

# Checklist

Name of reviewer

Proposed ISFM technology

The ASHC communications team is involved in a range of activities to stimulate and facilitate the production of a range of exemplar ISFM materials.

At its meeting in May 2012 the technical advisory group (TAG) volunteered to be the backstop for the quality of the science within the ASHC communications.

To ensure the TAG's input is used effectively, specific members will be requested to sign off technologies closest to their area of expertise. There is a checklist on the website for print which sets out principles for explaining new technologies to farmers. However, in addition we need to ensure that the materials are kept simple and that benefits are stressed. Whilst at times the science may not be explained to farmers, this should not mean that the science itself has been compromised.

One of the ongoing challenges is explaining detailed measurements without access to measuring equipment. Our solution is to always include the recommended measurement – but to look for locally appropriate ways of estimating using items the farmers will have at their disposal.

Please review the text using track changes/comments – but also help us log our progress in the following summary.

**5 is high, 4 is very good, 3 is satisfactory, 2 or less needs to go back to the drawing board!**

	<i>Tick boxes as appropriate – comments can be added on the next page.</i>	5	4	3	2	1
A	How would you rate the underlying science?					
B	Do all claims for the technology appear reasonable?					
C	How would you rate the clarity of the instructions – in terms of smallholders being able to apply the recommendations?					
D	Will farmers be able to access the inputs required to make the technology work?					
E	Are the photographs suitable?					
F	Are the diagrams clear?					
G	How well would you rate the cost-benefit information?					
H	How well would you rate the explanation of risks?					
I	Choices for farmers are explained well (3-5=yes) or (1-2= no)	Yes			No	
J	ASHC is using farmer-friendly estimates of distances and volumes. Are the margins of error acceptable? (3-5=yes) or (1-2= no)	Yes			No	

## Comments

A	On the underlying science....
B	On the claims ...
C	On clarity of the instructions...
D	On access to required inputs...
E	On photographs...
F	On diagrams...
G	On cost-benefit information...
H	On risks...
I	On choices...
J	On measurements...
K	Other issues – such as design, fitness for purpose...