IPSI Case Study Summary Sheet

Basic Information

Title of case study *(should be concise and within approximately 25 words)*	
Assessing farmers' perceptions of resilience of socio-ecological production landscapes in central and eastern Kenya	
Submitting IPSI member organization(s)	
Bioversity International	
Other contributing organization(s) *(IPSI members and/or non-members)*	
Kenya Resource Centre for Indigenous Knowledge (KENRIK), The National Museums of Kenya (NMK)	
Author(s) and affiliation(s)	
Yasuyuki Morimoto, Bioversity International; Patrick Maundu, Kenya Resource Centre for Indigenous Knowledge (KENRIK), The National Museums of Kenya (NMK); Dunja Mijatovic, Bioversity International; Nadia Bergamini, Bioversity International; Pablo Eyzaguirre, Bioversity International	

Format of case study *(manuscript or audiovisual)*	Manuscript	Language	English
Keywords *(3-5 key concepts included in the case study)*			
farmers' perceptions, resilience indicators, resilience assessment, socio-ecological production landscapes and seascape (SEPLS), Kenya			
Date of submission *(or update, if this is an update of an existing case study)*	22 December 2015		
Web link *(of the case study or lead organization if available for more information)*			

Geographical Information

Country *(where site(s) or activities described in the case study are located – can be multiple, or even "global")*							
Kenya							
Location(s) *(within the country or countries – leave blank if specific location(s) cannot be identified)*							
East and Central Kenya							
Longitude/latitude or Google Maps link *(if location is identified)*							
https://www.google.com/maps/@-1.2100743,37.0398254,10z							
Ecosystem(s) *(please place an "x" in all appropriate boxes)*							
Forest	x	Grassland		Agricultural	x	In-land water		Coastal	
Dryland	x	Mountain		Urban/peri-urban	x	Other (Please specify)	

Socioeconomic and environmental characteristics of the area *(within 50 words)*	
The study was carried out in five communities, with characteristics from cool, humid highlands to hot semi-arid lowlands. All communities are highly agricultural, with other socio-economic pursuits as well.	
Description of human-nature interactions in the area *(land-use, traditional resource management practices etc. – within 50 words)*	
Primarily agricultural.	

Contents

Status *("ongoing" or "completed")*	Completed	Period *(MM/YY to MM/YY)*	03/2012

Rationale *(why activities or policies described, or information shared in the case study are needed – within 50 words)*

When an environment is degraded, many of the benefits that ecosystems provide to local communities and agricultural production are also degraded, food security is compromised and resilience is reduced. Local communities, as the primary managers of the processes and resources of Socio-Ecological Production Landscapes and Seascapes (SEPLS) face growing challenges in maintaining these systems, especially in the face of rapid socio-economic changes and increasing uncertainty regarding the natural environment due to climate change and its impacts.

Objectives *(goals of activities or policies described, or of producing the case study – within 50 words)*

In order to build resilient systems that can mitigate and manage risks, while securing healthy ecosystems and the well-being of local communities, the United Nations University Institute of Advanced Studies and Bioversity International developed an approach for monitoring and capturing the various aspects that sustain resilient landscapes using specific indicators.

Activities and/or practices employed *(within 50 words)*

This paper presents a practical application of SEPLS indicators and experiences and lessons gained in the process. It also presents the results of participatory mapping, Focus Group Discussions (FGD) and data assessment to elucidate farmers' perceptions regarding the status of SEPLS resilience across different landscapes in the five selected communities in Kenya.

Results *(within 50 words)*

The SEPLS assessment was confirmed valuable in: 1) identifying local perceptions of threats in landscape resilience, perception differences in various community landscapes, major causes of threats and community efforts toward mitigation, 2) improving awareness through stimulating discussions with participants, and 3) providing perspectives on future directions and encouraging local innovations and potential interventions in response to negative trends.

Lessons learned *(factors in success or failure, challenges and opportunities – within 40 words)*

A group of 6-7 participants was found appropriate for managing and facilitating discussions but insufficient for statistical data assessment of the scores. Target study communities need to be identified strategically taking into consideration the climatic, geographical and socio-cultural characteristics of the community. Periodic use of these indicators is also considered helpful. The indicators and questions need tailor-made modifications depending on local contexts and type of participants. Training facilitators is considered important in order to minimize variations caused by the way questions are administered to participants.

Key messages *(within 40 words)*

Identified solutions and recommendations should be maintained within communities and followed through based on enhanced cooperation among community stakeholders that would then develop an implementation strategy for the proposed interventions through a coordinating body or committee. With time, this indicator survey would need to move the focus from understanding the status of community resilience to research aimed at understanding the sustainable use of the interventions and the dynamic process of maintaining local crop and production landscape diversity.

Relationship to other IPSI activities *(if the case study is related to any other IPSI collaborative activities, case studies, etc.)*

This case study originally appeared in the Satoyama Initiative Thematic Review v. 1. The study is related to the "Indicators of Resilience in Socio-ecological Production Landscapes and Seascapes" project.

Contributions to Global Agendas

CBD Aichi Biodiversity Targets (https://www.cbd.int/sp/targets/)
The table below shows based on the self-evaluation by author(s). ● and ■ indicates the "direct" or "indirect" contributions to the CBD's Aichi Biodiversity Targets respectively to which the work described in this case study contributes to.

Strategic Goal A				Strategic Goal B					
●	■	■	■	■	■	■	■		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Strategic Goal C			Strategic Goal D			Strategic Goal E			
■	■	■	■	■		■	■	●	
11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20

UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdgs)
The table below shows based on the self-evaluation by author(s). ● and ■ indicates the "direct" or "indirect" contributions to the SDGs respectively to which the work described in this case study contributes to.

■	●	■		■			■	■
1 NO POVERTY	2 ZERO HUNGER	3 GOOD HEALTH AND WELL-BEING	4 QUALITY EDUCATION	5 GENDER EQUALITY	6 CLEAN WATER AND SANITATION	7 AFFORDABLE AND CLEAN ENERGY	8 DECENT WORK AND ECONOMIC GROWTH	9 INDUSTRY, INNOVATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE
		■	■		■	■	■	
10 REDUCED INEQUALITIES	11 SUSTAINABLE CITIES AND COMMUNITIES	12 RESPONSIBLE CONSUMPTION AND PRODUCTION	13 CLIMATE ACTION	14 LIFE BELOW WATER	15 LIFE ON LAND	16 PEACE, JUSTICE AND STRONG INSTITUTIONS	17 PARTNERSHIPS FOR THE GOALS	