Challenges

- Availability of data about variety releases, genetic pedigree and in English not well documented. Only breeders managed, but had limited information about adoption rates. How to select right balance experts/other experts
- Technical experts had very localized knowledge and managers did not contribute much, but bosses could not be excluded.
- Language barrier, little knowledge of English and difficult translation
- In some cases some institutions tend to over report the adoption of their own varieties

Confidence in the results

- Most estimates have a narrow confidence interval. In the case of cassava, plant few number of varieties (1-2 dominant)
- Countries like Thailand provided the best estimates as they are based on available national survey results.
- Countries with better information and were diverse experts could be invited seems to provide better estimates.

Cost - benefit

- In general, organizing one workshop per country was not too expensive in most Asian countries (we had 10 CCC)
- Only the activity in Indonesia resulted in a very expensive exercise, given the transport cost involved to bring experts from different regions

Do NARS & CGIAR continue using this method?

- For NARS most experts could continue doing this if combined with other activities. Not fully interested just to estimate adoption. For us worked by combining with research prioritization
- This is an important information for CGIAR and specially for areas where we have no information on CGIAR outcomes or where we do not regularly implement field activities

Expert opinion validation through HH survey in Vietnam

Expert estimate	%
Improved	94.8%
KM94	60.0%
KM140	16.3%
KM98-5	4.4%
KM419	4.1%
KM60	3.3%
Rayong 72	2.8%
Other	4.0%
Landraces	5.2%

Variety Name	English Translation	Total area(ha)	%
Improved			95.2%
Cao San (High yielding)	High yielding	2,836.6	22.3%
Tai Do (Red ear)	Red ear	1,780.3	14.0%
Moi (New)	New	1,106.4	8.7%
Giong (Breeding)	Breeding	1,002.3	7.9%
KM94	KM94	1,000.5	7.8%
cut (Cut)	Cut	449.2	3.5%
Vedan (factory name)	Vedan	423.8	3.3%
Tay Ninh (Tay Ninh)	Tay Ninh	271.4	2.1%
Rau Muong (Spinach)	Spinach	242.0	1.9%
Lai (Hybrid)	Hybrid	97.4	0.8%
Do (Red)	Red	62.7	0.5%
Other improved (70)		2,841.3	22.4%
Landraces			4.8%
La Tre	Bamboo leaf	376.1	3.0%
Xanh	Green	199.4	1.6%
Other land races (5)		23.8	0.2%

