



HAL
open science

Combining on-farm innovation tracking and participatory prototyping trials to develop legume-based cropping systems in West Africa

Anne Périnelle, Jean-Marc Meynard, Eric Scopel

► To cite this version:

Anne Périnelle, Jean-Marc Meynard, Eric Scopel. Combining on-farm innovation tracking and participatory prototyping trials to develop legume-based cropping systems in West Africa. *Agricultural Systems*, 2021, 187, 10.1016/j.agsy.2020.102978 . hal-03280170

HAL Id: hal-03280170

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-03280170>

Submitted on 15 Dec 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

1 Combining on-farm innovation tracking and participatory prototyping 2 trials to develop legume-based cropping systems in West Africa

3 Authors : Anne Périnelle^{a,b}, Jean-Marc Meynard^c, Eric Scopel^{a,b}

4
5 ^a CIRAD, UPR AIDA, F-34398 Montpellier, France

6 ^b AIDA, Univ Montpellier, CIRAD, Montpellier, France

7 ^c UMR Sad-Apt, INRAE, AgroParisTech, Université Paris-Saclay, 78850 Thiverval-Grignon, France

8

9 Key words: agroecological innovations, participatory evaluation, evaluation criteria, innovative farmers, field-
10 days, intercropping systems

11

12 Abstract

13 In the cotton-production zone of Burkina Faso, poor soil fertility and limited access to
14 appropriate fertilizers call for alternative approaches to sustain productivity, such as the introduction
15 of more legumes into the agroecosystem. Legumes have nearly disappeared from local cropping
16 systems under the pressure of the cotton monocropping model. To develop new legume-based
17 cropping systems using a bottom-up approach, this study was based on local farmers' agroecological
18 innovations. In a first step, called on-farm innovation tracking, five innovative legume-based cropping
19 systems were identified and characterized on farms located in the study area through interviews
20 with "innovative farmers" who had designed and implemented these cropping systems: (i) Sorghum
21 and legume (cowpea, soybean or peanut) intercropping in rotation with maize or cotton; (ii) Soybean
22 as a cash crop in rotation with maize or cotton; (iii) Red cowpea intra-annual succession with a
23 biomass crop; (iv) Mucuna in rotation with maize; and (v) Pigeon pea in rotation with maize. In a
24 second step, these five "innovative cropping systems" (ICSs) were implemented in "participatory
25 prototyping trials" (PPTs) in two communities located in the study area where they were evaluated
26 during field days by local farmers ("field-day farmers") having no previous experience with ICSs. By
27 comparing evaluations made by innovative farmers with those of field-day farmers, it was shown
28 that (i) locally implemented ICSs adapted to local drivers of change are of great interest to other
29 farmers, and (ii) the study's two-step participatory approach is an original and relevant way to co-
30 design and introduce innovations.

31 1. Introduction

32 Soil depletion and reduced productivity are increasing issues faced by farmers in Sub-Saharan
33 Africa (Giller et al., 2011; Ripoche et al., 2015) where chemical fertilizers and biomass return to the
34 soil are insufficient to compensate for nutrient exports (Grillot et al., 2018; Van Vugt et al., 2018). In
35 specialized production areas like the cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum*) production zone of West Africa
36 (Giller, 2001; Ripoche et al., 2015), where land pressure is high (Jahel et al., 2015) and crop diversity
37 is low (mainly maize-cotton rotation, Coulibaly et al., 2012), soil fertility maintenance is a huge
38 challenge.

39 Poor soil fertility and limited access to fertilizers call for alternative approaches to farming,
40 particularly, incorporating more legumes into the agroecosystem. Legumes provide important
41 ecological services (Crews and Peoples, 2004), such as improved soil fertility through nitrogen
42 fixation (Kermah et al., 2018; Giller, 2001), and reduced pest and disease pressure when
43 intercropped or rotated with a non-legume (Gaba et al., 2015). These services result in improved soil
44 health and increased crop productivity (Franke et al., 2018). Furthermore, grain legumes are a good
45 source of protein and essential amino acids, thereby contributing to food and nutrition security (de
46 Jager et al., 2019; Kerr et al., 2007). Legumes can also improve the short-term profitability of the
47 cropping system as the grain often has a high selling price (Muoni et al., 2019).

48 Many projects have tried to incorporate legumes into cropping systems by improving local
49 species management (Ronner et al., 2017; Falconnier et al., 2017), introducing new species, or
50 transferring technologies such as rhizobium inoculation (Wolde-meskel et al., 2018; Rurangwa et al.,
51 2018). However, technological change is difficult for poor farmers who are more risk-averse
52 (Nederlof and Dangbégnon, 2007), especially those living where governments and value-chain
53 stakeholders fail to create an environment favorable to change (Davies et al., 2017). In Burkina Faso's
54 cotton-production zone, the cotton value chain places economic pressure on farmers to monocrop
55 (Bazie et al., 2020), thereby limiting legume integration and innovative cropping systems (Audouin et
56 al., 2018). In such sociotechnical systems (Geels and Schot, 2007; Meynard et al., 2017), it is difficult
57 for scientists to scale-out otherwise appropriate innovations, especially agroecological innovations.

58 Previous studies have attempted to address these challenges by designing innovative
59 solutions with farmers (Vall et al., 2016). Instead of being considered adopters of technology, farmers
60 in this participatory approach are joint drivers of agricultural innovation within the context of their
61 environment (Salembier et al., 2018; Schut et al., 2018). They actively participate in the innovation
62 system (Dolinska and d'Aquino, 2016) by sharing their knowledge with local stakeholders,
63 researchers, and extension agents, to co-design innovative practices or cropping systems (Meynard
64 et al., 2012, Verret et al., 2020). Farmers who help develop these innovative solutions may be the

65 catalysts of change necessary to drive wide-spread adoption within the community, as was shown by
66 Pant and Hambly Odame, 2009 using the theory of positive deviance.

67 One promising participatory approach has been the use of innovation platforms (Dabire et
68 al., 2017; Davies et al., 2017). Innovation platforms aim to stimulate the problem-solving capacity of
69 farmers and other stakeholders. During platform meetings, actors identify and discuss ways to
70 alleviate constraints that prevent innovation adoption. Past studies show this approach is more
71 successful than simply transferring innovations designed by public or private research and
72 development (R&D) to farming communities (Davies et al., 2017). However, innovation platforms can
73 be costly and time-consuming and are rarely sustainable in the absence of a resource-rich local
74 development project (Dabire et al., 2017). When development projects end, the constraints they
75 helped minimize often creep back into the system, compromising the integrity of innovative systems.

76 To avoid this issue, and ensure innovations are sustained, this study sought out farmer
77 innovations already in place (Salembier et al., 2016; Verret et al., 2020). It was hypothesized that if
78 local farmers' innovations have enabled them to address their constraints and capitalize on
79 opportunities (Waters-Bayer and Bayer, 2009), then these innovations can likely overcome other
80 local farmers' constraints.

81 The study objectives were to (i) characterize innovative agroecological legume-based
82 cropping systems designed by local farmers and (ii) assess the potential interest other area farmers
83 had in these innovative systems.

84 To do this, an original two-step approach was implemented. It started by tracking on-farm
85 innovations to identify and describe innovative cropping systems (ICSs) being implemented by local
86 farmers (Salembier et al., 2016; Blanchard et al., 2017). The aim was to understand the link between
87 innovative farmers' production practices, and the rationale behind them, to determine the criteria
88 farmers used to evaluate their production. Then, participatory prototyping trials (PPTs) containing
89 ICSs were set up in two communities, and local farmers were invited to view and discuss the benefits
90 and constraints of the different systems in a collective participatory evaluation process. The
91 researchers then worked to determine whether, and to what extent, farmers would be interested in
92 ICSs. These two-complementary steps have been combined into a new approach to enhance a co-
93 design process of innovative legume-based cropping systems

94 2. Materials and Methods

95 2.1 Context: Studying innovations in the cotton-production area of Burkina Faso

96 The study area of Tuy Province (Figure 1) is characterized by a Sudano-Sahelian climate, with
97 a unimodal rainy season lasting from June to October. Average rainfall ranges between 850 and 950

98 mm per year, with strong inter-annual variability in the amount, duration, and distribution. With
99 ongoing climate change, the rainy season is often starting later, with rains being less frequent and
100 more intense (Ibrahim et al., 2014), thereby, exacerbating erosion and soil depletion. Rains are also
101 becoming erratic and unreliable (Ibrahim et al., 2014), making it difficult for farmers to decide when
102 to sow (Vall et al., 2008).

103 The vast majority of farmers in Tuy Province are smallholders. Farming systems are primarily
104 producing cotton (Coulibaly et al., 2012). In 2018, out of 299 farms randomly selected in Tuy
105 Province, cotton was grown on 40% of the cropped area, maize (*Zea mays*) on 30%, sorghum
106 (*Sorghum bicolor*) on 14%, and legumes (peanut (*Arachis hypogaea*), soybean (*Glycine max*), cowpea
107 (*Vigna unguiculata*), Bambara bean (*Vigna subterranean*)) made up 8% of the cropped area (D.
108 Gautier, CIRAD, unpublished data). Peanut and cowpea are the main legumes cropped, but in very
109 limited areas and quantities compared with other regions of Burkina Faso (Dabat et al., 2012).

110 The cotton-production zone relies on annual rotations of two to three crops, animal traction,
111 fertilizers, and herbicides (Bazie et al., 2020). The main access to fertilizer is through the *Société*
112 *Burkinabè des Fibres Textiles* (SOFITEX). This company contracts farmers to produce cotton, then
113 purchases cotton directly, and in exchange, provides seed and fertilizer in the form of campaign
114 credit and technical support to improve production (Guenot and Huchet-Bourdon, 2014). The credit
115 is reimbursed with cotton production.

116 Unlike pesticides, chemical fertilizers are not easily obtained apart from SOFITEX with priority
117 on cotton production (Porgo et al., 2018). Consequently, farmers who do not crop cotton, find it
118 difficult to obtain mineral fertilizers. Furthermore, to obtain credit, farmers need to be part of a
119 shared liability group (Gray et al., 2018), and such groups are reluctant to include poor and risky
120 farmers.

121 Maize cropping has also increased in the region thanks to its good response to fertilizers,
122 increased home consumption, and a market for its grain. Maize follows the same monocrop
123 intensification pattern as cotton (Guenot and Huchet-Bourdon, 2014), further marginalizing legume
124 crops.

125 In the communities surveyed, livestock farming is mostly practiced by sedentary Fulani
126 herders. Grazing is the rule on non-irrigated land, which makes up the majority of land in the region.
127 After the cotton and cereals have been harvested, cattle and small ruminants are released and graze
128 crop residues and/or crops left in the field throughout the dry season. The animals graze freely until
129 the beginning of the rainy season when farmers start plowing. Farmers do not have enough animals
130 to add manure to all of their fields despite the increasing number of cattle they own (Vall et al., 2017;
131 Zoma-Traoré et al., 2020).

132 2.2 On-farm innovation tracking

133 On-farm innovation tracking was conducted using a methodology adapted from Salembier et al.,
134 2016, which includes (i) characterization of the common practices in the study area, (ii) identification
135 of farmers who implement innovative cropping systems (ICSs) significantly different from common
136 practices, and (iii) characterization of ICSs and identification of the farmers' rationale (evaluation
137 criteria) for implementing ICSs. In the current study, farmers' evaluation criteria were discussed and
138 analyzed in greater detail than previous studies using on-farm innovation tracking (Salembier et al.,
139 2016; Blanchard et al., 2017).

140 Innovation tracking in the current study was conducted in the seven communes of Tuy Province
141 (Figure 1), which is within the cotton-production zone. In each commune, local agricultural extension
142 agents were asked to identify farmers who grew more legumes than most area farmers. They
143 identified 70 farmers, and the research team interviewed the farmers about their legume cropping
144 systems. Cropping systems selected for consideration in further studies were (i) atypical, i.e.,
145 different from legume production in the area (cowpea, soybean, or peanut grown alone on small
146 areas for household consumption (Andrieu et al., 2015; Dugué et al., 2014)) (ii) implemented or
147 improved regularly for several years, and (iii) following agroecological principles (for instance
148 cropping systems with increased used of pesticide or chemical fertilizer compared to common
149 practices were not considered).

150 From the 70 farmers interviewed, 22 were chosen as "innovative farmers" and underwent a
151 further, in-depth interview with the research team about their innovative practices. The in-depth
152 interviews focused on (i) ICS management: the farmer was asked to describe his practices from land
153 selection to selling or consumption; (ii) the rationale behind the ICS: the farmer was asked the
154 reasons why he chose his practices; and (iii) ICS evolution over time: the farmer was asked about the
155 origin of his ICS and its evolution during the last years. Various innovative systems, identified from
156 these interviews, were combined into five promising types of ICS (ICS1 to ICS5 in Table 1), which
157 were demonstrated in participatory prototyping trials (PPTs). Innovative farmers were also asked
158 about their overall farming system, including what other crops they produced and on what area, and
159 how many cattle they have.

160 The reasons given by innovative farmers for their farming choices were used to describe the
161 innovative farmers' evaluation criteria (Tables 2a-2e). For the analysis, a criterion that was
162 considered a constraint or an obstacle to adopting the ICS was classified as "weakness" and a
163 criterion that was considered an opportunity or a motivation to adopting the ICS was classified as
164 "strength" (Table 2 color key). To rate the importance of each criterion for each type of ICS, the

165 number of in-depth interviews in which the criterion was mentioned was counted (summarized in
166 Table 2 color key as "fewer than" or "more than" 50% of the interviews). A criterion considered a
167 weakness by some and strength by others, was rated as "no consensus" (Table 2 color key).
168 Literature on the origins and evolution of the ICSs' was used, along with farmers' interview responses
169 during innovation tracking, to better understand each type of ICSs' novelty and potential benefits.

170 2.3 Participatory workshops and Participatory prototyping trials (PPTS) in two communities

171 Two communities within two different communes of Tuy Province were selected for further
172 participatory activities: Boni (in the Hounde commune, 115 km by road from the main city in the
173 region, Bobo Dioulasso) and Founzan (in the Founzan commune, 145 km by road from Bobo
174 Dioulasso) (Figure 1). These communities were selected primarily because literature detailing their
175 farming systems was available, and connections with community leaders and farmers were
176 established (Coulibaly et al., 2011). Both communities are part of the same agroecosystem in the
177 cotton-production zone. However, Boni is located close to the cotton processing plant, so cotton is
178 very important for farmers, while Founzan is close to a dam, so the farmers produce a wider range of
179 products, including fish and irrigated vegetables.

180 In each community, a contact person was tasked with inviting between 20 and 30 farmers
181 representing a wide range of local farming systems and demographics (low and high resource
182 endowed farmers; cotton farmers, herders and farmers-herders; young and old; male and female) to
183 participatory workshops (Reau et al., 2012) (Table 3). The workshops were used to present the
184 results of on-farm innovation tracking with farmer participants, open up a discussion on the ICSs,
185 introduce the participatory approach of the study, and encourage farmer involvement. One
186 participatory workshop was conducted per community in May just before the 2017 growing season.
187 Farmer participants were then invited to attend field days at the participatory prototyping trial (PPT)
188 in their community.

189 One PPT was set up in each community. The PPTs were set up to generate discussion among
190 farmers by enabling them to see and compare the different cropping systems, including ICSs, within
191 the trial plots. The two trial sites were selected based on ease of access by farmers attending PPT
192 field days, and both held the same field location (belonging to a local farmer) over the two growing
193 seasons (2017 and 2018). The layout of the PPTs was the same for both locations and organized to
194 display a diversity of cropping systems like the matrix in Husson et al., 2016. The layout was not
195 designed for statistical analysis of crop performance, so treatment replications were not included.

196 Sixteen 400 m² plots were set up in each PPT (Table 4). Plots contained either one of the five
197 ICSs, or a sole crop (peanut, cowpea, soybean, sorghum, maize, or cotton), with some plots split into

198 two parts (Table 4). The research team designed and managed the ICSs based on information
199 collected during on-farm innovation tracking, comments made by farmers during participatory
200 workshops, and appropriate agronomic practices. Fertilizers were applied to crops at rates typical for
201 the region (150 kg/ha of NPK 14-23-14 and 50 kg/ha of urea 46% on cotton and maize). Plowing and
202 sowing were done five days later in Founzan than in Boni because cattle grazing was controlled later
203 in Founzan.

204 The first cropping season of the study (2017) is referred to as PPT1, and the second one
205 (2018), as PPT2. In PPT1, six of the 16 plots were sole maize set up on parameter plots to verify soil
206 homogeneity. In PPT1, farmers could easily compare the intercropped species in the ICS plots, with
207 the same species cropped alone on adjacent plots during field days. All the plots had the same
208 previous crop. After year one, the research team provided (for free) legume seeds for farmers to try
209 whatever ICS they wanted on their farm. There was also an evaluation workshop in each community
210 between the two seasons, where the research team presented yields from PPT1 to field-day farmers
211 and held discussions on what improvements could be made for PPT2 in 2018.

212 Changes to PPT2 included: (i) new arrangements for intercropping systems to allow ridging
213 by animal traction; (ii) addition of an earlier variety of pigeon pea; (iii) another ICS (sorghum – red
214 cowpea intercrop) at the request of field-day farmers; and (iv) another check (cotton after maize
215 which is the common rotation in the area) (Table 4). PPT2 was organized to enable field-day farmers
216 to see the carry-over effect of unfertilized legumes (*Mucuna*, pigeon pea, 2 successive cowpea),
217 unfertilized sorghum, and fertilized cotton and maize from PPT1 on the cropping systems in PPT2,
218 and make comparisons.

219 The research team used field days as a multi-step participatory approach to obtaining
220 farmers' evaluations of ICSs. Farmers who attended their community's participatory workshop were
221 invited to visit and comment on the cropping systems demonstrated in PPTs. Some of these farmers
222 had shared what they learned at the participatory workshop with friends and family, leading more
223 farmers to attend the first field day. After the first field day, only farmers who had participated in
224 either a participatory workshop or the first field day were included in the study. Innovative farmers
225 interviewed during the tracking phase did not belong to either of the two communities (except for
226 one farmer from Founzan), so they were not invited to avoid disturbing the local dynamic between
227 farmers from the same community.

228 Three field days were organized in each community: two for PPT1 (one after germination and
229 one just before the main harvest), and one for PPT2 (just before the main harvest) (Table 3). The first
230 field days (Figure 2) (labeled Field-day Intro. in Table 3) occurred at PPT1 in August when plants were
231 young and were used as a presentation of the trial. Each plot was described, and farmers asked
232 questions, but did not evaluate the various cropping systems. Just before harvest, during field

233 evaluation days (labeled Field-day Eval. in Table 3) at PPT1 and PPT2, the farmers were divided into
234 groups of five to 10 to facilitate discussion, and to give each farmer time to speak. There were three
235 groups per community, making a total of six groups per PPT. Women had their own group to allow
236 them to speak freely, while men were randomly mixed into the two other groups.

237 Field evaluation days started with an introduction explaining the purpose of the visit. Then,
238 each ICS was examined plot by plot, starting with ICSs growing common local crops, assuming those
239 would be easiest for farmers to evaluate. The activity leader asked the field-day farmers what they
240 liked or disliked about the ICS they were looking at, and how they would improve it. Questions were
241 purposely open-ended to avoid influencing responses, and farmers were incited to react to others'
242 comments.

243 As the activity leader could not speak any local languages, the research technician translated
244 from French to Dioula—the most widely spoken language in the area—and vice versa. He also
245 assisted the activity leader in answering farmers' questions, giving a voice to every participant
246 (including women and youth), reopening the discussion, or asking for clarification when needed; but
247 always avoided giving his own opinion or evaluation. Farmer discussions were recorded with a voice
248 recorder, and an assistant mastering Dioula was in charge of taking the minutes of farmers'
249 exchanges—especially small spontaneous debates occurring between farmers aside.

250 The day after the visits, the activity recording and the minutes were discussed among the
251 activity leader, technician, and assistant, and compiled. This material was used to describe the field-
252 day farmers' evaluation criteria of the ICSs (Tables 2a-2e). The same method was used to analyze and
253 rate the importance of the field-day farmers' criteria as was used for the innovative farmers' criteria
254 (Table 2 color key): a criterion that was considered a constraint or an obstacle to adopting the ICS
255 was classified as "weakness", and a criterion that was considered an opportunity or a motivation to
256 adopt the ICS was classified as "strength". To rate the importance of each criterion, the number of
257 groups that mentioned the criterion during discussions was counted (summarized in Table 2 color
258 key as "fewer than" or "more than" 50% of the groups). A criterion considered a weakness by some
259 farmers and strength by others was rated as "no consensus" (Table 2 color key). Evaluations between
260 innovative and field-day farmers for each type of ICS were then compared. Contextual information
261 given by farmers (i.g. climate, prices, value chain) was crosschecked with available literature (reports,
262 diagnosis, scientific paper, etc.).

263 2.4 Surveys to characterize field day farmers

264 During the second year of the study (2018), 64 of the 74 farmers who had participated in at
265 least one activity in 2017 were surveyed. Data from this survey were used to analyze the diversity

266 among field-day farmers in regard to their farming systems and endowment. Two important
267 characteristics of the farming systems (Vall et al., 2017) were used to compare field-day farmers,
268 innovative farmers, and 299 randomly selected farmers of the Tuy Province, who were surveyed the
269 same year for another project (“RELAX - Agropolis Fondation,” n.d., unpublished data): (i) cropped
270 area in 2017, and (ii) number of cattle owned by the household.

271 3. Results

272 3.1 ICSs characterized through the on-farm innovation tracking and innovative 273 farmers’ evaluations

274 During on-farm innovation tracking (brief interviews with 70 farmers identified as producing
275 legumes, and in-depth interviews with 22 of those farmers identified as innovative), the evolution of
276 local farm innovations was discussed, and five types of innovative cropping systems with legumes
277 were identified and characterized (Table 1): (i) ICS1 Sorghum and legume (red or white cowpea,
278 soybean, or peanut) intercropping in rotation with maize or cotton, for seven farmers; (ii) ICS2 sole
279 soybean as cash crop in rotation with cotton or maize, for five farmers; (iii) ICS3 red cowpea in intra-
280 annual succession with biomass crop, for five farmers; (iv) ICS4 Mucuna in rotation with maize, by
281 four herders; and (v) ICS5 pigeon pea in rotation with maize, by one farmer. ICS belonging to the
282 same type rely on the same agronomic rationale, even if they do not combine exactly the same
283 management practices.

284 During in-depth interviews with the 22 innovative farmers, the researchers identified criteria
285 the farmers used when developing and evaluating their innovative systems (Tables 2a-2e, Criteria
286 column). The evaluation criteria include: (i) Production/Yield - evaluation of crop performance and
287 yield; (ii) Soil fertility – evaluation of the legumes’ effect on soil productivity and *Striga* (*Striga*
288 *hemonthica*); (iii) Flexibility/Risk management – evaluation of the ICS’s adaptability and resilience to
289 unexpected circumstances without reducing productivity; (iv) Post-production strategy – evaluation
290 of strengths and weaknesses associated with the use of the harvested products; and (v) Labor
291 management – evaluation of workload and labor.

292 The following paragraphs present the evolution and characteristics of each of the five ICSs
293 and the main results of the innovative farmers’ evaluation of these systems (Tables 2a-2e, column 2)
294 using the five evaluation criteria mentioned above. It should be noted that these farmers’
295 evaluations are based on their understanding and implementation of the systems within their
296 particular context.

297 ICS1 (Table 2a) is a mixed-cropping system of sorghum with a legume (cowpea, peanut, or
298 soybean), dibbled on the same line, and rotated with cotton or maize. According to some farmers

299 interviewed during on-farm tracking, a mixed system of sorghum and cowpea, in which the seeds of
300 each were mixed for sowing, used to be a common practice. This system has all but disappeared with
301 the introduction of mechanical weeding and ridging with animal traction, which makes this
302 traditional system difficult to manage. In ICS1, instead of mixing seeds and planting everything
303 together, innovative farmers sow the two crops between each other on the same ridge at different
304 times. Sorghum is generally sown first, with the legume sown between the newly emerged sorghum.
305 Innovative farmers said that this organization of sowing made weeding (using animal traction based
306 on the legume cycle) easier (Table 2a, column 1, row 5), although sowing involved more time and
307 effort compared to the traditional system. Nevertheless, even with this weeding being easier than
308 the traditional system, sowing, and harvesting were still considered a weakness of this ICS compared
309 to sole crops (Table 2a, column 1, row 5). The main strength of the system, as indicated by more than
310 50% of farmers, was having a gap between the harvests, one of which coinciding with the lean
311 season (Table 2a, column 1, row 4): If the legume is cowpea or peanut, the farmer will be able to
312 harvest it just before ridging. Furthermore, the two harvests translated into increased grain
313 productivity per hectare compared to either sole crop (i.e. Land Equivalent Ratio >1) (Table 2a,
314 column 1, row 1).

315 ICS2 (Table 2b) is a rotation of sole soybean with sole maize or cotton, all three being cash
316 crops on a large area (at least 1ha). According to interview responses from the 70 farmers, sole
317 soybean is mostly grown as a staple crop on very small plots (between 0.1 and 0.25 ha) by women for
318 processing into products (condiments made from fermented pulses called “soubala”) consumed by
319 the household. Soybean in ICS2 is much more input-intensive, uses larger areas, and is intended for
320 the emerging market linked to the development of a soybean oil-processing unit in Ouagadougou.
321 According to innovative farmers, the main strength of the system is the sale of grain to private buyers
322 (Table 2b, column 1, row 4), which more than offsets the labor costs associated with harvesting large
323 areas quickly (to avoid pods opening in the field) at a time that coincides with the lean season. (Table
324 2b, column 1, rows 3 and 5). Farmers also highlighted that growing soybean helps improve soil
325 fertility, and reduces populations of *Striga*-a plant parasite of cereals (Table 2b, column 1, row 2).

326 ICS3 (Table 2c) is sole red cowpea followed the same season by a crop that can be valued for
327 its biomass. During interviews, farmers said that red cowpea is often the first crop sown because the
328 pods can be harvested during the rainy season, as they are less sensitive to fungi than other cowpea
329 varieties. It was also explained that some farmers used to follow red cowpea with sesame (*Sesamum*
330 *indicum*)—a crop quite resistant to drought, but with no significant biomass value. However, with
331 climate change, farmers complain that the rainy season is getting shorter, and it is increasingly
332 difficult to harvest the second crop. Innovative farmers reduced this risk by sowing a second crop
333 that can be valued for its biomass, such as white cowpea or maize (stalks) for fodder, or hibiscus

334 (leaves) for soup. Being able to manage risk in this way was seen as a strength by more than 50% of
335 innovative farmers (Table 2c, column 1, row 3). Perhaps a more important strength of ICS3 is that it
336 allows for two harvests, providing greater household (and livestock) food security (Table 2c, column
337 1, rows 1 and 4). However, two harvests mean extra labor. Fortunately, this extra work does not
338 overlap with the labor requirements of cash crops such as cotton or maize on other fields (many
339 innovative farmers are also producing cash crops), so it was not considered a weakness (Table 2c,
340 column 1, row 5). The carry-over effect of the legume on soil fertility and biomass crop performance
341 was also highly valued by farmers (Table 2c, column 1, row 2).

342 ICS4 (Table 2d) is sole Mucuna for fodder production followed by maize, and is farmed by
343 Fulani herders. Previous projects aimed to expand Mucuna cultivation within the study area to feed
344 cattle (Coulibaly et al., 2012b). Some of the 70 interviewed farmers were part of that project and
345 explained that they did not have the necessary equipment to make or store bales of fodder from
346 Mucuna biomass. They considered the need to feed their family before the need to feed their cattle,
347 and as they could not use Mucuna beans for human consumption, they did not grow Mucuna. Only a
348 few herders with access to balling equipment and covered storage facilities adopted Mucuna. These
349 farmers did not mention labor-management issues, unlike the other innovative farmers who
350 considered the need for equipment and facilities as a weakness (“no consensus” Table 2d, column 1,
351 row 5). Innovative Mucuna farmers used the crop to feed ruminants kept near the house: mainly
352 dairy cows or sick cattle during the dry season, a practice appreciated by more than 50% of the
353 farmers (Table 2d, column 1, rows 1, 3, and 4). They also appreciated the fact that Mucuna is a good
354 crop to grow before maize for its positive carry-over effect on soil fertility (Table 2d, column 1, row
355 2). For these farmers, the hardest part is producing seed (Table 2d, column 1, row 3).

356 ICS5 (Table 2e) sole pigeon pea grown on a small area followed by maize. According to
357 several farmers interviewed, pigeon pea has been promoted in the past by extension agents and
358 NGOs for fodder production. However, farmers involved in such projects said it has not been adopted
359 because the cattle did not eat the plant biomass, and seed was difficult to produce due to the length
360 of the crop cycle. Pigeon pea was the only ICS whose production was not considered a strength by
361 innovative farmers (Table 2e, column 1, row 1). The one innovative farmer who crops pigeon pea
362 sows it on poor soils in a very small area. The seeds are difficult to find in Burkina Faso, so the farmer
363 bought them in Ivory Coast. The farmer’s main incentive was diversifying the household’s diet (Table
364 2e, column 1, row 4), even though grain yield is quite low (Table 2e, column 1, row 1). He also
365 mentioned the crop’s resistance to drought (Table 2e, column 1, row 3), and role in managing weeds
366 and improving soil fertility (Table 2e column 1 row 2) as strengths of the system. The main difficulty
367 expressed by the farmer was the risk of cattle damaging the pigeon pea before it flowers when free
368 grazing starts (Table 2e, column 1, row 3).

369 3.2 Participatory Prototyping Trials and Field Days.

370 When compiling the evaluation results from field-day farmers (Tables 2a-2e, columns 2 and
371 3), it was determined that they used the same five general criteria (refer to paragraph 2 in Section
372 3.1) to evaluate the ICSs as innovative farmers. Contrary to the evaluation by innovative farmers,
373 field-days farmers rated the productivity of ICS1 a weakness in PPT1, explaining that the total crop
374 density was too high, especially in Boni where farmers are less familiar with intercropping practices.
375 Farmers argued that there would be competition for light and soil nutrients, meaning there was a risk
376 of individual sorghum and legume plants underperforming (Table 2a, column 2, row 1). However,
377 many farmers strongly highlighted how the intercropped sorghum looked much better (more
378 biomass and greener) than sole sorghum, suggesting the legume enhanced soil fertility (Table 2a,
379 column 2, row 2). A few farmers suggested alternating crops between the rows instead of within the
380 rows, even though it implies a lower density of sorghum. Therefore, in PPT2, sorghum-legume
381 intercropping systems using either inter-row or within-line sowing were placed side by side, but the
382 field-day farmers did not agree on which layout they preferred (Table 2a, column 3, row 1).
383 According to fewer than 50% of the field-day-farmer groups, the soil should not be too fertile to
384 prevent sorghum from overtaking the legume (Table 2a, column 2, row 3), but should be sufficiently
385 fertile to make the sorghum strong enough to resist competition from the legume; especially if the
386 legume was sown first (Table 2a, column 2, row 3). Both innovative farmers and field-day farmers
387 agreed that intercropping makes it possible to separate the harvest periods and enhance household
388 food security (Table 2a, row 4). Even though fewer than 50% of innovative farmers complained about
389 labor (Table 2a, column 1, row 5), it was the main worry of most field-day farmers during PPT1 (Table
390 2a, column 2, row 5), especially the possibility of not being able to ridge with animal traction. In
391 response to this concern, PPT2 was organized in a way that enabled ridging using animal traction.
392 This reorganization resulted in some farmers assessing the ICS more positively in PPT2 (Table 2a,
393 column 3, rows 1 and 3).

394 Concerning ICS2 (Table 2b), while innovative farmers intensified their soybean production to
395 harvest enough grain to access the value chain, field-day farmers were not very confident about the
396 market (Table 2b, column 2, row 5), but appreciated soybean for household consumption (Table 2b,
397 column 3, row 5). A few groups appreciated the fact that sole soybean requires much less labor than
398 intercropped soybean, especially because selective herbicides can be used (Table 2b, columns 2 and
399 3, row 5). Field-day farmers agreed with innovative farmers that, soybean is good for soil fertility and
400 Striga management (Table 2b, row 2). Field-day farmers also talked about the fact that soybean
401 needs to be harvested quickly (Table 2b, columns 2 and 3, row 3), but did not refer to this as a major

402 obstacle, unlike the innovative farmers (Table 2b, column 1, row 5). For this ICS, the evaluations in
403 the two communities were similar.

404 Concerning ICS3 (Table 2c), according the field-day farmers, the possibility of harvesting two
405 crops in one field, including one that helps during the lean season, is the main strength of the intra-
406 annual succession system (Table 2c, column 2, row 1). The choice of a second crop whose biomass
407 can be exploited reduces the risk of losing the second crop if the rainy season ends early, and is
408 another main strength of the ICS (Table 2c, columns 2 and 3, row 1). In PPT2, the field-day farmers
409 did not emphasize this strength, as they were aware of the difficulty of sowing the first crop
410 sufficiently early to be able to sow a second one, especially due to free grazing (Table 2c, column 3,
411 row 3). The farmers in Founzan stressed this difficulty more than farmers in Boni, saying that this ICS
412 could not succeed because of this problem. Unlike the innovative farmers (Table 2c, column1, row 3),
413 the field-day farmers did not emphasize the benefits of red cowpea improving soil fertility for the
414 second crop (Table 2c, column 2, row 2), and sometimes saw it as a difficulty for weed management
415 (Table 2c, column 3, row 2). The field-day farmers also had more comments to make about the extra
416 work required to grow two crops successively (Table 2c, columns 2 and 3, row 5).

417 Concerning ICS4 (Table 2d), both innovative and field-day farmers viewed Mucuna as an easy
418 way to obtain large quantities of quality fodder while improving soil fertility (Table 2d, rows 1, 2, 3,
419 and 4). The main difficulty is producing seed (Table 2d, row 3), especially in the opinion of the field-
420 day farmers in Founzan, where some had tried the crop but stopped after losing the seeds. There
421 was a notable knowledge gap between farmers in Founzan and Boni, where most had never seen the
422 crop before. This resulted in greater variation in responses from field-day farmers, whereas
423 innovative farmers' evaluations of this system were relatively consistent. The field-day farmers
424 regretted that the grains are not fit for human consumption (Table 2d, column 2, row 4). In Founzan,
425 however, one farmer said that the grain could be used to feed fowl, which triggered a positive
426 reaction from the others (Table 2d, column 3, row 4). A concern expressed by some of the field-day
427 farmers was the difficulty involved in properly drying, transporting, and storing it without the
428 necessary equipment (Table 2d, columns 2 and 3, row 5).

429 Concerning ICS5 (Table 2e), none of the field-day farmers were familiar with pigeon pea, so
430 they based their evaluation on what they could see, and on the agronomist's answers to their
431 questions. As with innovative farmers, they also appreciated the fact that pigeon pea grows well on
432 poor soils (Table 2e, row 3), and improves soil fertility (Table 2e, row 2), especially after seeing the
433 carry-over effect on PPT2 by comparing the same maize cultivar after pigeon pea, Mucuna, cowpea,
434 cotton, or another maize. The main difficulty is the length of the crop cycle resulting in low grain

435 yields (Table 2e, column 2, row 1). Furthermore, farmers noted that even though there are benefits
436 to it being drought resistant, the fact that its leaves stay green after the rains stop makes it at risk of
437 being grazed before the grains reach maturity (Table 2e, row 3). Consequently, we introduced a
438 cultivar with a shorter growth cycle in PPT2, which was assessed more positively (Table 2e, column 3,
439 row 1).

440 3.3 Characteristics of Farmers and their participation and contribution

441 Herders are more represented among innovative farmers than among field-day farmers or
442 the 299 farmers from the “RELAX - Agropolis Fondation,” (n.d.) study (Figure 4). This can be explained
443 by the fact that several legume-based innovations enable farmers to produce fodder, especially
444 Mucuna or, to a lesser extent, intra-annual succession. In terms of farm area, only one innovative
445 farmer among 22 had less than three hectares of cropped area, which is a much lower proportion
446 than other farmer groups (Figure 3). Field-day farmers tend to crop larger areas than the 299 farmers
447 sample (Figure 3). However, there is no obvious difference concerning the number of cattle owned
448 by the household (Figure 4).

449 During the participatory workshops (Table 3), farmers provided feedback and ideas that
450 helped the researcher decide the final design of ICSs. During the evaluation workshop (Table 3),
451 farmers were particularly interested in ICS crop yields, which were shared by the researcher.
452 Comments made by farmers about the ICSs were consistent with their comments during evaluation
453 field days, no new information was obtained from these evaluation workshops.

454 Farmer attendance rate throughout the study was between 60% and 130% in Boni, and
455 between 70% and 163% in Founzan (Table 3). The 130% attendance rate in Boni and 163% rate in
456 Founzan occurred during the first field day (Field-day Intro.) as some farmers came without having
457 been invited. Women were a minority in all activities representing only 12% (nine) of the 73 total
458 participants, and did not speak much during the workshops. The women were particularly interested
459 in the multipurpose characteristics of pigeon pea, which can be used as fodder for cattle and small
460 ruminants, as well as for household consumption.

461 4. Discussion

462 4.1 Introducing innovative legume-based cropping systems

463 In the Tui Province where legume farming is minimal (Coulibaly et al., 2012), on-farm
464 innovation tracking was used to identify farmers growing atypical legume-based cropping systems.
465 With the help of extension agents, the researchers identified 22 such innovative farmers out of 70
466 legume-producing farmers. This approach to identifying innovation differs from traditional

467 approaches where researches rely heavily on farm typology information (Alvarez et al., 2018;
468 Tiftonnell et al., 2020), and focus their attention on, and focus their attention on dominant systems
469 (Bainville, 2017). In such classical approaches, potentially transformative innovations among atypical
470 systems are often overlooked, and therefore, rarely studied (Doré et al., 1997). The current study
471 focused on the innovations developed by innovative farmers to reveal and/or confirm solutions to
472 local drivers of change. Pant and Hambly Odame (2009) also worked with innovative farmers, whom
473 they identified as “positive deviants”. The literature describes positive deviants as individuals within
474 a community whose atypical behaviors or actions address complex local challenges that their peers,
475 with similar available resources, also face. In our study, innovative farmers may have larger farms
476 and livestock than most farmers in the area, but they belong to the same sociotechnical system as
477 field day farmers. Positive deviants are usually seen as performing particularly well (Bradley et al.,
478 2009), hence the term “positive”. In this paper, the innovations studied met innovative farmers’
479 criteria while respecting agroecological principles, so the innovations themselves may be considered
480 as “positive”. In this positive aspect, positive deviants and farmer’s innovations are what may inspire
481 peers and catalyze change in the community. In the current study the PPTs, played the role of
482 revealing innovations to initiate adoption by other farmers.

483 Although the five types of ICSs in this study were considered atypical for the area,
484 components of each ICS are comparable with cropping systems existing in other regions of Africa. For
485 example, sorghum intercropped with cowpea (Dabat et al., 2012) is common in the north of Burkina
486 Faso (Zongo et al., 2016) and Mali (Falconnier et al., 2017). The climate being dryer there, it is easier
487 to grow cowpea using less pesticide (Dabat et al., 2012). Soybean is grown as a cash crop in several
488 West African countries (Odendo et al., 2011) with good technical knowledge. The system with
489 cowpea in intra-annual succession is less common in the literature. Cowpea is usually cultivated as a
490 sole crop, or intercropped with a cereal (Dabat et al., 2012). Cowpea has the advantage of a short
491 cycle (60 to 70 days) but is quite sensitive to pest and disease (Bado et al., 2006). Only a hardy variety
492 such as red cowpea can be used as an early sown crop that can be harvested when it is still raining.
493 Pigeon pea is common in neighboring countries (Jalloh et al., 2012)—sometimes in intercropped
494 systems, where the grains are part of the traditional diet (Kerr et al., 2007; Ene-Obong and Obizoba
495 1995). Mucuna is farmed primarily in East Africa where the leaves are used as fodder, and the grains
496 are sometimes consumed by people after special treatment to eliminate their toxicity (Muoni et al.,
497 2019b).

498 Although the ICSs introduced here are not completely innovative for Africa, the innovative
499 farmers made specific adjustments, for instance in the selection of crop variety and its management,
500 to adapt their ICSs to constraints and opportunities in their particular environmental and
501 sociotechnical system. Some of the ICSs are more atypical than others. Pigeon pea (ICS5), for

502 example, was found on only one farm, whereas the four other ICSs were found on four to seven
503 farms in the study area.

504 4.2 Innovative farmers' evaluations of ICSs and links to local drivers of change

505 Analyzing and crossing innovative farmers' evaluation criteria with the local drivers of change
506 described in the literature, suggest that the innovative cropping systems have been implemented
507 and adapted in response to the main drivers of change in the area. For example, farmers were
508 interested in sorghum-legume intercropping (ICS1) to increase their productivity per hectare, which
509 addresses the challenge of increasing land pressure in the cotton-production zone (Jahel et al., 2015).
510 Soybean as a cash crop (ICS2) is grown by innovative farmers in response to the emergence of the
511 soybean market, whose value chain is currently taking shape (Guilloux et al., 2018). In intra-annual
512 successions (ICS3), the choice of a second crop that can be valued before its cycle is completed is a
513 strategy to adapt to the shortening of the cropping season, and the uncertain rainfall pattern caused
514 by climate change (Gérardeaux et al., 2015; Vall et al., 2008). Mucuna as a fodder crop (ICS4) is
515 expanding with the intensification of livestock farming. Fodder crops are produced for dairy cows,
516 traction bullocks, and sometimes for cattle fattening, and these activities are being developed by
517 both Fulani herders and farmers (Vall et al., 2017; Zoma-Traoré et al., 2020). Finally, pigeon pea
518 (ICS5), whose leaves begin to fall quite early in the cycle and form litter, may help for both restoring
519 soil fertility and managing weeds (Hepperly et al., 1992). This decreases the need for a fallow to
520 counteract soil fertility depletion in the context of increasing land pressure (Jahel et al., 2015).
521 Innovative farmers are aware of soil fertility depletion, and they see the use of legumes as a way to
522 improve productivity in the short term (carry-over effect, Striga management, etc.).

523 4.3 Comparison between evaluations made by innovative farmers and field-day farmers

524 Both innovative and field-day farmers mentioned the same general criteria (Criteria Column
525 in Tables 2a-2e) when discussing how they evaluated an innovative system. Furthermore, the
526 evaluations themselves revealed many similarities between both categories of farmers, supporting
527 the study's hypothesis that many farmers in the study area have the same concerns or challenges:
528 farmers, regardless of their innovative potential, make farming decisions using similar agronomic
529 rationale, and are more likely to adopt innovations from other farmers who operate within the same
530 sociotechnical system. However, to verify this hypothesis, it would be interesting to monitor field-day
531 farmers' adoption of the ICSs.

532 The criteria that mattered most to both innovative and field-day farmers were concerned
533 with short-term benefits, supporting evidence that farmers do not use the same indicators and
534 criteria as agronomists (Toffolini et al., 2016). Agronomists highlight the quantitative performance of

535 the systems, including yield, gross margin, and labor productivity (Sadok et al., 2008), while farmers
536 are also sensitive to more qualitative, operational, or organizational aspects (Ronner et al., 2019). For
537 instance, regarding harvest timing, short-cycle legumes harvested in August provide household food
538 while waiting for the cereal harvest, even though yields of short-cycle legumes are often low. The
539 distribution of the workload and system flexibility also mattered to farmers, as illustrated by the fact
540 that the main challenge with soybean is that harvest cannot wait and happens at the same time as
541 the maize harvest (Table 2b).

542 Resilience and flexibility are also important criteria for both innovative and field-day farmers,
543 sometimes even more important than productivity, because they enable farmers to better adapt to
544 drivers of change and risks (Milestad et al., 2012). For example, several field-day farmers emphasized
545 that their interest in pigeon pea is its ability to grow on poor soils and its resistance to drought,
546 despite its low productivity in actual conditions. Field-day farmers also appreciated the multi-
547 purpose characteristics of the second crop in the red cowpea intra-annual succession (ICS3).
548 Resilience and flexibility are rarely among the set of sustainability indicators established by
549 researchers (Sadok et al., 2008), who focus more on the medium and long-term impacts of cropping
550 systems (e.g. soil fertility, greenhouse gas emissions, water pollution).

551 The three sustainability dimensions that usually structure cropping system evaluation (Smith
552 et al., 2017) appeared several times among the farmers' criteria: (i) "economic sustainability"
553 appeared in the form of agricultural income and market access; (ii) "human wellbeing" was
554 mentioned in connection with food security and workload; and (iii) "environmental sustainability"
555 was taken into account through soil fertility. However, the farmers did not mention long-term criteria
556 such as biodiversity, carbon sequestration, erosion, or soil biological activity and quality, which are
557 frequently used by agronomists. They also did not mention social aspects like gender equity or
558 information access.

559 There were also differences between the evaluations made by innovative and field-day
560 farmers that revealed the concerns and possible obstacles to the adoption of the ICSs. Some of these
561 obstacles depend on the producer and represent perceptions, beliefs, or knowledge gaps (Leclère et
562 al., 2018). For example, farmers who do not grow intercrops tend to overestimate the risks of
563 competition between species and lack knowledge of practices that avoid such competition. Other
564 obstacles are more dependent on the sociotechnical system (Meynard et al., 2017). For instance, free
565 grazing can hamper ICSs that require early sowing (e.g. in the intra-annual succession system – ICS3),
566 or late harvesting (e.g., in the pigeon pea system – ICS5).

567 4.4 Use of ICSs and PPTs to introduce innovation

568 The ICSs designed by innovative farmers in the study area in response to local drivers of
569 change will probably require fewer organizational changes when implemented by other local
570 farmers, compared to breakthrough innovations designed by researchers at experimental stations
571 (Geels and Schot, 2007; Duru et al., 2015). For instance, conservation agriculture (Scopel et al., 2013;
572 Corbeels et al., 2014) may be efficient in improving both short- and long-term soil fertility, but often
573 requires strong changes linked to the sociotechnical system (e.g. landscape management, supply
574 chain) (Dabire et al., 2017). In the current study, the field-day farmers identified very few obstacles
575 to the implementation of the ICSs. This is consistent with the fact than the ICSs are already
576 implemented within the local sociotechnical system. Moreover, even though the field-day farmers
577 did not have the opportunity to test the ICSs on their farms, they were able to imagine the ICSs in
578 their context.

579 The PPTs enabled visual and hands-on comparisons of the ICSs at evaluation field-days, timed
580 just before harvest, when differences in crop productivity are most evident. Moreover, focusing on
581 local innovative systems, and demonstrating them under local conditions in terms of soil, climate,
582 and land-use management, made it easier to trigger conversations between farmers by enabling
583 them to use and gain situated knowledge (Navarrete et al., 2018). For instance, the PPT in Founzan
584 was sown later than in Boni because cattle were left out to graze longer in Founzan. Therefore, the
585 ICS was decontextualized in its relation to the farming system of the innovative farmers, but partially
586 re-contextualized it in its relation to the community. While researchers consistently gained
587 information from farmers during field days, evaluation workshops provided no new criteria or
588 evaluations, suggesting the actual visualization of ICSs in the field was crucial to the initiation of
589 fruitful discussions among farmers.

590 Due to the characteristics of PPTs, ICSs could not be evaluated taking into account all the
591 farmers' local conditions and criteria (Amudavi et al., 2009). This may have resulted in evaluation
592 biases (Ashby, 1987). For instance, the ICS with soybean as a cash crop (ICS2) could not be properly
593 assessed by field-day farmers in a PPT plot, as one of its main issues is the difficulty in harvesting
594 rapidly large areas. Similarly, it was not possible to demonstrate the storage issue associated with the
595 Mucuna system (ICS4), or the food security benefit of the pigeon pea system (ICS5). Future studies
596 utilizing the PPT approach should consider ways to illustrate system characteristics that are not
597 revealed through small-trial plots.

598 PPTs made it possible to involve farmers without implementing themselves a system they are
599 unfamiliar with, thus saving them from taking associated risks. A variety of approaches can be used
600 to study the relevance of innovations, including participatory workshops, modeling tools (Dogliotti et
601 al., 2014; Berthet et al., 2016), field days on producers' fields, or experimental plots, such as with
602 Farmer Field Schools (Phillips et al., 2014; Duveskog et al., 2011). The advantages of the last two are

603 that the farmers can observe what actually happens in the field (Amudavi et al., 2009). The practices
604 to be evaluated are concrete. Prototype trials, which are generally used for agronomic evaluation
605 and demonstration for farmers (Meynard et al., 2012; Husson et al., 2016; Compagnone et al., 2018),
606 were successfully used here for participatory evaluation, and to trigger a process of innovation by the
607 field-day farmers.

608 4.5 Farmers' knowledge and co-learning

609 The farmers' evaluations were dependent on their knowledge and experiences (Van Asten et
610 al., 2009). For example, intercropped systems and Mucuna were more appreciated in Founzan,
611 where farmers have a better knowledge of intercropping than in Boni. Moreover, all field-day
612 farmers assessed pigeon pea in the same way, as none of them were familiar with this crop. Farmers'
613 evaluations of the ICSs evolved from one season to the next, supporting the idea that, as knowledge
614 of, a system increases, opinions and evaluations of the system change. From one field day to the
615 next, evaluation comments came faster in the discussion, and opinions were firmer, revealing a
616 learning process on legumes and on the legume-based ICSs.

617 Collaboration between researchers and farmers enabled co-learning (Falconnier et al., 2017).
618 In the PPTs, researchers learned about the systems resulting from the innovation tracking, even
619 though scientific evaluation was not a prior objective of these trials. Researchers also learned about
620 ICSs' strengths and weaknesses for different farmers, and about the range of evaluation criteria
621 farmers have apart from yields (Ronner et al., 2019). Simultaneously, the field-day farmers began to
622 understand the management and performance of the ICSs through observation and discussions. This
623 interwoven learning, combining farmers' empirical knowledge with researchers' scientific knowledge,
624 is a source of new agronomic knowledge (Girard and Navarrete, 2005). This "actionable knowledge,
625 that can be mobilized for the implementation of cropping systems" (Leclère et al., 2018), helped the
626 researchers define ICS management on the PPTs, and improve the ICSs between year 1 and year 2.
627 These improvements, based not only on agronomic principles, but also on farmers' knowledge and
628 evaluations, constitute a first step in a co-design process (Meynard et al., 2012; Ronner et al., 2019;
629 Reckling et al., 2020).

630 Thanks to collective dynamics, the study's approach also supported co-learning among
631 farmers, despite their different farming systems and previous experiences with legumes. Informal
632 knowledge exchanges among farmers occurred during field-days, and also at the margins of PPTs,
633 before and after field-days, with no researcher present to record the discussion.

634 4.6 Initiation of a co-design process with a wide range of farmers

635 This study aimed to develop cropping systems with, and for, any farmer, without distinction
636 of income, in an inclusive innovation process (Heeks et al., 2014; Swaans et al., 2014). The purpose

637 was not to establish an ex-ante typology (Tittonell et al., 2009), or design different technical options
638 to fit the biophysical and socio-economic niches (Ojiem et al., 2006; Pigford et al., 2018). Instead, this
639 study emphasized bringing together farmers with diverse farming experiences, including livestock
640 farmers, to foster diverse conversations, and obtain their evaluations with no prior information on
641 which ICS they would appreciate most, as it is difficult to predict farmers' preferences from their
642 household characteristics (Ronner et al., 2017). To better involve a diversity of farmers, the study
643 used an inclusive method of evaluation, where the evaluation criteria came from the farmers
644 themselves and were mostly qualitative. Although the study does represent a wide range of farmers,
645 marginalized people, such as women, were underrepresented. This may be due to the biases of the
646 community contact people tasked with identifying farmer volunteers for the study, as they likely
647 identified farmers within their circles.

648 The methodology used in this study could be used by development operators to trigger
649 change in a region. This study builds on tools already used for development, such as participatory
650 workshops, trials, and field-days. For instance, the PPTs constitute an interesting "basket of options"
651 from which farmers can select an ICS that they can adapt to their context (Ronner et al., 2017). Also,
652 using farmers' evaluations to improve PPTs enables a participatory dynamic that resembles the
653 Farmer Field Schools approach for the dissemination of new practices (Phillips et al., 2014; Duveskog
654 et al., 2011). This type of participatory approach is considered time-consuming but has shown
655 effective for farmer capacity building and empowerment (Friis-Hansen and Duveskog, 2012).
656 However, if field-days and participatory trials are common tools to enhance the dissemination of
657 "good practices" (Phillips et al., 2014; Amudavi et al., 2009), or to support the co-design process
658 (Ronner et al., 2017), building PPTs from farmers' own innovations is original. This new approach
659 helped farmers adverse to the risks associated with new practices to validate ICSs, likely because the
660 innovations were designed by local farmers, responding to similar drivers of change.

661 Just as environmental conditions and sociotechnical system are inherently dynamic, so too is
662 innovation. Farming innovation continuously evolves as farmers address new drivers of change
663 (Salembier et al., 2018). Therefore, it is important to continuously track innovations and extend the
664 panel of innovations in comparative trials to satisfy the farmers' curiosity. From a development
665 perspective, it would be interesting to create a feedback loop between continuous innovation
666 tracking and prototyping trials, to account for new opportunities or constraints, and to monitor
667 closely the dynamics of the territory.

668 5. Conclusion

669 By combining on-farm innovation tracking and farmers' evaluations in participatory
670 prototyping trials, a new method was tested that accounts for farmers' expectations and constraints

671 in an inclusive innovation process, while simultaneously fostering co-learning. This study reveals the
672 reasons why, and to what extent, farmers in the region may be interested in integrating legumes into
673 their cropping systems. ICSs that were identified through this process can respond to local drivers of
674 change and meet many of the farmers' interests. By identifying and characterizing local innovations
675 and understanding the rationale behind their development, researchers can help drive an innovation
676 process with local farmers. Therefore, this approach could be an efficient starting point for a co-
677 design process. To go further in an inclusive movement and with the aim of co-designing legume-
678 based cropping systems, farmers who began to familiarize themselves with ICSs through field-days
679 should test them on their farms and adapt them to their conditions. This additional step will trigger
680 another cycle of knowledge co-building that should reinforce farmers' empowerment, and facilitate
681 the inclusion of legumes in the local range of cropping systems.

682

683 Funding

684 This work was conducted with financial support from the SANTE (Sécurité Alimentaire et
685 Nutritionnelle et Transition agro-écologique) project, part of the Inra-Cirad GloFoodS Meta-program.

686 Acknowledgements

687 We would like to thank Zonou Hamadou for his work as technician and all the participating
688 farmers. We thank Dr. Tara Wood and Daphne Goodfellow for their correction of the English
689 language in this article. We also thank our colleagues of the ASAP Platform for their support during
690 the field phase, and those of AÏDA research unit and IDEAS collective for their methodological
691 advices.

692

693 References

- 694 Alvarez, S., Timler, C.J., Michalscheck, M., Paas, W., Descheemaeker, K., Tittonell, P., Andersson, J.A.,
695 Groot, J.C.J., 2018. Capturing farm diversity with hypothesis-based typologies: An innovative
696 methodological framework for farming system typology development. *PLOS ONE* 13,
697 e0194757. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0194757>
- 698 Amudavi, D.M., Khan, Z.R., Wanyama, J.M., Midega, C.A.O., Pittchar, J., Hassanali, A., Pickett, J.A.,
699 2009. Evaluation of farmers' field days as a dissemination tool for push-pull technology in
700 Western Kenya. *Crop Protection* 28, 225–235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2008.10.008>

701 Andrieu, N., Descheemaeker, K., Sanou, T., Chia, E., 2015. Effects of technical interventions on
702 flexibility of farming systems in Burkina Faso: Lessons for the design of innovations in West
703 Africa. *Agricultural Systems* 136, 125–137. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2015.02.010>

704 Ashby, J.A., 1987. The effects of different types of farmer participation on the management of on-
705 farm trials. *Agricultural Administration and Extension* 25, 235–252.
706 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0269-7475\(87\)90079-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0269-7475(87)90079-1)

707 Audouin, S., Gazull, L., Gautier, D., 2018. Territory matters: Exploring the functioning of an innovation
708 system through the filter of local territorial practices - the example of the adoption of cashew
709 trees in Burkina Faso. *Journal of Rural Studies*.
710 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2018.08.007>

711 Bado, B.V., Bationo, A., Cescas, M.P., 2006. Assessment of cowpea and groundnut contributions to
712 soil fertility and succeeding sorghum yields in the Guinean savannah zone of Burkina Faso
713 (West Africa). *Biol Fertil Soils* 43, 171–176. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00374-006-0076-7>

714 Bainville, S., 2017. Land rights issues in Africa: the contribution of agrarian systems research in
715 Burkina Faso. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 44, 261–285.
716 <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2016.1170010>

717 Bazie, Y.G., Cotty, T.L., D’hôtel, É.M., Ouattara, D.O., Sanou, A., 2020. Pourquoi une relation positive
718 entre taille des exploitations et productivité au Burkina Faso ? *Economie rurale* n° 371, 37–
719 58.

720 Berthet, E.T.A., Barnaud, C., Girard, N., Labatut, J., Martin, G., 2016. How to foster agroecological
721 innovations? A comparison of participatory design methods. *Journal of Environmental*
722 *Planning and Management* 59, 280–301.

723 Blanchard, M., Vall, É., Loumbana, B.T., Meynard, J.-M., 2017. Identification, caractérisation et
724 évaluation des pratiques atypiques de gestion des fumures organiques au Burkina Faso :
725 sources d’innovation ? *Autrepart* N° 81, 115–134.

726 Bradley, E.H., Curry, L.A., Ramanadhan, S., Rowe, L., Nembhard, I.M., Krumholz, H.M., 2009. Research
727 in action: using positive deviance to improve quality of health care. *Implementation Science*
728 4, 25. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-4-25>

729 Compagnone, C., Lamine, C., Dupré, L., 2018. La production et la circulation des connaissances en
730 agriculture interrogées par l’agro-écologie: De l’ancien et du nouveau. *Revue d’anthropologie*
731 *des connaissances* 12,2, 111. <https://doi.org/10.3917/rac.039.0111>

732 Corbeels, M., de Graaff, J., Ndah, T.H., Penot, E., Baudron, F., Naudin, K., Andrieu, N., Chirat, G.,
733 Schuler, J., Nyagumbo, I., Rusinamhodzi, L., Traore, K., Mzoba, H.D., Adolwa, I.S., 2014.
734 Understanding the impact and adoption of conservation agriculture in Africa: A multi-scale

735 analysis. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 187, 155–170.
736 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2013.10.011>

737 Coulibaly, K., Vall, E., Autfray, P., Nacro, H., Sedogo, M., 2012. Effets de la culture permanente coton-
738 maïs sur l'évolution d'indicateurs de fertilité des sols de l'Ouest du Burkina Faso.
739 *International Journal of Biological and Chemical Sciences* 6.
740 <https://doi.org/10.4314/ijbcs.v6i3.13>

741 Coulibaly, Kalifa, Vall, E., Autfray, P., Sedogo, M.P., 2012. Performance technico-économique des
742 associations maïs/niébé et maïs/mucuna en situation réelle de culture au Burkina Faso:
743 potentiels et contraintes. *Tropicultura*.

744 Coulibaly, K., Vall, E., Blanchard, M., Autfray, P., 2011. Expérimenter à l'échelle de la parcelle
745 paysanne pour concevoir des itinéraires techniques innovants: quelle méthode de traitement
746 des données? Cas du travail du sol en sec, Province du Tuy, Burkina Faso, in: *Partenariat,*
747 *Modélisation, Expérimentations: Quelles Leçons Pour La Conception de l'innovation et*
748 *l'intensification Écologique?* Cirad, pp. 8–p.

749 Crews, T.E., Peoples, M.B., 2004. Legume versus fertilizer sources of nitrogen: ecological tradeoffs
750 and human needs. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 102, 279–297.
751 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2003.09.018>

752 Dabat, M.-H., Lahmar, R., Guissou, R., 2012. La culture du niébé au Burkina Faso : une voie
753 d'adaptation de la petite agriculture à son environnement ?, *Growing cowpea in Burkina*
754 *Faso: a pathway for small-scale farming contextual adaptation?* *Autrepart* 95–114.
755 <https://doi.org/10.3917/autr.062.0095>

756 Dabire, D., Andrieu, N., Djamen, P., Coulibaly, K., Posthumus, H., Diallo, A.M., Karambiri, M., Douzet,
757 J.-M., Triomphe, B., 2017. Operationalizing an innovation platform approach for community-
758 based participatory research on conservation agriculture in Burkina Faso. *Experimental*
759 *Agriculture* 53, 460–479. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0014479716000636>

760 Davies, J., Maru, Y., Hall, A., Abdourhamane, I.K., Adegbidi, A., Carberry, P., Dorai, K., Ennin, S.A.,
761 Etwire, P.M., McMillan, L., Njoya, A., Ouedraogo, S., Traoré, A., Traoré-Gué, N.J., Watson, I.,
762 2017. Understanding innovation platform effectiveness through experiences from west and
763 central Africa. *Agricultural Systems*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2016.12.014>

764 De Jager, I., Borgonjen-van den Berg, K.J., Giller, K.E., Brouwer, I.D., 2019. Current and potential role
765 of grain legumes on protein and micronutrient adequacy of the diet of rural Ghanaian infants
766 and young children: using linear programming. *Nutr J* 18, 12.
767 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12937-019-0435-5>

768 Dogliotti, S., García, M.C., Peluffo, S., Dieste, J.P., Pedemonte, A.J., Bacigalupe, G.F., Scarlato, M.,
769 Alliaume, F., Alvarez, J., Chiappe, M., Rossing, W.A.H., 2014. Co-innovation of family farm

770 systems: A systems approach to sustainable agriculture. *Agricultural Systems* 126, 76–86.
771 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2013.02.009>

772 Dolinska, A., d’Aquino, P., 2016. Farmers as agents in innovation systems. Empowering farmers for
773 innovation through communities of practice. *Agricultural Systems* 142, 122–130.
774 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2015.11.009>

775 Doré, T., Sebillotte, M., Meynard, J.M., 1997. A diagnostic method for assessing regional variations in
776 crop yield. *Agricultural Systems* 54, 169–188. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0308-521X\(96\)00084-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0308-521X(96)00084-4)
777 [4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0308-521X(96)00084-4)

778 Dugué, P., Autfray, P., Blanchard, M., Djamé, P., Dongmo, A., Girard, P., Olina, J.-P., Ouedraogo, S.,
779 Sissoko, F., Vall, E., 2014. L’agroécologie pour l’agriculture familiale dans les pays du Sud:
780 impasse ou voie d’avenir? Le cas des zones de savane cotonnière de l’Afrique de l’Ouest et
781 du Centre 23.

782 Duru, M., Therond, O., Fares, M., 2015. Designing agroecological transitions; A review. *Agronomy for*
783 *Sustainable Development* 35, 1237–1257. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-015-0318-x>

784 Duveskog, D., Friis-Hansen, E., Taylor, E.W., 2011. Farmer Field Schools in Rural Kenya: A
785 Transformative Learning Experience. *Journal of Development Studies* 47, 1529–1544.
786 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2011.561328>

787 Ene-Obong, H.N., Obizoba, I.C., 1995. Protein quality of some Nigerian traditional diets based on the
788 African yambean (*Sphenostylis stenocarpa*) and pigeon pea (*Cajanus cajan*). *Plant Food Hum*
789 *Nutr* 48, 297–309. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01088489>

790 Falconnier, G.N., Descheemaeker, K., Van Mourik, T.A., Adam, M., Sogoba, B., Giller, K.E., 2017. Co-
791 learning cycles to support the design of innovative farm systems in southern Mali. *European*
792 *Journal of Agronomy* 89, 61–74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2017.06.008>

793 Franke, A.C., van den Brand, G.J., Vanlauwe, B., Giller, K.E., 2018. Sustainable intensification through
794 rotations with grain legumes in Sub-Saharan Africa: A review. *Agriculture, Ecosystems &*
795 *Environment* 261, 172–185. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2017.09.029>

796 Friis-Hansen, E., Duveskog, D., 2012. The Empowerment Route to Well-being: An Analysis of Farmer
797 Field Schools in East Africa. *World Development* 40, 414–427.
798 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2011.05.005>

799 Gaba, S., Lescourret, F., Boudsocq, S., Enjalbert, J., Hinsinger, P., Journet, E.-P., Navas, M.-L., Wery, J.,
800 Louarn, G., Malézieux, E., Pelzer, E., Prudent, M., Ozier-Lafontaine, H., 2015. Multiple
801 cropping systems as drivers for providing multiple ecosystem services: from concepts to
802 design. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development* 35, 607–623.
803 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-014-0272-z>

804 Geels, F.W., Schot, J., 2007. Typology of sociotechnical transition pathways. *Research Policy* 36, 399–
805 417. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2007.01.003>

806 Gérarddeaux, E., Affholder, F., Bernoux, M., Muller, B., 2015. Les relations entre systèmes de culture
807 annuels tropicaux et changement climatique. *Changement climatique et agricultures du*
808 *monde* 107–120.

809 Giller, K.E., 2001. *Nitrogen Fixation in Tropical Cropping Systems*. CABI.

810 Giller, K.E., Tiftonell, P., Rufino, M.C., van Wijk, M.T., Zingore, S., Mapfumo, P., Adjei-Nsiah, S.,
811 Herrero, M., Chikowo, R., Corbeels, M., Rowe, E.C., Baijukya, F., Mwijage, A., Smith, J.,
812 Yeboah, E., van der Burg, W.J., Sanogo, O.M., Misiko, M., de Ridder, N., Karanja, S., Kaizzi, C.,
813 K'ungu, J., Mwale, M., Nwaga, D., Pacini, C., Vanlauwe, B., 2011. Communicating complexity:
814 Integrated assessment of trade-offs concerning soil fertility management within African
815 farming systems to support innovation and development. *Agricultural Systems* 104, 191–203.
816 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2010.07.002>

817 Girard, N., Navarrete, M., 2005. Quelles synergies entre connaissances scientifiques et empiriques ?
818 L'exemple des cultures du safran et de la truffe, Exploring synergies between scientific and
819 empirical knowledge: the case of saffron and truffle cropping in France. *Natures Sciences*
820 *Sociétés* 13, 33–44.

821 Gray, L.C., Dowd-Urbe, B., Kaminski, J., 2018. Weaving cotton-led development? Liberalization,
822 cotton producer organizations, and uneven development in Burkina Faso.
823 <https://doi.org/10.1111/joac.12229>

824 Grillot, M., Guerrin, F., Gaudou, B., Masse, D., Vayssières, J., 2018. Multi-level analysis of nutrient
825 cycling within agro-sylvo-pastoral landscapes in West Africa using an agent-based model.
826 *Environmental Modelling & Software* 107, 267–280.
827 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2018.05.003>

828 Guenot, A., Huchet-Bourdon, M., 2014. Rôle du coton sur la filière maïs au Burkina Faso. *Économie*
829 *rurale. Agricultures, alimentations, territoires* 107–119.
830 <https://doi.org/10.4000/economierurale.4353>

831 Guilloux, G.L., David, A., Pouzet, A., 2018. La différenciation par l'organisation de filières :
832 l'expérience d'AGROPOL. *OCL* 25, D210. <https://doi.org/10.1051/ocl/2018023>

833 Heeks, R., Foster, C., Nugroho, Y., 2014. New models of inclusive innovation for development.
834 *Innovation and Development* 4, 175–185. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2157930X.2014.928982>

835 Hepperly, P., Aguilar-Erazo, H., Perez, R., Diaz, M., Reyes, C., 1992. Pigeon pea and velvet bean
836 allelopathy, in: Rizvi, S.J.H., Rizvi, V. (Eds.), *Allelopathy: Basic and Applied Aspects*. Springer
837 Netherlands, Dordrecht, pp. 357–370. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-2376-1_21

838 Husson, O., Tran Quoc, H., Boulakia, S., Chabanne, A., Tivet, F., Bouzinac, S., Lienhard, P., Michellon,
839 R., Chabierski, S., Boyer, J., Enjalric, F., Rakotondramanana, Moussa, N., Jullien, F., Balarabe,
840 O., Rattanatrav, B., Castella, J.-C., Charpentier, H., Séguy, L., 2016. Co-designing innovative
841 cropping systems that match biophysical and socio-economic diversity: The DATE approach
842 to Conservation Agriculture in Madagascar, Lao PDR and Cambodia. *Renewable Agriculture
843 and Food Systems* 31, 452–470. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S174217051500037X>

844 Ibrahim, B., Karambiri, H., Polcher, J., Yacouba, H., Ribstein, P., 2014. Changes in rainfall regime over
845 Burkina Faso under the climate change conditions simulated by 5 regional climate models.
846 *Clim Dyn* 42, 1363–1381. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-013-1837-2>

847 Jahel, C., Baron, C., Vall, E., Bégué, A., Coulibaly, K., Karambiri, M., Castets, M., Dupuy, S., Seen, D.L.,
848 2015. Land pressure and agrarian mutation, spatial modelling of farming systems evolution
849 from plot to regional scale in West Burkina Faso 2.

850 Jalloh, A., Roy-Macauley, H., Sereme, P., 2012. Major agro-ecosystems of West and Central Africa:
851 Brief description, species richness, management, environmental limitations and concerns.
852 *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 157, 5–16.
853 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2011.11.019>

854 Kermah, M., Franke, A.C., Adjei-Nsiah, S., Ahiabor, B.D.K., Abaidoo, R.C., Giller, K.E., 2018. N 2 -
855 fixation and N contribution by grain legumes under different soil fertility status and cropping
856 systems in the Guinea savanna of northern Ghana. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*
857 261, 201–210. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2017.08.028>

858 Kerr, R.B., Snapp, S., CHIRWA (deceased), M., Shumba, L., Msachi, R., 2007. Participatory research on
859 legume diversification with Malawian smallholder farmers for improved human nutrition and
860 soil fertility. *Experimental Agriculture* 43, 437–453.
861 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0014479707005339>

862 Leclère, M., Loyce, C., Jeuffroy, M.-H., 2018. Growing camelina as a second crop in France: A
863 participatory design approach to produce actionable knowledge. *European Journal of
864 Agronomy* 101, 78–89. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2018.08.006>

865 Meynard, J.-M., Dedieu, Benoit, Bos, A.P. (Bram), 2012. Re-design and co-design of farming systems.
866 An overview of methods and practices, in: Darnhofer, I., Gibbon, D., Dedieu, Benoît (Eds.),
867 *Farming Systems Research into the 21st Century: The New Dynamic*. Springer Netherlands,
868 pp. 405–429. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-4503-2_18

869 Meynard, J.-M., Jeuffroy, M.-H., Le Bail, M., Lefèvre, A., Magrini, M.-B., Michon, C., 2017. Designing
870 coupled innovations for the sustainability transition of agrifood systems. *Agricultural Systems*
871 157, 330–339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2016.08.002>

872 Milestad, R., Dedieu, B., Darnhofer, I., Bellon, S., 2012. Farms and farmers facing change: The
873 adaptive approach, in: Darnhofer, I., Gibbon, D., Dedieu, B. (Eds.), *Farming Systems Research*
874 *into the 21st Century: The New Dynamic*. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, pp. 365–385.
875 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-4503-2_16

876 Muoni, T., Barnes, A.P., Öborn, I., Watson, C.A., Bergkvist, G., Shiluli, M., Duncan, A.J., 2019. Farmer
877 perceptions of legumes and their functions in smallholder farming systems in east Africa.
878 *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability* 1–14.
879 <https://doi.org/10.1080/14735903.2019.1609166>

880 Navarrete, M., Brives, H., Catalogna, M., Gouttenoire, L., Lamine, C., Ollion, E., Simon, S., 2018.
881 *Farmers’ involvement in collective experimental designs in a French region, Rhône-Alpes.*
882 *How do they contribute to farmers’ learning and facilitate the agroecological transition?* 12.

883 Nederlof, E.S., Dangbégnon, C., 2007. Lessons for farmer-oriented research: Experiences from a West
884 African soil fertility management project. *Agriculture and Human Values* 24, 369–387.
885 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-007-9066-0>

886 Odendo, M., Bationo, A., Kimani, S., 2011. Socio-Economic Contribution of Legumes to Livelihoods in
887 Sub-Saharan Africa, in: Bationo, Andre, Waswa, B., Okeyo, J.M., Maina, F., Kihara, J.,
888 Mokwunye, U. (Eds.), *Fighting Poverty in Sub-Saharan Africa: The Multiple Roles of Legumes*
889 *in Integrated Soil Fertility Management*. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, pp. 27–46.
890 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-1536-3_2

891 Ojiem, J.O., Ridder, N. de, Vanlauwe, B., Giller, K.E., 2006. Socio-ecological niche: a conceptual
892 framework for integration of legumes in smallholder farming systems. *International Journal*
893 *of Agricultural Sustainability* 4, 79–93. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14735903.2006.9686011>

894 Pant, L.P., Odame, H.H., 2009. The promise of positive deviants: bridging divides between scientific
895 research and local practices in smallholder agriculture. *Knowledge Management for*
896 *Development Journal* 5, 160–172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/18716340903201504>

897 Phillips, D., Waddington, H., White, H., 2014. Better targeting of farmers as a channel for poverty
898 reduction: a systematic review of Farmer Field Schools targeting. *Development Studies*
899 *Research* 1, 113–136. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21665095.2014.924841>

900 Pigford, A.-A.E., Hickey, G.M., Klerkx, L., 2018. Beyond agricultural innovation systems? Exploring an
901 agricultural innovation ecosystems approach for niche design and development in
902 sustainability transitions. *Agricultural Systems* 164, 116–121.
903 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2018.04.007>

904 Porgo, M., Kuwornu, J.K.M., Zahonogo, P., Jatoe, J.B.D., Egyir, I.S., 2018. Credit constraints and
905 cropland allocation decisions in rural Burkina Faso. *Land Use Policy* 70, 666–674.
906 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2017.10.053>

907 Reau, R., Monnot, L.A., Schaub, A., Munier-Jolain, N., Pambou, I., Bockstaller, C., Cariolle, M.,
908 Chabert, A., Dumans, P., 2012. Les ateliers de conception de systèmes de culture pour
909 construire, évaluer et identifier des prototypes prometteurs.

910 Reckling, M., Bergkvist, G., Watson, C.A., Stoddard, F.L., Bachinger, J., 2020. Re-designing organic
911 grain legume cropping systems using systems agronomy. *European Journal of Agronomy* 112,
912 125951. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2019.125951>

913 RELAX - Agropolis Fondation [WWW Document], n.d. URL <https://www.agropolis-fondation.fr/RELAX>
914 (accessed 4.3.20).

915 Ripoché, A., Crétenet, M., Corbeels, M., Affholder, F., Naudin, K., Sissoko, F., Douzet, J.-M., Tittonell,
916 P., 2015. Cotton as an entry point for soil fertility maintenance and food crop productivity in
917 savannah agroecosystems—Evidence from a long-term experiment in southern Mali. *Field
918 Crops Research* 177, 37–48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2015.02.013>

919 Ronner, E., Descheemaeker, K., Almekinders, C., Ebanyat, P., Giller, K.E., 2019. Co-design of improved
920 climbing bean production practices for smallholder farmers in the highlands of Uganda.
921 *Agricultural Systems* 175, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2019.05.003>

922 Ronner, E., Descheemaeker, K., Almekinders, C.J.M., Ebanyat, P., Giller, K.E., 2017. Farmers' use and
923 adaptation of improved climbing bean production practices in the highlands of Uganda.
924 *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2017.09.004>

925 Rurangwa, E., Vanlauwe, B., Giller, K.E., 2018. Benefits of inoculation, P fertilizer and manure on
926 yields of common bean and soybean also increase yield of subsequent maize. *Agriculture,
927 Ecosystems & Environment* 261, 219–229. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2017.08.015>

928 Sadok, W., Angevin, F., Bergez, J.-É., Bockstaller, C., Colomb, B., Guichard, L., Reau, R., Doré, T., 2008.
929 Ex ante assessment of the sustainability of alternative cropping systems: implications for
930 using multi-criteria decision-aid methods. A review. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development*
931 28, 163–174. <https://doi.org/10.1051/agro:2007043>

932 Salembier, C., Elverdin, J.H., Meynard, J.-M., 2016. Tracking on-farm innovations to unearth
933 alternatives to the dominant soybean-based system in the Argentinean Pampa. *Agronomy
934 for Sustainable Development* 36. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-015-0343-9>

935 Salembier, C., Segrestin, B., Berthet, E., Weil, B., Meynard, J.-M., 2018. Genealogy of design
936 reasoning in agronomy: Lessons for supporting the design of agricultural systems.
937 *Agricultural Systems* 164, 277–290. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2018.05.005>

938 Schut, M., Cadilhon, J.-J., Misiko, M., Dror, I., 2018. Do mature innovation platforms make a
939 difference in agricultural research for development? a meta-analysis of case studies.
940 *Experimental Agriculture* 54, 96–119. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0014479716000752>

941 Scopel, E., Triomphe, B., Affholder, F., Da Silva, F.A.M., Corbeels, M., Xavier, J.H.V., Lahmar, R.,
942 Recous, S., Bernoux, M., Blanchart, E., de Carvalho Mendes, I., De Tourdonnet, S., 2013.
943 Conservation agriculture cropping systems in temperate and tropical conditions,
944 performances and impacts. A review. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development* 33, 113–130.
945 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-012-0106-9>

946 Smith, A., Snapp, S., Chikowo, R., Thorne, P., Bekunda, M., Glover, J., 2017. Measuring sustainable
947 intensification in smallholder agroecosystems: A review. *Global Food Security* 12, 127–138.
948 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2016.11.002>

949 Tiftonell, P., Bruzzone, O., Solano-Hernández, A., López-Ridaura, S., Easdale, M.H., 2020. Functional
950 farm household typologies through archetypal responses to disturbances. *Agricultural*
951 *Systems* 178, 102714. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2019.102714>

952 Tiftonell, P., van Wijk, M.T., Herrero, M., Rufino, M.C., de Ridder, N., Giller, K.E., 2009. Beyond
953 resource constraints – Exploring the biophysical feasibility of options for the intensification of
954 smallholder crop-livestock systems in Vihiga district, Kenya. *Agricultural Systems* 101, 1–19.
955 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2009.02.003>

956 Toffolini, Q., Jeuffroy, M.-H., Prost, L., 2016. Indicators used by farmers to design agricultural
957 systems: a survey. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development* 36.
958 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-015-0340-z>

959 Vall, E., Andrieu, N., Dugué, P., Richard, D., Tou, Z., Diallo, M.A., 2008. Evolutions des pratiques
960 agropastorales et changements climatiques en zone soudano-sahélienne d’Afrique de
961 l’Ouest : proposition d’un modèle conceptuel de l’interaction climat-écosystèmes de
962 production agropastorales [WWW Document]. Atelier sous Régional : Changements
963 climatiques et interactions élevage environnement en Afrique de l’Ouest, 11-15 février 2008,
964 Niamey, Niger. URL <http://agritrop.cirad.fr/543499/> (accessed 3.11.19).

965 Vall, E., Chia, E., Blanchard, M., Koutou, M., Coulibaly, K., Andrieu, N., 2016. La co-conception en
966 partenariat de systèmes agricoles innovants. *Cahiers Agricultures* 25, 15001.
967 <https://doi.org/10.1051/cagri/2016001>

968 Vall, E., Marre-Cast, L., Kamgang, H.J., 2017. Chemins d’intensification et durabilité des exploitations
969 de polyculture-élevage en Afrique subsaharienne : contribution de l’association agriculture-
970 élevage. *Cahiers Agricultures* 26, 25006. <https://doi.org/10.1051/cagri/2017011>

971 Van Asten, P.J.A., Kaaria, S., Fermont, A.M., Delve, R.J., 2009. Challenges and lessons when using
972 farmer knowledge in agricultural research and development projects in Africa. *Experimental*
973 *Agriculture* 45, 1. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0014479708006984>

974 Van Vugt, D., Franke, A.C., Giller, K.E., 2018. Understanding variability in the benefits of N₂-fixation
975 in soybean-maize rotations on smallholder farmers' fields in Malawi. *Agriculture, Ecosystems
976 & Environment* 261, 241–250. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2017.05.008>

977 Verret, V., Pelzer, E., Bedoussac, L., Jeuffroy, M.-H., 2020. Tracking on-farm innovative practices to
978 support crop mixture design: The case of annual mixtures including a legume crop. *European
979 Journal of Agronomy* 115, 126018. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2020.126018>

980 Waters-Bayer, A., Bayer, W., 2009. Enhancing local innovation to improve water productivity in crop–
981 livestock systems. *Rangel. J.* 31, 231–235. <https://doi.org/10.1071/RJ09009>

982 Wolde-meskel, E., van Heerwaarden, J., Abdulkadir, B., Kassa, S., Aliyi, I., Degefu, T., Wakweya, K.,
983 Kanampiu, F., Giller, K.E., 2018. Additive yield response of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) to
984 rhizobium inoculation and phosphorus fertilizer across smallholder farms in Ethiopia.
985 *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 261, 144–152.
986 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2018.01.035>

987 Zoma-Traoré, B., Soudré, A., Ouédraogo-Koné, S., Khayatzaheh, N., Probst, L., Sölkner, J., Mészáros,
988 G., Burger, P.A., Traoré, A., Sanou, M., Ouédraogo, G.M.S., Traoré, L., Ouédraogo, D.,
989 Yougbaré, B., Wurzinger, M., 2020. From farmers to livestock keepers: a typology of cattle
990 production systems in south-western Burkina Faso. *Trop Anim Health Prod.*
991 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11250-020-02241-6>

992 Zongo, K.F., Hien, E., Drevon, J.-J., Blavet, D., Masse, D., Clermont-Dauphin, C., 2016. Typologie et
993 logique socio-économique des systèmes de culture associant céréales et légumineuses dans
994 les agro-écosystèmes soudano-sahéliens du Burkina Faso. *International Journal of Biological
995 and Chemical Sciences* 10, 290. <https://doi.org/10.4314/ijbcs.v10i1.23>

996

Tables and figures




Figure 1: Tuy Province in Burkina Faso, with the location of the two participatory prototyping trials (PPT), and the number of in-depth interviews conducted per commune during on-farm innovation tracking.



Figure 2: First field day of the participatory prototyping trials in Boni, July 2017




Figure 3: Distribution in percentage of 22 innovative farmers (“% innovative”), 64 field-day farmers (“% field days”) and 299 randomly selected in the Tuy Province (“% random”) by the cropped area (ha) in their farm in 2017.




Figure 4 : Distribution in percentage of 22 innovative farmers (“% innovative”), 64 field-day farmers (“% field days”) and 299 randomly selected in the Tuy Province (“% random”) by the number of cattle owned by the household (logarithmic scale).

1 Table 1: Characterization of the 5 types of Innovative Cropping Systems (ICS) identified during on-farm innovation tracking.

ICS	Number of interviewed farmers	Crops (layout and rotation)	Field size	Crop management				Production and use	Source of seeds
				Sowing	Fertilization	Weeding	Harvesting		
1 Sorghum legume Intercropping in rotation with maize or cotton	7	Sorghum intercropped with cowpea, peanut, or soybean dibbled on the same line	Small areas (<1 ha)	Sorghum and legume sown separately	None	Sorghum ridging with animal traction	Legume harvested first, allowing sorghum harvest by cutting the whole plant	Sorghum and legume (cowpea, sometimes peanut) for household consumption	Kept from the previous year or purchased on the market
2 Soybean in rotation with maize or cotton	5	Sole soybean in rotation with maize or cotton, all on large areas	1 to 4 ha	Among the first crops sown in the farm	NPK sometimes on soybean; NPK and urea always on maize	By selective herbicide application and/or animal traction.	Harvesting must be done quickly to avoid losses by pods opening; performed with external labor	For sale (emerging market for soybeans) as cash crops	Certified seeds bought
3 Red cowpea- in intra-annual succession with biomass crop	5	Sole red cowpea followed by a crop whose biomass can be used (cowpea, maize, hibiscus, etc.)	Small areas (<1 ha)	Early seeding of the first crop (end of May)	None	Mostly by hand except between the 2 crops (plowing)	First crop at maturity, during the rainy season. Second crop at the end of the rains	Cowpea and hibiscus leaves used for soup, and maize stalks for fodder	Kept from the previous year, or purchased on the market
4 Mucuna in rotation with maize	4 herders	Sole Mucuna alone in rotation with Maize	Small areas (<1 ha)	After the other crops have been sown	No chemical fertilizer (only manure)	Only at the beginning for Mucuna; by animal traction for maize	Fodder harvested when the weather is dry, but before seeds are ripe	For fodder production, stored as bales	Mucuna kept from the previous year; maize bought
5 Pigeon pea in rotation with maize	1	Pigeon pea alone in rotation with maize	Very small areas (<0.25ha)	After the other crops have been sown	None on pigeon pea; NPK on maize	Only at the beginning for pigeon pea; by animal traction for maize	Harvesting of the pigeon pea seeds during the dry season (needs to be protected from grazing livestock)	For the production of peas (seeds and household consumption)	Pigeon pea kept from the previous year; maize bought

2

Tables 2a,b,c,d,e: Summary tables of the ICS evaluations by innovative farmers made during in-depth interviews (column 1 “Innovative tracking”) and by field days farmers during field day 2 on PPT1 (column 2 “PPT1 evaluation”) and field day 3 on PPT2 (column 3 “PPT2 evaluation”). Criteria are classified in 5 categories (organized in rows, from row 1 “production/yield” to row 5 “labor management”).

Color Key for tables 2a, b, c, d, e.

	weakness mentioned in more than 50% of the groups (field-day farmers) or interviews (innovative farmers)
	weakness mentioned in fewer than 50 % of the groups (field-day farmers) or interviews (innovative farmers)
	no consensus among the groups (field-day farmers) or interviews (innovative farmers)
	strength mentioned in fewer than 50 % of the groups (field-day farmers) or interviews (innovative farmers)
	strength mentioned in more than 50% of the groups (field-day farmers) or interviews (innovative farmers)

Table 2a: ICS 1 Sorghum legume intercropping in rotation with cotton or maize

Criteria	Farmer’s evaluation and quotes		
	1. Innovative Farmers	2. Field-day farmers on PPT 1	3. Field-day farmers on PPT 2
1. Production/ yield	Land equivalent Ration (LER)>1 “I harvest more than with mono crops”	Risks of LER<1 “You need to reduce sorghum density or it will have a negative effect on both crops, you’d better do interlines.”	LER>1 “you get the same amount of sorghum plus peanuts and the residues can be used for fodder” “With interlines there is less competition, so each crop produces more”
2. Soil fertility	Beneficial effect of legume on sorghum “sorghum produces more when intercropped”	Beneficial effect of legume on sorghum “intercropped sorghum looks stronger than sorghum grown alone”	Beneficial effect of legume on sorghum “cowpea fertilizes the soil, even better if you bury the biomass while ridging the sorghum” “soybean helps fighting against striga”
3. Flexibility/ Risk management	Better distribution of the risks (2 crops) “there is always at least one crop to harvest”	Limited flexibility in terms of soil type: need to be grown on relatively poor soil to avoid the risk of competition. “It cannot work on a good soil because both crops would develop well and there would be competition for light”	Limited flexibility in terms of soil type “It doesn’t work on a too poor soil either: sorghum won’t grow fast enough”
			-Small sowing window “It is important to sow the sorghum at the right time after cowpea”
4. Post production strategy	Improving household food security “The cowpea being harvested early, it helps to finish the hunger season or to feed the cotton harvesting labor”	Improving household food security “farmers who only have a small farm intercrop to get different products”	Improving household food security “I can grow more different crops”
5. Labor management	Labor intensive “As the soybean needs to be harvested quickly, it is difficult to grow it on large area” “Sowing and weeding may take more time than in sole crops, but it’s easier than in the traditional sorghum-cowpea intercrop”	Labor intensive, especially for weeding: “after sowing, you can’t use animal traction in the field” “you can’t use selective herbicides”	Labor intensive, especially for weeding: “Manual weeding is more difficult in intercropped cropping systems, because you can destroy the weaker crop”

Table 2b: ICS 2 Soybean in rotation with maize or cotton as cash crops

Criteria	Farmer’s evaluation and quotes		
	1. Innovative Farmers	2. Field-day farmers on PPT 1	3. Field-day farmers on PPT 2
1. Production/ yield	Intensive production “A company came and said that we should produce, they would buy the whole harvest”	Intensive production “Soybean is better alone than intercropped, you get a bigger yield”	

2. Soil fertility	Striga management « Sorghum will do well after soybean, because it's good against striga »	Good previous crop for cereal « soybean is a better previous crop than cotton »	Good previous crop for cereal and cotton "Better previous crop for cotton and maize than maize" "it helps fight striga"
3. Flexibility/ Risk management	High risk of losing grain at harvest time "the harvest has to be done quickly, or the pods open"	High risk of losing grain at harvest time "you need to harvest quickly or you will lose"	High risk of losing grain at harvest time "the problem is the harvest cannot wait"
4. Post production strategy	Market opportunity « I grow soybean to be ready when the market opens »	Unsure market opportunity "The market is not reliable"	For household food security "My wife makes soubala or soya meat for the family and to sell"
5. Labor management	Need labor for harvest "I need to hire labor for the harvest as it has to be done quickly"	Allow the use of selective herbicides « it is better than in association because you can't use selective herbicides on sorghum »	Allow the use of selective herbicides « you can use selective herbicide for weeding »

Table 2c: ICS 3 Red cowpea- in intra-annual succession with biomass crop

Criteria	Farmer's evaluation and quotes		
	1. Innovative Farmers	2. Field-day farmers on PPT 1	3. Field-day farmers on PPT 2
1. Production/ yield	Two harvests per season "You can sow the second crop even more densely than the first one" "you'll harvest more from the second crop than from the first one"	Two harvests per season "If you can sow early enough, you can double the yield"	Two harvests per season "You may even get the grain for maize as second crop"
2. Soil fertility	Soil improvement by the first crop "the second crop looks better than the first one" "when you plow between the 2 crops, you bury the cowpea residues, it's like a fertilizer"	Fertilizer still needed for some fodder crops « It's good but we may need to fertilize the maize if it's the second crop »	Soil improvement by the first crop "and plowing allows you to bury cowpea residues" "you need to plow between the two crops to avoid weeds"
3. Flexibility/ Risk management	Low risk of losing the first harvest due to the rain "Unlike white cowpea, red cowpea can be harvested in the rainy season"	Location constraint due to free grazing "to be able to sow early you need a field where the cattle can't get in"	Limited flexibility for sowing "it won't work if you can't sow early, and you need rain early"
	Multipurpose second crop "If the rain stops early, you harvest the leaves"	Multipurpose second crop "It can work well if you sow early enough" "sesame is more resistant to water stress but with cowpea, you get the leaves"	Multipurpose second crop "You may even get two grain harvests if the rain lasts"
4. Post production strategy	Household food security (red cowpea) "red cowpea is for the family, there is no real market for it, but it helps in the lean period"	Household food security (red cowpea) "As red cowpea is harvested early, it can be used to feed the laborers who harvest the cotton"	
	Good fodder value for the second crop "I cut the maize green and give it to the cattle, they like it"	Good fodder value for the second crop "green fodder is better than brown"	Good fodder value for the second crop "you may get the grains, perhaps maize cobs to grill"
5. Labor management	Work management "Sowing and harvesting do not happen at the same time as for cotton and maize so here is no competition for work" "Less pests on the second crop as it rains less"	Work intensive "It's interesting if you have a small farm but you have to be strong"	Work intensive "I can't do it because I don't have enough time to plow between the two crops"

	"I don't grow the second crop if I am short of laborers: Two crops need more work than one"		
--	---	--	--

Table 2d: ICS 4 Mucuna in rotation with maize, by herders

Criteria	Farmer's evaluation and quotes		
	1. Innovative Farmers	2. Field-day farmers on PPT 1	3. Field-day farmers on PPT 2
1. Production/ yield	High yield "I get enough fodder from very small areas"	High yield "it has lot of leaves" "it grows fast"	High yield "on a better soil, you can get more that what you've got here"
2. Soil fertility	Positive effect on the following crop "Mucuna is a good previous crop"	Good previous effect "Mucuna covers the soil well" "it will feed the soil"	Good previous effect "It's a better previous crop for maize than soybean, peanut, cotton and maize"
3. Flexibility/ Risk management	Easy fodder production "you can sow it anywhere" "you don't always need to weed after planting" "I grow it on my poorest soil"	Easy fodder production « it's a crop that can grow even on a poor soil »	Easy fodder production "It has grown very well considering the soil is not fertile"
	Risks of losing the seeds "I produce my own seeds on 1/5 of the Mucuna area" "you can't find the seeds on the market"	Risks of losing the seeds "some of us tried it but we stopped because we couldn't find any seeds"	
4. Post production strategy	Good quality fodder "It is very rich for cattle, they like it" "I give it to my cows to get milk"	Good quality fodder « It's a really good fodder crop »	Grains valuable for fowls feed "It's interesting if it's possible to use the grain to feed fowl, how do you make that kind of feed?"
		Not fit for human consumption "It's a pity that the grains are not eatable" "What else can you do with the grains?"	
5. Labor management	Difficult drying and storage management "The problem is drying the fodder properly" "It's easy. The hardest part is the drying and storage but I've got the equipment I need"	Difficult drying and storage management "It is a lot of work to harvest, make bales and transport them back to the house"	Difficult drying and storage management "How do you dry it if the rain lasts like it did this year?"

Table 2e: ICS 5 Pigeon pea in rotation with maize

Criteria	Farmer's evaluation and quotes		
	1. Innovative Farmers	2. Field-day farmers on PPT 1	3. Field-day farmers on PPT 2
1. Production/ yield	Low grain yields "I just get some grains for the family and to re sow"	Low grain yields "the cycle is too long, it's going to be difficult to get the grains" Multipurpose « It's good if the leaves can be given to the animals » « it's good because it is multipurpose: you can also eat the beans »	Good grain yields from short cycle variety "the shorter variety is really good to get grains"
			High fodder production on the fodder variety "It is good for fodder production, especially if it re grows after cutting"
2. Soil fertility	Good previous effect for cereals "Pigeon pea helps control weeds, and the maize does better the following year"	Good previous effect for cereals "The litter made of the leaves seems to be good for the soil"	Good previous effect for cereals "It is a better previous crop for maize than soybean, peanut, cotton and maize"
3. Flexibility/ Risk management	Can be cropped on poor soil "I can plant it anywhere" Drought resistant "It stays green even after the rain stops"	Drought resistant « It's good if it is drought resistant »	Drought resistant "so you can get 2 harvests of fodder because it regrows after cutting and stays green for a while"

	Risks of losing production due to grazing "Last year I couldn't harvest before the cow destroyed it." "I started with some seeds I brought from Cote d'Ivoire. Since then, I produce my own seeds but I couldn't get any seeds last year"	Risks of losing production due to grazing "The problem is how to protect it from cattle grazing in the dry season?" « So you need to grow it where it is easy to protect it from free grazing » "fencing is too expensive"	Risks of losing production due to grazing "the short variety is much better because you can harvest the grain before the cattle get into the field"
4. Post production strategy	Food diversification « I don't sell lit. People don't know it" "I didn't know it was good as fodder" "the grain is very sweet. My wife likes cooking it"		
5. Labor management	Low work load "I plant it last". "I don't always weed"		

Table 3: List of activities involving the field day farmers per communities; .Workshops are collective activities led in a municipal room, and Field days are collective activities led on the Participatory Prototyping Trials of 2017 (PPT 1) or 2018 (PPT2). The counted attendees are farmers participating to the activity.

Community	Activity name	Location	Date (DD/MM/YY)	Attendance rate (%)
Boni	Participatory workshop	Municipal room	11/05/17	92%
Boni	Field day Intro.	PPT1	04/08/17	130%
Boni	Field day Eval.	PPT1	21/09/17	67%
Boni	Evaluation workshop	Municipal room	18/04/18	60%
Boni	Field day Eval.	PPT2	03/10/18	100%
Founzan	Participatory workshop	Municipal room	10/05/17	76%
Founzan	Field day Intro.	PPT1	14/08/17	163%
Founzan	Field day Eval.	PPT1	27/09/17	71%
Founzan	Evaluation workshop	Municipal room	19/04/18	87%
Founzan	Field day Eval.	PPT2	02/10/18	70%

Table 4: List of the 16 treatments implemented in the participatory prototyping trials (PPT), ICS: Innovative cropping system (described in table 3); each box represents a 400m², some plots are divided into 2 parts (boxes divided with a dotted line)

Plot n°	Treatment PPT1	Treatment PPT2	ICS or check
1	Sole mucuna	Sole maize	ICS 4
2	Sole maize	Sole mucuna	ICS 4
3	Sole pigeon pea	Sole maize	ICS 5
4	Sole maize	Sole pigeon pea	ICS 5
5	Succession red cowpea- white cowpea	Sole maize	ICS 3
6	Succession red cowpea- maize	Succession red cowpea- maize	ICS 3
7	Sole maize	Succession red cowpea- white cowpea	ICS 3
8	Sole sorghum	cotton	check
	Sole soybean		ICS 2
9	Sorghum -soybean inter-hole intercropping	Sorghum -soybean inter-hole intercropping	ICS 1
		Sorghum -soybean inter-row intercropping	ICS 1
10	Cotton	Sole sorghum	check
		Sole soybean	ICS 2
11	Sole sorghum	Cotton	check
	Sole peanut		check
12	Sorghum- peanut inter-hole intercropping	Sorghum- peanut inter-hole intercropping	ICS 1
		Sorghum- peanut inter-row intercropping	ICS 1
13	Cotton	Sole sorghum	check
		Sole peanuts	check
14	Sole maize	Sorghum- red cowpea intercropping	ICS 1
15	Sole maize	Sole cotton	check
16	Sole maize	Sole maize	check