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Step 3: Participatory Validation

• Bringing the results back to the community/territory to validate their accuracy/precision and representative value

• Can be in the form of a community meeting, PRA session, etc.

• Designed to link to Step 0- Characterization of context

• Makes key connections between context features (enabling/disabling environment) and analysis of multi-dimensional performance
Step 3: Participatory Validation

- Bringing the results back to the community/territory to validate their accuracy/precision and representative value

- A chance to weight results and harmonize responses/perceptions

- A chance to share aggregated responses/results (especially the CAET with spider diagrams) and receive feedback on why results are the way they are

- Many options to use PRA methodologies (e.g. community mapping, ranking, SWOT, etc.)
Step 3: Participatory Validation

- Bringing the results back to the community/territory to validate their accuracy/precision and representative value
- A chance to discuss next steps and wider territorial/food system linkages
- Could be a chance to invite local/provincial/national policy makers and other stakeholders
  - Extension agents, CSOs, farmer organizations, etc.
- Could be an opportunity to strengthen enabling factors and reduce disabling factors
  - Policies, extension, coordination, projects, etc.
- Could be a chance to discuss food systems hopes/fears/opportunities/threats
Step 3: Participatory Validation

• Non-exhaustive list of some key questions you might ask:

• Do results of step 2 (performance) reflect reality for the different production systems in the territory?
• Are all production systems well depicted by the results of CAET? In case a typology was applied to the sample of farms (step 1 bis), are results interpretable and farm types useful? Should they be revised?
• Do results of step 1 (CAET) explain the performances (step 2)? (e.g. higher diversity and synergies lead to higher income; higher score in social values lead to higher women empowerment etc.)
• Do CAET results reflect reality or should there be weights applied to specific indices within each element to give them more relative importance?
Step 3: Participatory Validation

• Non-exhaustive list of some key questions you might ask:

• Are recommended thresholds for traffic light approach to performance adequate or should they be revised (e.g. green light allocated to lower minimum biodiversity score if the environment is typically/naturally less diverse like drylands compared to humid forest for example)

• What recommendations can be made to improve CAET scores and performances? (e.g. diversify access to market, improve access to platforms of knowledge, introduce a specific regulation etc.)

• .....