Seeds of Life 3
Baseline Survey

Volume 2
Data Tables

Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
Seeds of Life / Fini ba Moris

Dili, October 2012

This report summarizes the findings of the 2011 Seeds of Life baseline survey carried out by the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries / Seeds of Life program, with the assistance of the National Statistics Directorate of the Ministry of Finance.

The report of the survey consists of three parts:

1. The Main Report
2. Volume 2: Data Tables
3. Volume 3: Annexes

The report can be downloaded in PDF format from www.seedsoflifetimor.org

Suggested citation:

Seeds of Life. 2012. *Seeds of Life 3 Baseline Survey*. Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, Dili, Timor-Leste

Seeds of Life (Fini ba Moris) is a program within the Timor-Leste (East Timor) Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (MAF). The Governments of Timor-Leste and Australia collaboratively fund the program. Australian funding is through the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) plus the Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research (ACIAR) and is managed by ACIAR. The Centre for Legumes in Mediterranean Agriculture (CLIMA) within The University of Western Australia (UWA) coordinates the Australian funded activities.

Foreword

The baseline survey of the Seeds of Life 3 Program was conducted in October 2011 in 100 sucos, selected in the 13 districts of Timor-Leste.

The analysis of the baseline data, and the discussion of the findings is reported in volume 1, the **Main Report**. In order to increase the readability of the Main Report, it was decided to provide the more detailed data tables in a separate document. This is **Volume 2: Data Tables**.

The tables provided in the Main Report are all included in this Volume 2, many with a more detailed breakdown by district than provided in the Main Report. However, as this Volume 2 contains more tables than the Main Report, the numbering of the tables with the same data is – except for some of the early tables – not the same in the two volumes.

List of Tables

1. Household Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics

1.1 Sample Households

Table 1. Distribution of Sample Households by Gender of Head of Household

District	Number of households visited	Gender of head of household		Percentage distribution	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
Ainaro	108	95	13	88%	12%
Aileu	90	87	3	97%	3%
Baucau	233	208	25	89%	11%
Bobonaro	180	151	29	84%	16%
Covalima	126	121	5	96%	4%
Dili	90	85	5	94%	6%
Ermera	234	219	15	94%	6%
Liquiça	126	117	9	93%	7%
Lautem	126	115	11	91%	9%
Manufahi	90	86	4	96%	4%
Manatuto	72	67	5	93%	7%
Oecussi	162	153	9	94%	6%
Viqueque	162	156	6	96%	4%
Total	1,799	1,660	139	92%	8%

Table 2. Age Group and Gender of Heads of Household

Age group	Gender head of HH		Total	Percentage		Sample % of total
	Male	Female		Male	Female	
20 to 29 years	118	6	124	95%	5%	7%
30 to 39 years	363	25	388	94%	6%	22%
40 to 49 years	468	29	497	94%	6%	28%
50 to 59 years	299	27	326	92%	8%	18%
60 to 69 years	357	42	399	89%	11%	22%
70 years and over	52	9	61	85%	15%	3%
Total	1,657	138	1,795[1]	92%	8%	100%

[1] The total number of respondents is not always consistent between all tables. There are questionnaires from 1,799 respondents, but, due these are not always complete for all the data items. The analysis has been conducted on the basis of the available data.

Table 3. Size of Sample Households

District	1-2 persons	3-4 persons	5-7 persons	8-10 persons	11 or more persons	Average HH size	Average HH size Rural HHs 2010 Census
Ainaro	0	13 12%	52 48%	29 27%	14 13%	7.3	5.88
Aileu	4 4%	14 16%	36 40%	29 32%	7 8%	6.8	6.24
Baucau	20 9%	36 16%	96 41%	59 25%	22 9%	6.7	4.89
Bobonaro	4 2%	38 21%	97 54%	35 19%	6 3%	6.2	5.28
Covalima	6 5%	21 17%	62 49%	28 22%	9 7%	6.3	5.19
Dili	3 3%	10 11%	33 37%	27 30%	17 19%	7.7	6.29
Ermera	3 1%	40 17%	96 41%	69 29%	26 11%	7.1	6.01
Liquiça	1 1%	12 10%	43 34%	52 41%	18 14%	7.8	6.05
Lautem	10 8%	20 16%	45 36%	42 33%	9 7%	6.7	4.96
Manufahi	4 4%	13 14%	44 49%	19 21%	10 11%	6.8	6.06
Manatuto	1 1%	9 13%	41 57%	17 24%	4 6%	6.7	5.86
Oecussi	4 2%	38 23%	89 55%	30 19%	1 1%	5.8	4.47
Viqueque	11 7%	37 23%	71 44%	37 23%	6 4%	5.9	4.94
Total	71 4%	301 17%	805 45%	472 26%	149 8%	6.7	5.43
Male-headed HHs	59 4%	252 15%	757 46%	447 27%	145 9%	6.8	
Female-headed HHs	12 9%	49 35%	48 35%	26 19%	4 3%	5.4	

Table 4. Highest Level of Education of Heads of Sample Households, by District

Highest level of education	Percentage of respondents												
	Ainaro	Aileu	Baucau	Bobonaro	Covalima	Dili	Ermera	Liquiça	Lautem	Manufahi	Manatuto	Oecussi	Viqueque
No schooling	47	49	48	48	57	41	66	60	47	50	58	62	49
Attended Primary	15	13	24	13	6	20	15	13	18	11	8	11	10
Completed Primary	6	17	8	11	11	13	9	13	10	17	13	16	5
Attended Junior High School	6	1		4	4	6	2	2	6	3		2	7
Completed Junior High School	7	8	8	7	8	6	4	3	7	8	14	5	9
Attended Senior High School	4		1	2	5	4	1	1	3	4	1		1
Completed Senior High School	16	9	11	15	9	9	3	6	9	7	4	2	16
Higher education (attended/completed)	1	3	0.4	1		1	1	1			1	1	2

Table 5. Highest Level of Education of Heads of Sample Households, by Gender

Highest level of education	Male		Female		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
No schooling	861	52%	99	71%	960	53%
Attended Primary	242	15%	17	12%	259	14%
Completed Primary	183	11%	9	6%	192	11%
Attended Junior High School	53	3%	3	2%	56	3%
Completed Junior High School	115	7%	6	4%	121	7%
Attended Senior High School	32	2%	1	1%	33	2%
Completed Senior High School	158	10%	3	2%	161	9%
Higher education (attended/completed)	15	1%	1	1%	16	1%
Total	1,659		139		1,798	

1.2 Ownership of Amenities, Farming Tools and Farm Equipment

Table 6. Ownership of Household Amenities

Household item(s) in workable/usable condition	District													Total		Timor-Leste Census 2010 (Rural)
	Ainaro	Aileu	Baucau	Bobonaro	Covalima	Dili	Ermera	Liquiça	Lautem	Manufahi	Manatuto	Oecussi	Viqueque	Number	Percent	
Table	91%	91%	93%	84%	54%	98%	87%	99%	81%	71%	81%	71%	79%	1499	83%	—
Chairs (plastic, wood)	83%	87%	85%	89%	54%	92%	86%	98%	76%	57%	83%	74%	73%	1450	81%	—
Telephone / mobile	47%	51%	46%	44%	46%	63%	51%	86%	54%	60%	40%	19%	49%	887	49%	43.2%
Radio	29%	28%	15%	16%	20%	28%	35%	41%	17%	21%	18%	8%	18%	400	22%	28.5%
Television	12%	20%	8%	13%	9%	19%	5%	11%	13%	4%	11%	0.6%	10%	174	10%	10.9%
Motorcycle	8%	16%	2%	18%	14%	7%	3%	5%	7%	8%		4%	7%	130	7%	7.4%
Bicycle	0.9%	3%	0.9%	5%	14%	10%		6%	4%	17%	8%	3%	9%	94	5%	7.3%
Boat			2%	2%		16%		6%		2%			0.6%	33	2%	2.5%
Sewing machine	2%	6%	0.4%		2%	1.1%	0.9%	3%	2%	1.1%	4%	1.2%	2%	30	2%	—
Refrigerator / freezer			0.9%	2%		2%	0.4%	2%	0.8%		3%	0.6%	2%	19	1.1%	3.2%
Car / van / angguna	0.9%	1.1%	0.4%	2%				2%						9	0.5%	2.1%

Table 7. Ownership of Farming Tools and Farm Equipment

Farming tool(s) in workable condition	District													Total	
	Ainaro	Aileu	Baucau	Bobonaro	Covalima	Dili	Ermera	Liquiça	Lautem	Manufahi	Manatuto	Oecussi	Viqueque	Number of households	Number
Big knife / machete	95%	99%	97%	93%	98%	90%	94%	100%	98%	100%	99%	99%	98%	1741	97%
Pick	87%	97%	91%	92%	90%	90%	88%	95%	66%	92%	99%	98%	92%	1622	90%
Planting stick	84%	67%	68%	83%	77%	56%	85%	90%	56%	100%	96%	98%	81%	1437	80%
Hoe	64%	78%	35%	69%	43%	54%	66%	85%	29%	81%	69%	64%	60%	1068	59%
Shovel	39%	73%	23%	76%	37%	51%	62%	80%	39%	70%	76%	42%	36%	931	52%
Axe	32%	54%	15%	54%	40%	38%	61%	48%	20%	54%	58%	54%	43%	775	43%
Crop drying area	15%	41%	47%	6%	34%	81%	18%	13%	5%	77%	92%	17%	80%	647	36%
Tarpaulin/canvass	20%	27%	23%	39%	28%	29%	34%	44%	24%	48%	28%	21%	38%	556	31%
Sickle / reaping hook	13%	29%	13%	54%	30%	12%	18%	25%	17%	48%	54%	20%	36%	483	27%
Drum / bidon	30%	27%	9%	46%	15%	17%	20%	43%	65%	31%	18%	4%	7%	433	24%
Water can	11%	19%	1%	37%	26%	20%	10%	15%	10%	9%	18%	10%	6%	251	14%
Ox-cart	3%	13%	4%	12%	10%	4%	2%	13%	6%	18%	3%	3%	6%	126	7%
Wheelbarrow	1%	3%	3%	12%	7%	10%	3%	8%	3%	9%	7%	1%	7%	98	5%
Hand-operated sprayer	3%	6%	0.4%	11%	3%	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%			43	2%
Silo	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%	1%		2%	3%	7%	3%	1%	1%	31	2%
Hand tractor	1%		1%	1%	6%		0.4%				3%	3%		21	1%
Corn sheller	1%	1%		1%	1%			1%	1%		1%			7	0.4%

1.3 Housing Condition

Table 8. Housing Condition

Housing condition	District													Total		Timor-Leste Census 2010 (Rural)
	Ainaro	Aileu	Baucau	Bobonaro	Covalima	Dili	Ermera	Liquiça	Lautem	Manufahi	Manatuto	Oecussi	Viqueque	Number of housesholds	Percent	
Roof # of records	106	90	233	179	121	90	229	126	126	89	72	162	162	1785		
Corrugated iron	77%	81%	53%	74%	55%	77%	71%	52%	79%	45%	35%	56%	49%	1109	62%	58.5%
Palm leaves / Talitahan / Thatch / Grass	16%	17%	47%	25%	45%	21%	26%	43%	20%	52%	50%	43%	51%	632	35%	37.9%
Bamboo	5%	2%				1%	1%	6%	2%	3%	11%			31	2%	1.5%
Concrete	1%			1%							4%			5	0.3%	0.2%
Asbestos	1%			1%								1%		4	0.2%	1.2%
Tiles							1%							3	0.2%	0.5%
Tarpaulin / plastic						1%								1	0.1%	
External walls # of records	88	76	233	179	121	90	234	126	126	90	72	162	161	1758		
Palm trunk (bebak)	47%	21%	35%	45%	66%	42%	12%	49%	16%	76%	60%	65%	46%	735	42%	31.0%
Bamboo	19%	38%	46%	8%	8%	33%	70%	44%	65%	19%	31%	7%	40%	625	36%	40.3%
Concrete / brick	22%	30%	12%	28%	19%	23%	14%	5%	17%	2%	8%	16%	12%	276	16%	17.4%
Wood	3%	4%	1%	3%	2%		4%			1%		6%		38	2%	4.2%
Corrugated iron	7%	4%	1%	3%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	34	2%	3.0%
Rock			2%	10%					2%	1%		1%		28	2%	1.5%
Clay / soil	2%	3%	2%	3%	2%			1%				2%		20	1%	1.6%
No walls			0.4%										0.6%	2	0.1%	
Floor # of records	107	90	233	178	121	90	234	126	126	90	71	162	162	1790		
Soil / clay / mud	82%	84%	89%	47%	67%	70%	88%	70%	74%	77%	65%	80%	90%	1379	77%	71.8%
Concrete	15%	12%	10%	48%	23%	28%	9%	21%	24%	11%	11%	19%	9%	328	18%	17.3%
Wood	2%	1%	1%	3%	9%		2%	7%	1%	12%	24%		1%	64	4%	1.6%
Tile / stone	1%	2%		2%	1%	2%	1%	2%	2%			1%	1%	19	1%	2.7%

2. Crops and Land Usage

2.1 Cultivation of Foodcrops by Sample Households

Table 9. Cultivation of Five Foodcrops by Survey Sample Households

District	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents cultivating this crop				
		Corn	Rice	Peanut	Sweet Potato	Cassava
Ainaro	108	69%	6%	13%	82%	68%
Aileu	90	57%	24%	1%	41%	79%
Baucau	233	48%	64%	11%	64%	71%
Bobonaro	180	98%	39%	39%	36%	92%
Covalima	126	89%	26%	8%	21%	83%
Dili	90	60%			13%	74%
Ermera	234	90%	17%	10%	59%	89%
Liquiça	126	87%		32%	44%	96%
Lautem	126	97%	32%	23%	67%	90%
Manufahi	90	100%	20%	33%	89%	94%
Manatuto	72	100%	79%	47%	65%	90%
Oecussi	162	100%	90%	47%	53%	83%
Viqueque	162	86%	65%	33%	66%	84%
Total # and % of farmers	1,799	1,485 83%	687 38%	406 23%	977 54%	1,510 84%

Table 10. Projection of Households engaged in Crop Production (2010-2015)

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Households engaged in crop production (assuming 2% growth)	116,426	118,755	121,130	123,552	126,023	128,544

Table 11. Projected Number of Households growing Five Foodcrops (2010-2015)

Crop	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Corn	102,346	104,393	106,481	108,610	110,783	112,998
Rice	45,672	46,585	47,517	48,467	49,437	50,426
Peanut	26,778	27,314	27,860	28,417	28,985	29,565
Cassava	94,833	96,730	98,664	100,638	102,650	104,703
Sweet potato	62,870	64,127	65,410	66,718	68,053	69,414

Projections for corn, rice and cassava based on the census 2010 data.
Projections for peanut and sweet potato based on the baseline survey data.

Table 12. Number of Main Crops Cultivated per Farming Plot

District	Number of plots cultivated	Number of main crops cultivated per farming plot (% of plots cultivated in the district with this number of crops)							
		One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	Eight
Ainaro	126	10%	21%	16%	18%	13%	15%	6%	2%
Aileu	109	39%	15%	10%	9%	9%	8%	6%	4%
Baucau	331	50%	14%	20%	9%	4%	2%	0.6%	0.6%
Bobonaro	277	39%	29%	19%	13%				
Covalima	139	27%	50%	19%	3%				
Dili	105	56%	26%	16%	2%				
Ermera	270	17%	29%	34%	13%	5%	0.7%	0.4%	
Liquiça	126	13%	33%	37%	17%				
Lautem	159	27%	14%	39%	17%	3%			
Manufahi	108	19%	6%	39%	25%	9%	0.9%		
Manatuto	127	46%	9%	17%	18%	7%	4%		
Oecussi	275	25%	21%	20%	20%	13%	1.5%		
Viqueque	254	46%	9%	24%	17%	5%			
Total	2,406	794 33%	508 21%	572 24%	339 14%	122 5%	47 2%	16 0.7%	8 0.3%
Male-headed HHs	2,214	728 33%	464 21%	518 23%	319 14%	117 5%	46 2%	14 0.6%	8 0.4%
Female-headed HHs	192	66 34%	44 23%	54 28%	20 10%	5 3%	1 0.5%	2 1.0%	

Table 13. Correlation Analysis between Number of Crops Cultivated, Plot Sizes and Numbers of Plots

District	Number of respondents	Number of plots cultivated	Average # of plots cultivated by a farmer	Correlation between number of crops and	
				Plot size	# of plots
Ainaro	108	126	1.17	0.0951	- 0.2052
Aileu	90	109	1.21	- 0.0031	- 0.3505
Baucau	233	331	1.42	- 0.1285	- 0.3700
Bobonaro	180	277	1.54	- 0.0015	- 0.2658
Covalima	126	139	1.10	- 0.0233	- 0.3347
Dili	90	105	1.17	- 0.1729	- 0.2187
Ermera	234	270	1.15	- 0.0133	- 0.1348
Liquiça	126	126	1.00	0.2565	0
Lautem	126	159	1.26	- 0.0323	- 0.6848
Manufahi	90	108	1.20	- 0.0819	- 0.6984
Manatuto	72	127	1.76	- 0.0302	- 0.1303
Oecussi	162	275	1.70	0.2266	- 0.5280
Viqueque	162	254	1.57	- 0.0150	- 0.6805
Total	1,799	2,406	1.34		

2.2 Corn Production

Table 14. Corn Production

District	Corn production during October 2010 – September 2011 (Number of respondents in the district growing corn)									Average size of harvest (kg)	Maximum harvest (kg)
	No harvest	Less than 10 kg	10 to < 25 kg	25 to < 50 kg	50 to < 100 kg	100 to < 200 kg	200 to < 500 kg	500 to < 1,000 kg	More than 1000 kg		
Ainaro		1	8	8	13	18	12	9	4	263	1,800
Aileu	1		7	11	8	10	12	1	1	148	1,125
Baucau		2	8	32	24	31	11	3	1	134	1,575
Bobonaro					5	15	62	58	35	729	4,500
Covalima		1	1	1	10	24	46	12	9	413	4,500
Dili		2	7	11	15	9	9			108	450
Ermera	4	2	16	30	56	52	40	4	2	158	2,700
Liquiça		2	2	5	25	39	30	6		194	675
Lautem		1	3	5	20	38	34	18	3	289	1,500
Manufahi			5	8	18	11	35	11	1	272	2,250
Manatuto		5	7	17	11	7	19	4	2	246	3,150
Oecussi		10	28	29	43	31	17	2	2	118	1,902
Viqueque	1	2	12	24	31	25	20	13	11	380	6,300
Total # and % of crop growers	6 0.4%	28 2%	104 7%	181 12%	279 19%	310 21%	347 24%	141 10%	71 5%	287	6,300

2.3 Rice Production

Table 15. Irrigated Rice Production

District	Irrigated rice production during October 2010 – September 2011 (Number of respondents in the district growing irrigated rice)									Average size of harvest (kg)	Maximum harvest (kg)
	No harvest	Less than 10 kg	10 to < 25 kg	25 to < 50 kg	50 to < 100 kg	100 to < 200 kg	200 to < 500 kg	500 to < 1,000 kg	More than 1000 kg		
Ainaro							2	1	1	715	1,200
Aileu							2	10	10	1,084	2,400
Baucau			1	3	14	17	23	12	9	434	3,142
Bobonaro						3	5	9	11	1,026	2,800
Covalima				1	1	3	1	3	19	1,248	4,800
Dili											
Ermera				1	4	3	20	3	8	640	2,700
Liquiça											
Lautem					1	3	3	2	1	377	1,400
Manufahi						1	2	3	12	1,484	3,200
Manatuto				1		2	17	10	21	1,085	8,000
Oecussi				1	2	15	12	13	7	469	1,600
Viqueque	3			3	4	9	25	27	33	929	7,000
Total # and % of crop growers	3 0.7%	0 0%	1 0.2%	10 2%	26 6%	56 13%	112 26%	93 21%	132 30%	821	8,000

Table 16. Upland Rice Production

District	Upland rice production during October 2010 – September 2011 (Number of respondents in the district growing upland rice)									Average size of harvest (kg)	Maximum harvest (kg)
	No harvest	Less than 10 kg	10 to < 25 kg	25 to < 50 kg	50 to < 100 kg	100 to < 200 kg	200 to < 500 kg	500 to < 1,000 kg	More than 1000 kg		
Ainaro					1		1		1	750	1,800
Aileu						1	1			287	440
Baucau			1	7	10	26	18	6	1	215	1,036
Bobonaro							15	15	13	872	2,700
Covalima						1	4	1	1	438	1,000
Dili											
Ermera							1			252	252
Liquiça											
Lautem				1		6	13	5	5	501	2,200
Manufahi											
Manatuto					1	1	1	2	1	687	2,000
Oecussi			7	25	31	19	13	2		104	560
Viqueque											
Total # and % of crop growers	0 0%	0 0%	8 3%	33 13%	43 17%	54 21%	67 26%	31 12%	22 9%	340	2,700

2.4 Peanut Production

Table 17. Peanut Production

District	Peanut production during October 2010 – September 2011 (Number of respondents in the district growing peanut)									Average size of harvest (kg)	Maximum harvest (kg)
	No harvest	Less than 10 kg	10 to < 25 kg	25 to < 50 kg	50 to < 100 kg	100 to < 200 kg	200 to < 500 kg	500 to < 1,000 kg	More than 1000 kg		
Ainaro			3	1	5	3	2			83	250
Aileu			1		0					13	13
Baucau			8	11	3	2	1			50	320
Bobonaro			5	14	28	11	8	3	1	135	1,395
Covalima			2	4	1	2	3	1		158	675
Dili		1								6	6
Ermera			9	5	7	1		2	1	191	2,660
Liquiça	1	2	6	20	9	2				37	125
Lautem		1	15	7	3	3				37	180
Manufahi			2	14	6	7	1			64	250
Manatuto			4	18	11		1			44	250
Oecussi			31	29	11	7	1	1		49	500
Viqueque	2	3	16	17	11	4	1	1		48	500
Total # and % of crop growers	3 0.7%	7 2%	102 24%	140 34%	95 23%	42 10%	18 4%	8 2%	2 0.5%	75	2,660

2.5 Cassava Production

Table 18. Cassava Production

District	Cassava production during October 2010 – September 2011 (Number of respondents in the district growing cassava)									Average size of harvest (kg)	Maximum harvest (kg)
	No harvest	Less than 10 kg	10 to < 25 kg	25 to < 50 kg	50 to < 100 kg	100 to < 200 kg	200 to < 500 kg	500 to < 1,000 kg	More than 1000 kg		
Ainaro			2	3	11	9	21	23	5	436	1,600
Aileu					3	15	24	23	4	558	5,301
Baucau		2	4		40	52	41	11	16	315	2,010
Bobonaro				1		20	82	35	25	562	3,720
Covalima					10	22	26	25	15	505	2,325
Dili					6	8	30	9	14	604	4,020
Ermera		2	2	3	28	40	92	28	11	363	5,360
Liquiça	2	8	6	1	24	26	34	11	6	254	1,340
Lautem				1	20	46	36	8	1	256	1,860
Manufahi				1	13	34	24	11	3	287	2,660
Manatuto					1	10	34	14	6	494	3,350
Oecussi	6			3	28	33	46	9	4	261	3,216
Viqueque	2	4		1	79	24	18	2	4	155	1,608
Total # and % of crop growers	10 0.7%	16 1%	14 0.9%	14 0.9%	263 18%	339 23%	508 34%	209 14%	114 8%	370	5,360

2.6 Sweet Potato Production

Table 19. Sweet Potato Production

District	Sweet potato production during October 2010 – September 2011 (Number of respondents in the district growing sweet potato)									Average size of harvest (kg)	Maximum harvest (kg)
	No harvest	Less than 10 kg	10 to < 25 kg	25 to < 50 kg	50 to < 100 kg	100 to < 200 kg	200 to < 500 kg	500 to < 1,000 kg	More than 1000 kg		
Ainaro		2	1	18	18	11	26	11	1	255	1,688
Aileu				2	14	7	14			208	450
Baucau		4	4	30	30	39	27	10	5	217	3,000
Bobonaro				1	11	35	12	4	1	198	1,400
Covalima				6	6	7	6	1		185	750
Dili				2	2	8				117	188
Ermera		8	3	32	52	32	9	2		99	750
Liquiça		12	3	15	9	13	3			77	300
Lautem			1	23	20	20	17	1	1	140	1,050
Manufahi				13	29	22	12	2		138	750
Manatuto				2	14	21	9		1	178	1,500
Oecussi	4		1	20	38	13	7			90	488
Viqueque	2		1	71	16	16	2	1		66	900
Total # and % of crop growers	6 0.6%	26 3%	14 1%	235 24%	259 27%	244 25%	144 15%	32 3%	9 0.9%	149	3,000

2.7 Crop Damages and Losses, and their Causes

Table 20. Crop Damages and Losses

	Corn		Rice		Peanut	Sweet Potato	Cassava
	Irrigated	Non-irrigated	Irrigated	Non-irrigated	Non-irrigated	Non-irrigated	Non-irrigated
# of farmers reporting losses	21	1,277	387	215	340	817	1,296
% of farmers growing the crop (irrigated + non-irrigated) reporting losses or damages	1%	87%	56%	31%	82%	84%	87%
Most important causes of damage or loss to crops (% of reported cases of losses or damages)							
Total # of causes mentioned by respondents	33	1,910	621	374	454	1,151	1,865
Domestic livestock and dogs	39%	15%	14%	7%	14%	11%	13%
Rodents (rats and mice)	30%	31%	36%	38%	37%	32%	30%
Other wild animals	15%	31%	8%	10%	30%	36%	42%
Locusts		1%	11%	9%	1%	1%	1%
Other pests & diseases	3%	2%	14%	7%	1%	4%	2%
Fire		0.3%		0.3%		0.2%	0.3%
Too much rain	9%	16%	14%	21%	12%	13%	10%
Too little rain	3%	3%	2%	6%	4%	1%	2%
Theft		0.1%			0.4%	0.4%	0.3%
Other cause of damage		1%	2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%

2.8 Farming Plots Sizes and Number of Crops Grown

Table 21. Size of Farming Plots used for Cultivation of Foodcrops in the Last Year

District	Size of farming plots used for cultivation of foodcrops, Oct '10 – Sep '11 (% of plots cultivated by the respondents in the district)						
	< 0.25 ha	0.25-0.49 ha	0.5-0.74 ha	0.75-0.99 ha	1-1.49 ha	1.5-1.99 ha	> 2 ha
Ainaro	1%	32%	10%	3%	51%	2%	1%
Aileu	11%	29%	5%		48%		8%
Baucau	10%	24%	17%	2%	34%	5%	8%
Bobonaro	8%	28%	5%	6%	47%	0.4%	7%
Covalima	9%	19%	17%	1%	53%		1%
Dili	28%	39%	7%	1%	21%		5%
Ermera	11%	37%	8%		36%		7%
Liquiça	5%	18%	36%	2%	32%	1%	7%
Lautem	46%	34%	4%	2%	13%		2%
Manufahi		57%	1%		39%		3%
Manatuto	2%	46%	7%	2%	38%		5%
Oecussi	43%	43%	7%	3%	3%	1%	
Viqueque	17%	37%	11%	6%	19%	0.4%	9%
Total	370	800	258	58	766	26	128
	15%	33%	11%	2%	32%	1%	5%
Male-headed HHs	332	729	233	52	719	23	123
	15%	33%	11%	2%	33%	1%	6%
Female-headed HHs	37	70	25	6	47	3	5
	19%	36%	13%	3%	24%	2%	3%

Table 22. Number of Farming Plots cultivated per Farmer for Foodcrops

District	Number of farming plots cultivated per farmer for foodcrops (% of respondents in the district)				
	One	Two	Three	Four	Five
Ainaro	86%	12%	0.9%	0.9%	
Aileu	79%	21%			
Baucau	61%	36%	2%	0.4%	
Bobonaro	54%	40%	5%	0.6%	0.6%
Covalima	90%	10%			
Dili	83%	17%			
Ermera	85%	15%			
Liquiça	100%				
Lautem	74%	26%			
Manufahi	80%	20%			
Manatuto	24%	76%			
Oecussi	52%	32%	9%	7%	
Viqueque	44%	54%	1.2%		
Total	1,254 70%	499 28%	31 2%	14 0.8%	1 0.1%

Table 23. Irrigated and Non-Irrigated Plots, by Crop

District	Number of plots		Corn		Rice		Peanut		Sweet potato		Cassava	
	Irri-gated	Non irri-gated	Irri-gated	Non irri-gated	Irri-gated	Non irri-gated	Irri-gated	Non irri-gated	Irri-gated	Non irri-gated	Irri-gated	Non irri-gated
Ainaro	4	120	2	78	4	2	1	13	2	89	2	75
Aileu	21	86	2	53	20	3				36	1	68
Baucau	81	248	1	116	80	68		23	1	149	2	163
Bobonaro	27	248	1	175	26	47	1	69	1	61	1	160
Covalima	30	102	3	97	28	6		9		23	1	90
Dili	2	102	2	60						13		71
Ermera	35	227	12	196	33	6	3	22	8	126	12	194
Liquiça		124		106				39		55		119
Lautem	11	142	1	116	10	40		26	1	80	1	106
Manufahi	15	93		89	15	3		31		80		85
Manatuto	51	76	1	72	50	8		32		47		64
Oecussi	53	218	4	210	50	124	2	76	2	87	2	161
Viqueque	107	145	3	136	105	1		53	2	105	2	133
Total	437	1,931	32	1,504	421	308	7	393	17	951	24	1,489
% of irrigated plots			7%		96%		2%		4%		5%	
% of non irrigated plots				78%		16%		20%		49%		77%

Table 24. Number of Farmers growing Irrigated, Non-Irrigated and Mixed Crops

District	Total number of farmers in sample	Growing crops on irrigated plots only	Growing crops on non-irrigated plots only	Growing crops on irrigated and non-irrigated plots	Unknown
Ainaro	108	3	103	1	1
Aileu	90	5	67	16	2
Baucau	233	34	151	45	3
Bobonaro	180	2	152	24	2
Covalima	126	13	85	16	12
Dili	90		88	1	1
Ermera	234	15	191	20	8
Liquiça	126		124		2
Lautem	126	3	108	8	7
Manufahi	90		75	15	0
Manatuto	72		21	51	0
Oecussi	162	2	113	43	4
Viqueque	162	15	56	89	2
Total	1,799	92 5%	1,334 74%	329 18%	44 2%

Table 25. Number of Farmers growing Irrigated and Non-Irrigated Rice

District	Number of rice farmers	Irrigated rice only	Non irrigated rice only	Irrigated and non-irrigated rice
Ainaro	6	4	2	
Aileu	21	18	1	2
Baucau	145	80	64	1
Bobonaro	71	25	45	1
Covalima	33	27	5	1
Dili				
Ermera	39	33	6	
Liquiça				
Lautem	37	7	27	3
Manufahi	18	15	3	
Manatuto	57	50	7	
Oecussi	145	35	101	9
Viqueque	104	103		1
Total	676	397 59%	261 39%	18 3%

Table 26. Number of Farmers growing Irrigated and Non-Irrigated Corn

District	Number of corn farmers	Corn grown on irrigated plots only	Corn grown on non irrigated plots only	Corn grown on irrigated and non-irrigated plots
Ainaro	76	2	74	
Aileu	52	1	50	1
Baucau	109	1	108	
Bobonaro	172	1	171	
Covalima	100	3	97	
Dili	53	1	52	
Ermera	202	11	190	1
Liquiça	106		106	
Lautem	116	1	115	
Manufahi	89		89	
Manatuto	72		71	1
Oecussi	156	2	153	1
Viqueque	137	2	134	1
Total	1,440	25 2%	1,410 98%	5 0.3%

2.9 Travel Time from Homestead to Farming Plots

Table 27. Travel Time from Homestead to Farming Plots

District	Travel times from the homestead to farming plot (% of plots cultivated in the district)								
	< 5 min	5' to < 15'	15' to < 30'	30' to < 45'	45' to < 60'	60' to < 90'	90' to < 120'	120' to < 180'	3 hours, or more
Ainaro	15%	9%	10%	20%	3%	29%		13%	1%
Aileu	27%	7%	14%	27%	1%	13%	6%	6%	
Baucau	26%	9%	12%	23%	5%	18%	1%	7%	
Bobonaro	16%	7%	11%	30%	7%	20%	2%	7%	2%
Covalima	5%	6%	18%	26%	2%	31%	1%	9%	1%
Dili	37%	5%	4%	13%	2%	23%	1%	11%	4%
Ermera	33%	5%	9%	13%	1%	30%		10%	0.4%
Liquiça	6%	18%	14%	9%	2%	36%	2%	12%	2%
Lautem	5%	1%	10%	37%	2%	26%	4%	13%	3%
Manufahi	1%		9%	31%	6%	37%	1%	12%	4%
Manatuto	6%	1%	6%	30%	6%	28%	1%	17%	6%
Oecussi	18%	2%	7%	20%	2%	32%	0.4%	16%	3%
Viqueque	6%	4%	11%	12%	6%	26%	12%	21%	2%
Total	398	134	249	524	86	629	60	283	45
	17%	6%	10%	22%	4%	26%	2%	12%	2%
Male-headed HHs	360	116	227	485	79	583	58	264	43
	16%	5%	10%	22%	4%	26%	3%	12%	2%
Female-headed HHs	38	18	22	39	7	46	2	19	2
	20%	9%	11%	20%	4%	24%	1%	10%	1%

3. Seeds and Cuttings

Table 28. MAF/SoL Varieties Adoption Rates

District	Corn		Rice		Peanut		Cassava		Sweet potato	
	# of corn growers	Sele growers (%)	# of rice growers	Nakroma growers (%)	# of peanut growers	Utamua growers (%)	# of cassava growers	Ai-Luka growers (%)	# of sweet potato growers	Hohrae growers (%)
Ainaro	76	25%	6	0%	14	0%	73	1%	89	3%
Aileu	52	52%	22	18%	1	0%	70	0%	37	11%
Baucau	112	25%	148	24%	25	52%	165	8%	148	18%
Bobonaro	176	18%	72	15%	71	20%	162	8%	64	3%
Covalima	108	2%	33	3%	10	0%	101	4%	25	4%
Dili	54	19%	0	0%	0	0%	67	0%	12	0%
Ermera	210	9%	40	0%	23	0%	209	1%	134	0%
Liquiça	107	11%	0	0%	40	35%	121	2%	55	11%
Lautem	119	61%	39	33%	28	75%	98	19%	73	19%
Manufahi	90	7%	18	6%	30	23%	85	5%	79	8%
Manatuto	72	8%	57	5%	32	6%	62	0%	44	5%
Oecussi	162	0%	146	2%	73	1%	133	1%	81	0%
Viqueque	140	100%	104	100%	54	100%	136	100%	107	100%
Total for										
13 districts*	1.478	25%	685	26%	401	31%	1,482	13%	948	18%
11 districts**	1.219	13%	542	11%	319	16%	1,248	3%	768	7%

* The number of crop farmers listed in the table is smaller than the numbers reported in Table 9. The reason is that some crop grower records had inconclusive data. The respondent may have mentioned a source of seed, or a productivity comparison with other varieties, or a reason to select the variety, but none of the other requested data was provided, thus making it uncertain whether the crop was really planted by that farmer in the last year. Such farmers were not counted in the above table.re

** The "11 districts" total does not include Viqueque and Lautem. These two districts have not been included because the reported use of MAF/SoL varieties for the five crops is somewhat implausible.

Table 29. MAF/SoL Varieties Adoption Rates by Sub-District

District and Sub-District	# of farmers	MAF/SoL variety growers			MAF/SoL varieties				
		Total	Male headed HHs	Fem. headed HHs	Sele	Nakro-ma	Uta-mua	Ai-Luka	Hohrae
Ainaro	108	20	19	1	19			1	3
Ainaro	36	1		1					1
Hatu-Builico	18	7	7		7				1
Maubisse	36	8	8		8				
Hato-Udo	18	4	4		4			1	1
Aileu	90	30	28	2	27	4			4
Aileu Vila	36	26	24	2	23	4			4
Liquidoe	18	0							
Remexio	18	1	1		1				
Laulara	18	3	3		3				

District and Sub-District	# of farmers	MAF/SoL variety growers			MAF/SoL varieties				
		Total	Male headed HHs	Fem. headed HHs	Sele	Nakro-ma	Uta-mua	Ai-Luka	Hohrae
Baucau	233	88	83	5	28	35	13	14	27
Baucau	54	22	22		1	15	2	2	6
Laga	18	12	12		7		6	2	2
Quelicai	53	6	5	1		5			1
Baguia	36	23	22	1	15	1	4	2	11
Vemase	36	20	17	3	5	10	1	6	7
Venilale	36	5	5			4		2	
Bobonaro	180	42	33	9	32	11	14	13	2
Maliana	18	7	5	2	5	2	2	7	
Cailaco	18	6	3	3	6	1	1		
Balibo	36	1	1				1		
Atabae	18	8	8		4	4	4	1	
Lolotoe	18	3	3		3				
Bobonaro	72	17	13	4	14	4	6	5	2
Covalima	126	6	6		2	1		4	1
Fatumean	18	0							
Fohorem	18	0							
Maucatar	18	3	3		1	1		3	
Suai	18	0							
Tilomar	18	0							
Zumalai	36	3	3		1			1	1
Dili	90	10	8	2	10				
Vera Cruz	18	0							
Metinaro	18	3	2	1	3				
Atauro	36	6	6		6				
Cristo Rei	18	1		1	1				
Ermera	234	20	19	1	18			3	
Railaco	36	0							
Ermera	54	0							
Letefoho	54	4	4		4				
Atsabe	36	14	13	1	13			2	
Hatolia	54	2	2		1			1	
Liquiça	126	29	28	1	12		14	3	6
Bazartete	36	11	10	1	1		5	3	4
Liquiça	36	1	1						1
Maubara	54	17	17		11		9		1
Manufahi	90	14	14		6	1	7	4	6
Same	18	1	1		1				
Alas	36	8	8		5	1	5	2	4
Fatuberliu	18	2	2				2		
Turiscai	18	3	3					2	2
Manatuto	72	8	8		6	3	2		2
Manatuto	18	3	3		3		1		1
Laleia	18	4	4		2	3	1		1
Laclo	18	0							
Barique	18	1	1		1				
Oecusse	162	3	3			3	1	1	
Pante Macasar	54	1	1			1	1	1	
Nitibe	54	0							
Oesilo	36	2	2			2			
Passabe	18	0							
Total	1,511	270 18%	249	21	160	58	51	43	51

Table 30. MAF/SoL Varieties Adoption Rates

District	Farmers with irrigated plots		Farmers with non-irrigated plots		Farmers with irrigated and non-irrigated plots	
	# of farmers	# of farmers growing MAF/SoL varieties	# of farmers	# of farmers growing MAF/SoL varieties	# of farmers	# of farmers growing MAF/SoL varieties
Ainaro	3		103	20	1	
Aileu	5	4	67	9	16	15
Baucau	34	16	151	49	45	22
Bobonaro	2	1	152	32	24	9
Covalima	13		85	5	16	1
Dili			88	9	1	1
Ermera	15	4	191	14	20	1
Liquiça			124	29		
Manufahi			75	13	15	1
Manatuto			21	1	51	7
Oecussi	2		113		43	3
Total (11 districts)* Adoption rate by farmers with that irrigation status	74	25 34%	1,170	181 15%	232	60 26%

* Without Viqueque and Lautem

Note: The table does not include the 35 farmers, nor the 4 MAF/SoL variety adopters of whom the irrigations status was unclear,

3.1 Corn

Table 31. Corn Varieties Planted

District	Number of farmers planting corn, and % of farmers in the sample		Corn variety planted (# of farmers in district)							Number of varieties planted (# of farmers in district)			
	Number	%	Sele	Batar lais	Batar bo'ot	Suwan 5	Arjuna	Kalinga	Other *	One	Two	Three	Four
Ainaro	76	70%	19	43	33				9	49	26	1	
Aileu	52	58%	27	18	38		2		2	19	31	2	
Baucau	112	48%	28	24	51		36	1	13	72	39	1	
Bobonaro	176	98%	32	96	124		2		1	107	60	8	1
Covalima	108	86%	2	16	94		2			102	6		
Dili	54	60%	10	36	34		1	1	1	29	21	4	
Ermera	210	90%	18	127	102			2	2	171	37	2	
Liquiça	107	85%	12	87	69			4	1	44	60	3	
Lautem	119	94%	73	42	38	3	31			55	60	4	
Manufahi	90	100%	6	50	60	1				63	27		
Manatuto	72	100%	6	46	49	1	1			43	27	2	
Oecussi	162	100%		18	160		6			140	22		
Viqueque	140	86%	140							140			
Total (13 Dist.)	1.478	82%	373	603	852	5	81	8	29	1.034	416	27	1
Total (11 Dist.) **	1.219	81%	160 13%	561 46%	814 67%	2 0.2%	50 4%	8 1%	29 2%	839 69%	356 29%	23 2%	1 0.1%

* The category "Other" also includes varieties of which the respondent did not remember the name.
** Without Viqueque and Lautem

3.1.1 Sele

Table 32. Number of Farmers by Reported Starting year of growing Sele

District	Before 2005	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Total # of farmers	% of corn farmers in district growing Sele
Ainaro	9	0	4	4	1	1	0	19	25%
Aileu	13	4	8	0	1	0	1	27	52%
Baucau	12	4	1	4	3	1	3	28	25%
Bobonaro	7	1	6	6	6	4	2	32	18%
Covalima	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	2%
Dili	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	19%
Ermera	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	18	9%
Liquiça	0	0	2	0	3	6	1	12	11%
Lautem	48	9	6	5	3	2	0	73	61%
Manufahi	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	6	7%
Manatuto	0	0	0	2	1	2	1	6	8%
Oecussi	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Viqueque	25	26	28	21	22	14	4	140	100%
Total (13 Dist.)	132	44	55	43	43	34	22	373	
Total (11 Dist.) **	59	9	21	17	18	18	18	160	13%
Male-headed HHs (11 Dist.)	57	8	19	15	16	16	16	147	
Female-headed HHs (11 Dist.)	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	13	

Note: The year 2011 does not appear in the table because the farmers were asked what they had planted in the last season

Table 33. Sources of Seed - Sele

Source of seed	Number of times mentioned	% of respondents mentioning source of Sele seed
Own seed, saved from a previous harvest	34	21%
Bought in market	19	12%
Bought from community seed bank/ community seed group		
Bought from relative / neighbor / friend	1	1%
Given for free by relative / neighbor / friend	3	2%
Given for free by the Government	41	25%
Given for free by an NGO	63	39%
Given for free by the Church	3	2%

[164 sources mentioned by 163 respondents in 11 districts.]

The data on the source of seed from Viqueque and Lautem has also been discarded for this table, and will be for all following tables that relate to MAF/SoL varieties. The reason for this is that the data from these two districts substantially distorts the results of the data from the other 11 districts.

Table 34. Comparison of Productivity of Sele with Local Variety

Number of farmers reporting on productivity of Sele (11 districts)	Much better than local variety	Better than local variety	Same as local variety	Worse than local variety	Much worse than local variety	Don't know/ remember
138	102 74%	8 6%	25 18%	2 1%	0%	1

Table 35. Reasons for Selecting Sele

Reason	Number of times mentioned	% of respondents providing reasons for selecting the variety
Have always grown this	45	28%
Only choice available	11	7%
Received for free	72	45%
More productive	78	48%
Better taste	73	45%
Preferred colour	12	7%
Easier to store after harvest	8	5%
Better suited to local climate	44	27%
Resistant to wind (short height)	2	1%

[345 reasons mentioned by 161 respondents in 11 districts]

Table 36. Reasons for Not Intending to Replant Sele in the Next Season

Reason	Number of times mentioned	% of respondents providing reasons for not replanting
Farmers – replanting *Farmers – not replanting*	119 (75%) 40 (25%)	
Would like to replant, but don't have / cannot get the seed	38	95%
Production too low	1	3%
Not suitable for the local soil	1	3%
Too difficult to store / post-harvest loss too high	3	8%

[43 reasons mentioned by 40 respondents in 11 districts]

3.1.2 Other Corn Varieties than Sele

Table 37. Number of Farmers by Reported Starting year of growing Corn Varieties (other than Sele)

Variety	Before 2005	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Year not known	Total # of farmers	% of farmers growing corn
Batar Lais	448	27	32	36	29	22	8	2	604	41%
Batar Bo'ot	713	30	23	29	25	19	11	1	851	58%
Suwan-5	4						1		5	0.3%
Arjuna	69		3	2	4	3			81	5%
Kalinga	2			1	2	2	1		8	0.5%
Other / don't remember	25	1		1		1	1		29	2%

Notes: The percentages for *Batar Bo'ot* and *Batar Lais* are probably underestimations. The reason for this is that the survey reported that none of the corn farmers in Viqueque was growing either of these.

Table 38. Sources of Seed – other Corn Varieties than Sele

Source of seed	Batar Lais		Batar Bo'ot		Suwan-5		Arjuna		Kalinga		Other	
	# of times mentioned	% of variety growers	# of times mentioned	% of variety growers	# of times mentioned	% of variety growers	# of times mentioned	% of variety growers	# of times mentioned	% of variety growers	# of times mentioned	% of variety growers
Own seed, saved from a previous harvest	460	75%	725	85%	2	40%	46	56%	7	88%	12	75%
Bought in market	113	18%	93	11%	1	20%	19	23%			3	19%
Bought from community seed bank / community seed group	2	0.3%	2	0.2%								
Bought from relative / neighbor / friend	13	2%	39	5%			4	5%				
Given for free by relative / neighbor / friend	15	2%	16	2%	1	20%	11	13%				
Given for free by the Government	4	0.7%	6	0.7%					1	13%	1	6%
Given for free by an NGO	6	1.0%	2	0.2%	1	20%	2	2%				
Given for free by the Church			1	0.1%								

Table 39. Reasons for Selecting Corn Varieties (other than Sele)

Reason for selecting the corn variety	Batar Lais		Batar Bo'ot		Suwan-5		Arjuna		Kalinga	
	# of times mentioned	% of respondents	# of times mentioned	% of respondents	# of times mentioned	% of respondents	# of times mentioned	% of respondents	# of times mentioned	% of respondents
Have always grown this	528	88%	705	83%	5	100%	71	87%	6	75%
Only choice available	98	16%	271	32%			10	12%		
Received for free	6	1%	6	0.7%			1	1%	1	13%
More productive	57	10%	144	17%			8	10%		
Better taste	53	9%	108	13%			4	5%		
Preferred colour	7	1%	60	7%			3	4%		
Easier to store after harvest	19	3%	81	10%			1	1%		
Better suited to local climate	84	14%	168	20%			7	9%	1	13%
Resistant to wind (short height)	11	2%	2	0.2%			2	2%		
Other	8	1%	2	0.2%						

Table 40. Reasons for Not Intending to Replant Corn Varieties in the Next Season (other than Sele)

Reason for not intending to replant in the next season	Batar Lais		Batar Bo'ot		Suwan-5		Arjuna		Kalinga	
	# of times mentioned	% of farmers not replanting	# of times mentioned	% of farmers not replanting	# of times mentioned	% of farmers not replanting	# of times mentioned	% of farmers not replanting	# of times mentioned	% of farmers not replanting
Farmers – replanting	596 (99%)		823 (97%)		5 (100%)		77 (95%)		8 (100%)	
Farmers – not replanting	6 (1%)		22 (3%)		0		4 (5%)		0	
Would like to replant, but don't have / cannot get the seed	4	67%	13	59%			4	100%		
Seed on sale in local market, but don't have money to buy it			2	9%						
Production too low	1	17%	7	32%						
Too much labour needed to grow			1	5%						
Too easily lodges/bends under wind			1	5%						
Not a nice taste			1	5%						
Too difficult to store / post-harvest loss too high			2	9%						

3.2 Rice

Table 41. Rice Varieties Planted

District	Number of farmers planting rice, and % of farmers in the sample		Rice variety planted (number of farmers in district)											
	No.	%	Nakroma	IR-64	IR-54	IR-36	IR-8	IR-5	Mamberamo	Silaun	Nona Portu	Dinas	*Forget the name*	Other
Ainaro	6	6%							1					5
Aileu	22	24%	4	2	1	1	2	1	2	2				16
Baucau	148	63%	35	15	2	7	7		16	42	1		28	17
Bobonaro	72	40%	11	4		2		1	4	1	3	52	3	9
Covalima	33	26%	1	17		4	1	2	8		1			
Dili		0%												
Ermera	40	17%		11		2			4			16	5	2
Liquiça		0%												
Lautem	39	31%	13	5	1	1	10			7	2		2	
Manufahi	18	20%	1	2			14				1			
Manatuto	57	79%	3	12	3	3	5	1			17	2	1	13
Oecussi	146	90%	3	8					36	2	2		81	24
Viqueque	104	64%	104											
Total (13 Dist.)	685	38%	175	76	7	20	39	5	71	54	27	70	120	86
Total (11 Dist.)*	542	36%	58 11%	71 13%	6 1%	19 4%	29 5%	5 1%	71 13%	47 9%	25 5%	70 13%	118 22%	86 16%

* Without Viqueque and Lautem

Table 42. Number of Rice Varieties Planted by Household

District	Number of farmers planting rice	Number of rice varieties planted (number of farmers in district)			
		One	Two	Three	Four or more
Ainaro	6	6			
Aileu	22	15	6		1
Baucau	148	131	12	5	
Bobonaro	72	57	14		1
Covalima	33	32	1		
Dili					
Ermera	40	40			
Liquiça					
Lautem	39	37	2		
Manufahi	18	18			
Manatuto	57	54	3		
Oecussi	146	136	10		
Viqueque	104	104			
Total (13 Districts)	685	630	48	5	2
Total (11 Districts)*	542	489 90%	46 8%	5 0.9%	2 0.4%

* Without Viqueque and Lautem

3.2.1 Nakroma

Table 43. Number of Farmers by Reported Starting year growing Nakroma

District	Before 2005	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Year not known	Total # of farmers	% of farmers growing rice in the district
Ainaro											0%
Aileu	1	1	1				1			4	18%
Baucau	4			10	4	3	13	1		35	24%
Bobonaro	1		2	3	1	4				11	15%
Covalima				1						1	3%
Dili											0%
Ermera											0%
Liquiça											0%
Lautem	2		3		2	2			4	13	33%
Manufahi							1			1	6%
Manatuto						3				3	5%
Oecussi	1					1	1			3	2%
Viqueque	24	21	18	17	13	9	2			104	100%
Total (13 Districts)	33	22	24	31	20	22	18	1		175	
Total (11 Districts)	7	1	3	14	5	11	16	1		58	11%
Male-headed HHs (11 Districts)	33	21	22	31	18	21	18	1	4	169	
Female-headed HHs (11 Districts)		1	2		2	1				6	

Table 44. Sources of Seed - Nakroma

Source of seed	Number of times mentioned	% of respondents mentioning source of seed
Own seed, saved from a previous harvest	15	26%
Bought in market	1	2%
Bought from relative / neighbor / friend	1	2%
Given for free by relative/neighbor / friend	1	2%
Given for free by the Government	13	22%
Given for free by an NGO	26	45%
Given for free by the Church	1	2%

[58 sources mentioned by 58 respondents in 11 districts]

Table 45. Comparison of Productivity of Nakroma with Local Variety

Number of farmers reporting on productivity of Nakroma	Much better than local variety	Better than local variety	Same as local variety	Worse than local variety	Much worse than local variety	Don't know/ remember
55	31 56%	20 36%	4 7%			

Table 46. Reasons for Selecting Nakroma

Reason	Number of times mentioned	% of respondents providing reasons for selecting the variety
Have always grown this	11	19%
Only choice available	4	7%
Received for free	24	42%
More productive	27	47%
Better taste	32	56%
Preferred colour	11	19%
Easier to store after harvest	6	11%
Better suited to local climate	7	12%

[122 reasons mentioned by 57 respondents in 11 districts]

3.2.2 Other Rice Varieties than Nakroma

Table 47. Number of Farmers by Reported Starting Year of growing Rice Varieties other than Nakroma

Variety	Before 2005	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Total # of farmers	% of farmers growing rice
IR-64	46	4	5	2	3	5	11	76	11%
IR-54	5				1		1	7	1%
IR-36	13		1		3	2	1	20	3%
IR-8	31	2	1	2	1	2		39	6%
IR-5	5							5	0.7%
Mamberamo	57	3			3	4	4	71	10%
Silaun	50		1	1			2	54	8%
Nona Portu	22	1	1	1	1		1	27	4%
Dinas	65		1	2	1		1	70	10%
Other / don't remember	191	2	3	1	3	3	3	206	30%

Table 48. Sources of Seed – other Rice Varieties than Nakroma

Source of seed	IR-64		IR-8		Mamberamo		Silaun		Dinas	
	# of times mentioned	% of respondents	# of times mentioned	% of respondents	# of times mentioned	% of respondents	# of times mentioned	% of respondents	# of times mentioned	% of respondents
Own seed, saved from a previous harvest	53	70%	32	82%	56	79%	51	94%	56	80%
Bought in market			1	3%	12	17%	1	2%	6	9%
Bought from community seed bank/ community seed group										
Bought from relative / neighbor / friend			3	8%	8	11%			1	1%
Given for free by relative / neighbor / friend	2	3%	1	3%	7	10%	1	2%		0%
Given for free by the Government	9	12%	1	3%	4	6%	1	2%	7	10%
Given for free by an NGO	11	14%	1	3%	1	1%				
Given for free by the Church	1	1%								

Table 49. Reasons for Selecting Rice Varieties other than Nakroma

Reason for selecting the rice variety	IR-64		IR-8		Mamberamo		Silaun		Dinas	
	# of times mentioned	% of respondents	# of times mentioned	% of respondents	# of times mentioned	% of respondents	# of times mentioned	% of respondents	# of times mentioned	% of respondents
Have always grown this	51	67%	32	82%	55	77%	37	69%	62	90%
Only choice available	9	12%	5	13%	35	49%	6	11%	29	42%
Received for free	13	17%			3	4%				
More productive	14	18%	1	3%	16	23%	1	2%	21	30%
Better taste	14	18%	2	5%	21	30%	1	2%	20	29%
Preferred colour	7	9%			9	13%				
Easier to store after harvest	4	5%			17	24%			2	3%
Better suited to local climate	11	14%	2	5%	33	46%	18	33%	25	36%
Resistant to wind (short height)			1	3%					1	1%

Table 50. Reasons for Not Intending to Replant the Rice Variety in the Next Season – other than Nakroma

Reason for not intending to replant in the next season	IR-64	IR-8	Mambe-ramo	Silaun	Dinas
	# of times mentioned	# of times mentioned	# of times mentioned	# of times mentioned	# of times mentioned
Farmers – replanting *Farmers – not replanting*	73 (97%) 2 (3%)	39 (100%) 0	65 (97%) 2 (3%)	54 (100%) 0	67 (100%) 0
Would like to replant, but don't have/cannot get the seed	1		1		

3.3 Peanut

Table 51. Peanut Varieties Planted

District	Number of farmers planting peanut, and % of farmers in the sample		Peanut variety planted (number of farmers in district)						Number of varieties planted	
	No.	%	Utamua	*Lokal*	*Mean*	*Mutin*	*Forget the name*	Other	One	Two
Ainaro	14	13%		9			5		14	
Aileu	1	1%		1					1	
Baucau	25	11%	13	1			12		24	1
Bobonaro	71	39%	14		1		58	1	68	3
Covalima	10	8%		1			9		10	
Dili		0%								
Ermera	23	10%		1			18	4	23	
Liquiça	40	32%	14	10			12	5	39	1
Lautem	28	22%	21				7		28	
Manufahi	30	33%	7		7	9	5	3	29	1
Manatuto	32	44%	2		10	11		10	31	1
Oecussi	73	45%	1	7	5		52	9	72	1
Viqueque	54	33%	54						54	
Total (13 Dist.)	401	22%	126	30	23	20	178	32	393	8
Total (11 Dist.)*	319	21%	51 16%	30 9%	23 7%	20 6%	171 54%	32 10%	311 97%	8 3%

* Without Viqueque and Lautem

3.3.1 Utamua

Table 52. Number of Farmers by Reported Starting Year of growing Utamua

District	Before 2005	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Year not known	Total # of farmers	% of farmers growing peanut in the district
Ainaro										0%
Aileu										0%
Baucau	7	2		2	1	1			13	52%
Bobonaro	4	0	1	5	1	1	2		14	20%
Covalima										0%
Dili										0%
Ermera										0%
Liquiça	1	1	1	1	3	5	2		14	35%
Lautem	6		4	2	2	5		2	21	75%
Manufahi				1	5		1		7	23%
Manatuto				1		1			2	6%
Oecussi	1								1	1%
Viqueque	8	9	7	7	8	8	5		54	100%
Total (13 Districts)	27	12	13	19	20	21	10	2	126	
Total (11 Districts)	13	3	2	10	10	8	5		51	16%
Male-headed HHs (11 Districts)	12	3	2	10	10	8	5		50	
Female-headed HHs (11 Districts)	1								1	

Table 53. Sources of Seed - Utamua

Source of seed	Number of times mentioned	% of respondents mentioning source of seed
Own seed, saved from a previous harvest	13	25%
Bought in market	6	12%
Bought from community seed bank / community seed group	1	2%
Bought from relative / neighbor / friend	3	6%
Given for free by relative/neighbor / friend	4	8%
Given for free by the Government	3	6%
Given for free by an NGO	20	39%
Given for free by the Church	1	2%

[51 sources mentioned by 51 respondents in 11 districts]

Table 54. Comparison of Productivity of Utamua with Local Variety

Number of farmers reporting on productivity of Utamua	Much better than local variety	Better than local variety	Same as local variety	Worse than local variety	Much worse than local variety	Don't know/ remember
46	31 69%	10 22%	2 4%	0%	2 4%	1

Table 55. Reasons for Selecting Utamua

Reason	Number of times mentioned	% of respondents providing reasons for selecting the variety
Have always grown this	19	37%
Only choice available	7	13%
Received for free	10	19%
More productive	22	42%
Better taste	16	31%
Preferred colour	4	8%
Easier to store after harvest	4	8%
Better suited to local climate	6	12%

[88 reasons mentioned by 52 respondents in 11 districts]

3.3.2 Other Peanut Varieties than Utamua

Table 56. Sources of Seed – non Utamua growers

Source of seed	# of times mentioned	% of respondents
Own seed, saved from a previous harvest	246	87%
Bought in market	29	10%
Bought from relative / neighbor / friend	11	4%
Given for free by relative/neighbor / friend	6	2%
Given for free by the Government	1	0.4%
Given for free by an NGO	3	1%

[296 sources mentioned by 282 respondents]

Table 57. Reasons for Selecting the Peanut Variety (non Utamua growers)

Reason for selecting the peanut variety	# of times mentioned	% of respondents
Have always grown this	255	90%
Only choice available	77	27%
Received for free	8	3%
More productive	56	20%
Better taste	43	15%
Preferred colour	32	11%
Easier to store after harvest	24	9%
Better suited to local climate	63	22%

[558 reasons mentioned by 282 respondents]

3.4 Cassava

Table 58. Cassava Varieties Planted

District	Number of farmers planting cassava, and % of farmers in the district		Cassava variety planted (number of farmers in district)									
	No.	%	Ai-luka 2	Ai-luka 4	Aifarinha boraisa	Aifarinha manteiga bo'ot	Aifarinha manteiga kiik	Lesu	Nona metan	Silva	*Forget the name*	Other
Ainaro	73	68%	1	1	1	21	35	37	2			6
Aileu	70	78%			4	15	23	11	27	17		11
Baucau	165	71%	13	11	24	103	56	52	28	8	11	1
Bobonaro	162	90%	13	3	23	119	19	24	151	1		4
Covalima	101	80%	4		1	67	13	2	29			
Dili	67	74%			12	26	47	1	2	17		
Ermera	209	89%	3		38	60	61	21	122	8	3	8
Liquiça	121	96%	3		11	63	83	51	18	2		1
Lautem	98	78%	15	11	23	90	58	1				
Manufahi	85	94%	4	1	7	48	62	12	1			
Manatuto	62	86%			3	43	45	2	6		1	1
Oecussi	133	82%	1			122	27	1	2		1	35
Viqueque	136	84%	136									
Total (13 Dist.)	1,482	82%	193	27	147	777	529	215	388	53	16	67
Total (11 Dist.)*	1,248	83%	42 3%	16 1%	124 10%	687 55%	471 38%	214 17%	388 31%	53 4%	16 1%	67 5%

Table 59. Number of Cassava Varieties Planted

District	Number of farmers planting cassava	Number of varieties planted (number of farmers in district)					
		One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six
Ainaro	73	44	27	2			
Aileu	70	37	28	5			
Baucau	165	63	74	19	7	1	1
Bobonaro	162	22	91	43	6		
Covalima	101	87	13	1			
Dili	67	36	24	7			
Ermera	209	124	61	18	6		
Liquiça	121	40	58	19	1	3	
Lautem	98	12	74	10	2		
Manufahi	85	40	40	5			
Manatuto	62	26	33	3			
Oecussi	133	83	44	6			
Viqueque	136	136					
Total (13 Districts)	1,482	750	567	138	22	4	1
Total (11 Districts)	1,248	602	493	128	20	4	1
		48%	40%	10%	2%	0.3%	0.1%

* Without Viqueque and Lautem

3.4.1 Ai-luka

Table 60. Number of Farmers by Reported Starting Year of growing Ai-luka (2 & 4)

District	Before 2005	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Total # of farmers	% of farmers growing cassava
Ainaro				2					1	1%
Aileu										0%
Baucau	5	1	2			4	12		14	8%
Bobonaro	3	1	2	3	5		2		13	8%
Covalima	1	1	1	1					4	4%
Dili										0%
Ermera	1			1		1			3	1%
Liquiça	1				2				3	2%
Lautem	14		2	5		3		2	19	19%
Manufahi	1					2	2		4	5%
Manatuto										0%
Oecussi	1								1	1%
Viqueque	22	25	31	18	23	12	5		136	100%
Total (13 Districts)	49	28	38	30	30	22	21	2	198	
Total (11 Districts)	13	3	5	7	7	7	16		43	3%
Male-headed HHs (11 Districts)	13	3	5	6	5	7	12		39	
Female-headed HHs (11 Districts)				1	2		4		4	

Note: The numbers in the columns for the years refer to the starting year of growing a variety. If a farmer started to grow both Ai-:Luka 2 and Ai-luka 4 in 2009, it will be counted as 2. The data in the column "Total # of farmers" does however count the unique farmers; no farmer is counted twice here.

Table 61. Sources of Cuttings – Ai-luka

Source of cuttings	Number of times mentioned		% of respondents mentioning source of cuttings	
	Ai-Luka 2	Ai-Luka 4	Ai-Luka 2	Ai-Luka 4
Own cuttings, saved from a previous harvest	12	1	29%	6%
Bought in market	1		2%	
Bought from community seed bank / community seed group	1		2%	
Bought from relative / neighbor / friend	1	1	2%	6%
Given for free by relative/neighbor / friend	6	2	14%	13%
Given for free by the Government	6	4	14%	25%
Given for free by an NGO	15	8	36%	50%

[58 sources mentioned by 43 respondents in 11 districts]

Table 62. Comparison of Productivity of Ai-luka with Local Variety

Number of farmers reporting on productivity of Ai-luka	Much better than local variety	Better than local variety	Same as local variety	Worse than local variety	Much worse than local variety	Don't know/ remember
Ai-luka 2: 35	21 60%	9 26%	5 14%			
Ai-luka 4: 15	9 60%	6 40%				

Table 63. Reasons for Selecting Ai-luka

Reason	Number of times mentioned		% of respondents providing reasons for selecting the variety	
	Ai-Luka 2	Ai-Luka 4	Ai-Luka 2	Ai-Luka 4
Have always grown this	15	1	37%	6%
Only choice available	3	1	7%	6%
Received for free	11	5	27%	31%
More productive	17	10	41%	63%
Better taste	18	11	44%	69%
Preferred colour	8	2	20%	13%
Easier to store after harvest	2	1	5%	6%
Better suited to local climate	3	1	7%	6%
Resistant to wind (short height)	1		2%	

[Ai-luka 2: 78 reasons mentioned by 41 respondents in 11 districts; Ai-luka 4: 32 reasons mentioned by 16 respondents in 11 districts]

3.4.2 Other Cassava Varieties than Ai-luka

Table 64. Number of Farmers by Reported Starting Year of growing Cassava Varieties (other than Ai-luka)

Variety	Before 2005	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Year not known	Total # of farmers	% of farmers growing cassava
Aifarinha boraisa	129	4	4	3	1	3	1		2	147	10%
Aifarinha manteiga bo'ot	642	29	28	29	18	17	8	1	5	777	52%
Aifarinha manteiga kiik	391	33	29	28	19	23	3	1	2	529	36%
Lesu	134	21	11	23	12	13			1	215	15%
Nona metan	350	6	2	8	5	13	2	1	1	388	26%
Silva	50	2					1		0	53	4%
Other / don't remember	81					1	0	0	1	83	6%

Table 65. Sources of Cuttings – other Cassava Varieties than Ai-luka

Source of cuttings	Aifarinha manteiga bo`ot		Aifarinha manteiga kiik		Nona metan		Lesu		Other	
	# of times mentioned	% of respondents	# of times mentioned	% of respondents	# of times mentioned	% of respondents	# of times mentioned	% of respondents	# of times mentioned	% of respondents
Own cuttings, saved from a previous harvest	705	91%	448	85%	369	95%	159	74%	263	93%
Bought in market	5	1%	3	0.6%	2	0.5%	1	0.5%	3	1%
Bought from community seed bank/ community seed group			1	0.2%	2	0.5%	1	0.5%		
Bought from relative / neighbor / friend	31	4%	18	3%	15	4%	4	2%	7	2%
Given for free by relative/neighbor / friend	60	8%	67	13%			52	24%	13	5%

Table 66. Reasons for Selecting the Cassava Variety other than Ai-luka

Reason for selecting the cassava variety	Aifarinha manteiga bo`ot		Aifarinha manteiga kiik		Nona metan		Lesu		Other	
	# of times mentioned	% of respondents	# of times mentioned	% of respondents	# of times mentioned	% of respondents	# of times mentioned	% of respondents	# of times mentioned	% of respondents
Have always grown this	650	84%	441	84%	310	80%	183	85%	239	85%
Only choice available	203	26%	71	14%	129	33%	30	14%	68	24%
Received for free	7	1%	1	0.2%	7	2%	2	1%	1	0.4%
More productive	111	14%	37	7%	73	19%	23	11%	18	6%
Better taste	95	12%	44	8%	58	15%	16	7%	38	14%
Preferred colour	43	6%	9	2%	6	2%	2	1%	9	3%
Easier to store after harvest	43	6%	14	3%	12	3%	1	0.5%	20	7%
Better suited to local climate	131	17%	47	9%	84	22%	45	21%	52	19%
Resistant to wind (short height)	5	0.6%	6	1%	3	1%				
Other	1	0.1%	2	0.4%		0%	1	0.5%		

Table 67. Reasons for Not Intending to Replant the Cassava Variety in the Next Season (other than Ai-luka)

Reason for not intending to replant in the next season	Number of times mentioned				
	Aifarinha manteiga bo`ot	Aifarinha manteiga kiik	Nona metan	Lesu	Other
Farmers – replanting *Farmers – not replanting*	760 (98%) 12 (2%)	516 (98%) 9 (2%)	376 (98%) 6 (2%)	211 (99.5%) 1 (0.5%)	277 (99%) 3 (1%)
Would like to replant, but don't have / cannot get the cuttings	6	6	4		2
Cuttings on sale in local market, but don't have money to buy it	2	3		1	
Production too low	3	2			
Too much labour needed to grow			1		

3.5 Sweet Potato

Table 68. Sweet Potato Varieties Planted

District	Number of farmers planting sweet potato, and % of farmers in the sample		Sweet potato variety planted (number of farmers in district)								
	No.	%	Hohrae 1	Hohrae 2	Hohrae 3	Lokal mutin	Lokal mean	Lokal Atabae	Mauhato	*Forget the name*	Other
Ainaro	89	82%	3	3	2	36	52	1	12	2	6
Aileu	37	41%	4	1	1	12	17		13		2
Baucau	148	64%	23	13	12	108	102	2		4	
Bobonaro	64	36%	2			56	41	1		1	1
Covalima	25	20%			1	18	12				
Dili	12	13%				7	9				
Ermera	134	57%				108	103	2			
Liquiça	55	44%	6			33	39	2			1
Lautem	73	58%	12	5	2	62	59				
Manufahi	79	88%	6			48	54	1			3
Manatuto	44	61%	2			34	34				1
Oecussi	81	50%				53	67				
Viqueque	107	66%	107								
Total (13 Dist.)	948	53%	165	22	18	575	589	9	25	7	14
Total (11 Dist.)*	768	51%	46 6%	17 2%	16 2%	513 67%	530 69%	9 1%	25 3%	7 1%	14 2%

* Without Viqueque and Lautem

Table 69. Number of Sweet Potato Varieties Planted

District	Number of farmers planting sweet potato	Number of varieties planted				
		One	Two	Three	Four	Five
Ainaro	89	64	22	3		
Aileu	37	26	10		1	
Baucau	148	50	86	8	2	2
Bobonaro	64	28	34	2		
Covalima	25	19	6			
Dili	12	8	4			
Ermera	134	55	79			
Liquiça	55	30	24	1		
Lautem	73	9	61	3		
Manufahi	79	47	31	1		
Manatuto	44	17	27			
Oecussi	81	42	39			
Viqueque	107	107				
Total (13 Districts)	948	502	423	18	3	2
Total (11 Districts)	768	386 50%	362 47%	15 2%	3 0.4%	2 0.3%

* Without Viqueque and Lautem

3.5.1 Hohrae

Table 70. Number of Farmers by Reported Starting Year of growing Hohrae

District	Before 2005	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Year now known	Total # of farmers	% of farmers growing sweet potato
Ainaro			3	2			3		3	3%
Aileu	3	1		1			1		4	11%
Baucau	3	2	1	5	5	15	17		27	18%
Bobonaro	1			1					2	3%
Covalima	1								1	4%
Dili										0%
Ermera										0%
Liquiça	1		1		1	2	1		6	11%
Lautem	8		1	5	3			1	14	19%
Manufahi					2	1	3		6	8%
Manatuto				1		1	0		2	5%
Oecussi										0%
Viqueque	17	20	24	13	20	9	4		107	100%
Total (13 Districts)	34	23	30	28	31	28	29		172	
Total (11 Districts)	9	3	5	10	8	19	25		51	7%
Male-headed HHs (11 Districts)	9	2	5	9	7	19	22		47	
Female-headed HHs (11 Districts)		1		1	1		3		4	

Note: The numbers in the columns for the years refer to the starting year of growing a variety. If a farmer started to grow both Hohrae 1 and Hohrae 2 in 2009, it will be counted as 2. The data in the column "Total # of farmers" does however count the unique farmers; no farmer is counted two or three times here.

Table 71. Sources of Cuttings – Hohrae

Source of cuttings	Number of times mentioned			% of respondents mentioning source of cuttings		
	Hohrae 1	Hohrae 2	Hohrae 3	Hohrae 1	Hohrae 2	Hohrae 3
Own cuttings, saved from a previous harvest	10	2	3	22%	12%	19%
Bought in market	5	1	1	11%	6%	6%
Bought from relative / neighbor / friend	6	1		13%	6%	
Given for free by relative / neighbor / friend	4	2	3	9%	12%	19%
Given for free by the Government	5	2	1	11%	12%	6%
Given for free by an NGO	16	9	8	35%	53%	50%

[79 sources mentioned by 51 respondents in 11 districts]

Table 72. Comparison of Productivity of Hohrae with Local Variety

Number of farmers reporting on productivity of Hohrae	Much better than local variety	Better than local variety	Same as local variety	Worse than local variety	Much worse than local variety	Don't know/ remember
Hohrae 1: 40	27 69%	11 28%		1 3%		1
Hohrae 2: 16	8 50%	7 44%	1 6%			
Hohrae 3: 15	6 40%	9 60%				

Table 73. Reasons for Selecting Hohrae

Reason	Number of times mentioned			% of respondents providing reasons for selecting the variety		
	Hohrae 1	Hohrae 2	Hohrae 3	Hohrae 1	Hohrae 2	Hohrae 3
Have always grown this	6	2	2	13%	12%	13%
Only choice available	2			4%		
Received for free	19	8	10	41%	47%	63%
More productive	19	8	9	41%	47%	56%
Better taste	19	8	8	41%	47%	50%
Preferred colour	5	4	4	11%	24%	25%
Easier to store after harvest	1		1	2%		6%
Better suited to local climate	7	3	2	15%	18%	13%
Resistant to wind (short height)		1			6%	
Other	1	1	1	2%	6%	6%

[Hohrae 1: 79 reasons mentioned by 46 respondents in 11 districts; Hohrae 2: 35 reasons mentioned by 17 respondents in 11 districts; Hohrae 3: 37 reasons mentioned by 16 respondents in 11 districts]

3.5.2 Other Sweet Potato Varieties than Hohrae

Table 74. Number of Farmers by Reported Starting Year of growing Sweet Potato Varieties (other than Hohrae)

Variety	Before 2005	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Year not known	Total # of farmers	% of farmers growing sweet potato
Lokal mutin	485	13	23	19	15	9	3	1	7	575	61%
Lokal mean	489	20	20	21	16	13	3	0	7	589	62%
Other / don't remember	42	3	1	6	0	2	1	0		55	6%

Table 75. Sources of Cuttings – other Sweet Potato Varieties than Hohrae

Source of cuttings	Lokal mutin		Lokal mean		Other	
	# of times mentioned	% of respondents	# of times mentioned	% of respondents	# of times mentioned	% of respondents
Own cuttings, saved from a previous harvest	519	90%	528	90%	53	96%
Bought in market	5	1%	3	1%	1	2%
Bought from community seed bank/ community seed group			1	0.2%		
Bought from relative / neighbor / friend	13	2%	16	3%		
Given for free by relative/neighbor / friend	54	9%	58	10%	1	2%

Table 76. Reasons for Selecting the Sweet Potato Variety other than Hohrae

Reason for selecting the sweet potato variety	Lokal mutin		Lokal mean		Other	
	# of times mentioned	% of respondents	# of times mentioned	% of respondents	# of times mentioned	% of respondents
Have always grown this	475	83%	490	84%	52	95%
Only choice available	115	20%	111	19%	7	13%
Received for free	1	0.2%	2	0.3%		
More productive	44	8%	44	8%	1	2%
Better taste	45	8%	49	8%	3	5%
Preferred colour	15	3%	30	5%		
Easier to store after harvest	18	3%	16	3%		
Better suited to local climate	90	16%	104	18%	26	47%
Resistant to wind (short height)	7	1%	5	0.9%		
Other	1	0.2%			2	4%

Table 77. Reasons for Not Intending to Replant the Sweet Potato Variety in the Next Season (other than Hohrae)

Reason for not intending to replant in the next season	Lokal mutin		Lokal mean		Other	
	# of times mentioned	% of respondents	# of times mentioned	% of respondents	# of times mentioned	% of respondents
Farmers – replanting *Farmers – not replanting*	552 (98%) 11 (2%)		573 (98%) 12 (2%)		53 (96%) 2 (4%)	
Would like to replant, but don't have / cannot get the cuttings	4	44%	4	44%		
Cuttings on sale in local market, but don't have money to buy it	5	56%	4	44%	1	100%
Production too low	1	11%	2	22%		
Too difficult to store / post-harvest loss too high			1	11%		

4. Food and Seed Storage

4.1 Storage of Corn

Table 78. Number of Ways Farmers Store Corn for Food and Seed

District	Number of ways corn is stored by a farmer			Method of storing corn for food and seed (Number of corn farmers in the district)			
	One	Two	Three	Only for food	Only for seed	Food & seed separate	Food & seed together
Ainaro	70	5		39	1	4	31
Aileu	39	10		17	1	10	21
Baucau	50	61		2	1	57	51
Bobonaro	20	151	5	2	2	151	21
Covalima	30	80	2			81	31
Dili	33	21		1	1	20	32
Ermera	110	91		3	1	91	106
Liquiça	109						109
Lautem	45	77		1		75	46
Manufahi	64	26		1		24	65
Manatuto	57	15				13	59
Oecussi	85	76		2	1	74	84
Viqueque	136	3		2		3	134
Total	848 58%	616 42%	7 0.5%	70 5%	8 1%	603 41%	790 54%
Male-headed HHs	784	568	5	63	7	553	734
Female-headed HHs	64	48	2	7	1	50	56

Table 79. Number of Farmers saving Corn for Food and/or Seed in Different Ways

District	Manner of storing corn for food and/or seed (Number of farmers storing corn in this manner)										
	In sack	Above the fireplace	Hang in tree	Metal drum (one household)	Metal drum (shared)	Plastic containers (one household)	Plastic containers (shared)	Metal silo (one household)	Metal silo (shared)	Elevated house (Bouleten)	Other
Ainaro	39	16	8	14	1					1	1
Aileu	14	32	3		1	7	2				
Baucau	57	55	25	6	1	3		1			24
Bobonaro	112	62	14	47	2	95	5				
Covalima	86	28	2	13	3	55	6				3
Dili	11	33	8	1		14	3			4	1
Ermera	91	109	2	3		71	3				13
Liquiça	65	37		7							
Lautem	29	32	29	94		14	1				
Manufahi	68	22	14	12							
Manatuto	26	37	21	3							
Oecussi	41	116	3	2		42	1			20	12
Viqueque	25	82	33	2							
Total	664 45%	661 45%	162 11%	204 14%	8 0.5%	301 20%	21 1.4%	1 0.1%	0 0%	25 2%	54 4%
Male-headed HHs	617	605	148	185	7	279	20	1		23	50
Female-headed HHs	47	56	14	19	1	22	1			2	4

Table 80. Reason for Storing Corn with a Particular Method

	No. of respon-dents	# of rea-sons given for this method	Reason (% of respondents giving reasons for this method of corn storage)							
			Custom / have always used this method	Cheap	Easy to check amount of maize left	Easy to move stored grain	Safe / little risk of theft	Little risk of weevil damage or loss	Little risk of damage by rats / rodents	Other
Storage in sack	643	939	73%	13%	24%	14%	5%	10%	5%	0.2%
Storage above the fire place	653	955	77%	9%	18%	11%	2%	23%	6%	0.2%
Hanging in trees	153	257	82%	25%	22%	12%	1%	13%	12%	
Storage in metal drum – This household only	189	257	80%	6%	10%	8%	8%	15%	7%	2%
Storage in metal drum – Shared between households	7	10	57%				14%	43%	29%	
Storage in plastic container(s) – This household only	291	512	77%	1%	11%	8%	8%	44%	28%	0.3%
Storage in plastic container(s) – Shared between households	19	26	53%		5%		11%	47%	21%	
Storage in metal silo – This household only	1	2						100%	100%	
Storage in metal silo – Shared between households	0									
Storage in elevated house (Bouleten)	24	68	92%		67%	33%		67%	25%	
Other	48	63	71%		4%		2%	35%	19%	

Table 81. Estimate of Percentage Storage Loss for Corn

	# report-ing losses	Average loss (%)	Percentage estimate of corn storage losses (Number and percentage of farmers reporting losses for this storage methos)															
			0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	45%	50%	55%	60%	65%	70%	75%
Storage in sack	656	14.8	34 5%	205 31%	146 22%	80 12%	51 8%	62 9%	16 2%	13 2%	5 0.8%	3 0.5%	29 4%	3 0.5%	4 0.6%	1 0.2%	1 0.2%	3 0.5%
Storage above the fire place	658	13.9	19 3%	183 28%	203 31%	90 14%	56 9%	54 8%	7 1.1%	11 2%	8 1.2%	1 0.2%	21 3%			1 0.2%	1 0.2%	3 0.5%
Hanging in trees	161	17.0	4 2%	20 12%	40 25%	43 27%	20 12%	16 10%	4 2%	1 0.6%	3 2%		9 6%		1 0.6%			
Storage in metal drum – This household only	203	16.1	22 11%	34 17%	37 18%	47 23%	8 4%	28 14%	5 2%	5 2%	5 2%	4 2%	4 2%		3 1.5%			1 0.5%
Storage in metal drum – Shared between households	8	12.5	1 13%	4 50%	1 13%		1 13%						1 13%					
Storage in plastic container(s) – This household only	299	5.2	85 28%	163 55%	34 11%	8 3%	2 0.7%	4 1%	1 0.3%				2 0.7%					
Storage in plastic container(s) – Shared between households	21	6.0	5 24%	10 48%	5 24%			1 5%										
Storage in metal silo – This household only	1	25.0						1 100%										
Storage in elevated house (Bouleten)	25	13.8	1 4%	3 12%	6 24%	11 44%		3 12%	1 4%									
Other	54	18.5	7 13%	15 28%	6 11%	2 4%		15 28%		1 2%			7 13%					1 2%

4.2 Estimate of Storage Loss for Rice

Table 82. Estimate of Percentage Storage Loss for Rice

Percentage estimate of rice storage losses (Number of farmers reporting losses)																
0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	45%	50%	55%	60%	65%	70%	75%	80%
34	126	219	96	55	56	6	6	5	1	44		3			39	1

5. Corn Farmers and Farmer Groups

5.1 Decision-making on Corn Variety and Seed Selection

Table 83. Decision-making on Corn Variety to Plant and Seed Selection for the Next Season

District	Variety selection made by			Seed selection made by		
	Men	Women	Unspecified	Men	Women	Unspecified
Ainaro	60	17		60	16	1
Aileu	37	14		39	12	
Baucau	84	28		84	28	
Bobonaro	62	112	2	93	81	1
Covalima	53	58	1	45	64	3
Dili	32	22		28	26	
Ermera	127	78	5	125	79	6
Liquiça	81	25	3	78	26	2
Lautem	67	53	2	65	54	3
Manufahi	22	68		47	43	
Manatuto	32	40		41	31	
Oecussi	11	149	2	10	149	3
Viqueque	95	45		95	43	2
Total	763 52%	709 48%	15	810 55%	652 45%	21

Table 84. Selection of Corn Variety and Seed Selection

		Choice of corn variety to plant		
		Man	Woman	
Selection of corn seed for next season	Man	723 50%	85 6%	808 55%
	Woman	35 2%	615 42%	650 45%
		758 52%	700 48%	

5.2 Number of Corn Seeds planted and Seed Selection Techniques

Table 85. Number of Corn Seed Grains per Planting Hole

District	Number of respon-dents	Number of corn seed grains per planting hole			
		One	Two	Three	Four
Ainaro	77		38	34	5
Aileu	51		19	21	11
Baucau	112		3	100	9
Bobonaro	176		4	123	49
Covalima	112	1		17	94
Dili	54		5	22	27
Ermera	210		50	133	27
Liquiça	109		1	80	28
Lautem	122			67	55
Manufahi	90		5	81	4
Manatuto	72	1		59	12
Oecussi	162			111	51
Viqueque	140			140	
Total	1,487	2 0.1%	125 8%	988 66%	372 25%
Male respondents	915	1	97	599	218
Female respondents	572	1	28	389	154

Table 86. Corn Seed Selection Techniques

Corn seed selection techniques	Number of respondents	Percentage
Save seeds from the total harvest	908	61%
Select specific plants from the standing crop for seeds	290	20%
Select cobs after they are harvested	728	49%
Select seeds from a specific section of the cob	149	10%

[2,075 answers from 1,478 farmers]

5.3 Corn Growers and Farmer Groups

Table 87. Corn Growers who are Members of Farmer Groups

District	Number of respondents	Farmer group members	% of respondents	Group growing seed	% of farmer groups
Ainaro	76	19	25%	9	47%
Aileu	52	14	27%	7	50%
Baucau	124	32	26%	15	47%
Bobonaro	174	47	27%	17	36%
Covalima	112	57	51%	3	5%
Dili	61	8	13%	1	13%
Ermera	209	10	5%	6	60%
Liquiça	108	5	5%	3	60%
Lautem	119	12	10%	6	50%
Manufahi	90	14	16%	5	36%
Manatuto	70	21	30%	12	57%
Oecussi	161	9	6%	3	33%
Viqueque	143	11	8%	6	55%
Total	1,499	259	17%	93	36%
Male respondents	921	178	19%	70	39%
Female respondents	578	81	14%	23	28%

Table 88. Seed Selling Farmer Groups and Local Seed Traders

District	Know farmer group in Suco selling seed	% of respondents	Know that there is a seed trader in the local market	% of respondents
Ainaro	7	9%	38	49%
Aileu	10	20%	21	41%
Baucau	4	3%	30	24%
Bobonaro	12	7%	109	62%
Covalima	14	13%	12	11%
Dili		0%	14	23%
Ermera	2	1%	15	7%
Liquiça	6	6%	43	40%
Lautem	3	2%	23	19%
Manufahi	10	11%	15	17%
Manatuto	5	7%	25	35%
Oecussi	6	4%	42	26%
Viqueque	12	8%	32	22%
Total	91	6%	419	28%
Male respondents	58	6%	254	27%
Female respondents	33	6%	165	28%

Table 89. Seed Fairs

District	Know of "Seed Fairs"	% of respondents	Locations					Seed Fair organizers				
			Suco	Sub-District	District	Regional	Dili	MAF	Church	NGO	Private comp	Other
Ainaro	27	36%	18	5	1	4		21	4			1
Aileu	12	22%	6	1	3	1		6		4	1	
Baucau	22	17%	5	5	9		11	16	3	14	1	1
Bobonaro	4	2%	2		1		2	2				
Covalima	9	8%	7				1	6		4		
Dili	2	3%	2					2				
Ermera	10	5%	8	1				9				
Liquiça	3	3%	2							2		
Lautem	7	6%	1	2	2		1	3		3		
Manufahi	6	7%	4	1	1	1		3	3	6	1	
Manatuto	7	10%	3		2		1	3	5	4		
Oecussi		0%										
Viqueque	4	3%	1	1			1	1		2		
Total	113	7%	59 55%	16 15%	19 18%	6 6%	17 16%	72 67%	15 14%	39 36%	3 3%	2 2%
Male respondents	90	10%	48	13	15	5	15	58	15	34	3	2
Female respondents	23	4%	11	3	4	4	4	14	4	1		

6. Familiarity with Seeds of Life

6.1 Familiarity of Respondents with the Seeds of Life Program

Table 90. Familiarity of Respondents with the Seeds of Life Program

Districts	Female respondents		Male respondents		Total	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Ainaro	6	24	31	37	37	34
Aileu	3	15	21	30	24	27
Baucau	4	6	27	16	31	13
Bobonaro	1	2	3	3	4	2
Covalima	4	7	12	17	16	13
Dili	1	3	5	9	6	7
Ermera	8	10	9	6	17	7
Liquiça	2	6	4	4	6	5
Lautem	1	1	3	5	4	3
Manufahi	4	15	13	21	17	19
Manatuto	2	10	14	27	16	22
Oecussi	10	10	4	7	14	9
Viqueque	1	1	3	3	4	2
Total	47	7	149	13	196	11

Table 91. Length of Familiarity with the Seeds of Life Program

Districts	Less than 6 months	6 months to 1 year	1-3 years	More than 3 years
Ainaro	20	7	3	6
Aileu	10	9	1	
Baucau	3	6	11	6
Bobonaro	1	1	1	1
Covalima	3	3	4	5
Dili	1		1	2
Ermera	5	8	1	
Liquiça		1		2
Lautem	1		2	
Manufahi	1	10	1	
Manatuto	4	5	4	1
Oecussi	6	3	2	3
Viqueque	1			2
Total	56 33%	53 32%	31 18%	28 17%

Table 92. Channel of Familiarity with the Seeds of Life Program

	MAF staff / Extension workers	SoL staff	NGOs / Organisations	Media (Newspaper, radio, TV)	Relative	Neighbour	Church	Other	Total
Male	49 33%	37 25%	30 20%	25 17%	27 18%	23 15%	3 2%	4 3%	149
Female	15 32%	6 13%	7 15%	8 17%	7 15%	6 13%	2 4%	3 6%	47
Total	64 33%	43 22%	37 19%	33 17%	34 17%	29 15%	5 3%	7 4%	196

6.2 Knowledge of other Farmers growing MAF/SoL varieties

Table 93. Number of farmers recognizing the name SoL and knowing farmers growing MAF/SoL varieties

District	All respondents		Male respondents				Female respondents			
	Know SoL	Know MAF/SoL variety grower	Know SoL		Know MAF/SoL variety grower		Know SoL		Know MAF/SoL variety grower	
			No.	% of male resp.	No.	% of male resp.	No.	% of female resp.	No.	% of female resp.
Ainaro	37	40	31	37%	36	43%	6	24%	4	16%
Aileu	24	28	21	30%	24	34%	3	15%	4	20%
Baucau	32	207	28	16%	154	92%	4	6%	53	80%
Bobonaro	4	95	3	3%	60	50%	1	2%	35	58%
Covalima	16	2	12	17%	1	1%	4	7%	1	2%
Dili	6	12	5	9%	8	15%	1	3%	4	11%
Ermera	17	15	9	6%	9	6%	8	10%	6	7%
Liquiça	6	43	4	4%	28	29%	2	6%	15	48%
Lautem	4	118	3	5%	50	91%	1	1%	68	96%
Manufahi	17	26	13	21%	20	32%	4	15%	6	22%
Manatuto	16	22	14	27%	18	35%	2	10%	4	19%
Oecussi	14	28	4	7%	11	18%	10	10%	17	17%
Viqueque	4	162	3	3%	91	100%	1	1%	71	100%
Total (13 Districts)	197	798	150	13%	510	45%	47	7%	288	43%
Total (11 Districts)	189	518	144	15%	369	38%	45	9%	149	28%

* Without Viqueque and Lautem

Table 94. Familiarity of Respondents with MAF/SoL Varieties

Crop variety		No. and % of farmers who know someone growing the crop *	Relationship to known MAF/SoL variety grower (No. and % of known MAF/SoLvariety growers)			
			Relative	Neighbour	Friend	Other
Corn	Sele	326 22%	226 69%	144 44%	107 33%	23 7%
Rice	Nakroma	298 20%	181 61%	144 48%	163 55%	37 12%
Peanut	Utamua	231 15%	158 68%	135 58%	129 56%	23 10%
Cassava	Ai-luka 2	151 10%	86 57%	78 52%	75 50%	10 7%
	Ai-luka 4	119 8%	60 50%	59 50%	65 55%	8 7%
	Ai-Luka 2 & 4 combined	156 10%				
Sweet potato	Hohrae 1	139 9%	83 60%	75 54%	74 53%	6 4%
	Hohrae 2	103 7%	54 52%	49 48%	58 56%	4 4%
	Hohrae 3	94 6%	49 52%	40 43%	53 56%	4 4%
	Hohrae 1, 2 & 3 combined	147 10%				
All five crops combined		518 34%				

* Based on data from 1,510 respondents in 11 districts

Table 95. Knowledge of “Seeds of Life” vs knowing MAF/SoL variety growers

		Knows “Seeds of Life”		
		Yes	No	
Knows someone growing MAF/SoL varieties	Yes	111 7%	407 27%	518 34%
	No	78 5%	915 61%	993 66%
		189 13%	1,322 87%	

[1,511 respondents in 11 districts]

7. Food Security

7.1 Food Self-Sufficiency

The figures that are reported in the columns of the months in Table 96 (corn), Table 98 (rice), Table 100 (peanut), Table 102 (cassava) and Table 104 (sweet potato) are adjusted figures. For each of the five crops, the number of farmers who reported being able to consume self-grown crops during each of the 12 months of the year was exaggerated. To obtain more realistic information, the number of farmers being able to consume a crop during each of the 12 months was taken to be the same as the number of farmers reporting to be able to do this during 11 months.

Table 96. Number of Corn Growers Able to Consume Self-Grown Corn

Districts	Number of households		Month in which food from self-grown corn was available (*)											
	with corn harvest	with 12 m. consumption of corn	Oct 2010	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep 2011
Ainaro	74	25	33	31	32	37	42	54	63	65	57	55	52	47
Aileu	48	1	3	1	2	11	25	39	40	32	32	27	21	20
Baucau	114		21	16	14	28	28	50	61	71	60	46	26	15
Bobonaro	175	22	105	93	89	99	121	132	130	132	114	113	119	103
Covalima	113	1	3	4	4	5	10	37	87	102	65	54	46	40
Dili	55		2	3	6	12	21	38	43	36	33	28	25	25
Ermera	210	11	105	165	171	174	172	132	99	64	54	49	48	42
Liquiça	109	16	28	31	44	75	83	102	106	100	93	87	75	67
Lautem	119	21	86	79	87	86	77	73	51	40	37	29	26	25
Manufahi	90	40	47	48	49	54	62	72	78	77	76	72	68	66
Manatuto	72	22	35	35	35	36	39	43	46	43	51	51	50	49
Oecussi	162	4	13	7	6	7	7	43	113	151	148	117	67	44
Viqueque	141		2	10	15	25	41	115	132	128	126	121	108	100
Total	1,484	163	483	523	554	649	728	929	1.048	1,040	945	848	731	643
Male respondents	912	109	279	315	323	397	456	589	664	657	616	554	482	432
Female respondents	572	54	204	208	231	252	272	341	385	384	330	295	249	211

(*) The figures in the columns of the months include the overestimated # of households that reported to be able to consume self-grown corn during all 12 months.

Table 97. Number of Months of Self-Sufficiency for Corn of Corn Growing Households

District	Total number of corn farmers (*)	Number of months in which corn was available from self-grown corn												
		12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Ainaro	51			1	4	6	7	8	5	8	4	2	4	2
Aileu	51			1	3	2	8	5	7	8	9	4		4
Baucau	114						3	13	18	24	40	15	1	
Bobonaro	165	11	11	26	17	17	23	16	13	14	7	8	1	1
Covalima	113	1	1		1	2	11	17	9	16	11	44		
Dili	55				1	7	8	8	3	12	8	8		
Ermera	202	3	3	1	8	11	28	59	53	22	9	5		
Liquiça	97	3	3	8	20	13	25	9	13	2				1
Lautem	101			1	1	3	8	13	17	25	24	8		1
Manufahi	50				4	6	9	7	9	10	5			
Manatuto	50				2	6	5	6	6	13	6	6		
Oecussi	158					4	6	19	25	61	33	9	1	
Viqueque	143	1	1	2	2	18	60	28	24	4	2			1
Total	1,350	19 1.4%	19 1.4%	40 3%	63 5%	95 7%	201 15%	208 15%	202 15%	219 16%	158 12%	109 8%	7 0.5%	10 0.7%

(*) This number of corn farmers is a corrected figure. The original number and distribution of households that reportedly could consume self-grown corn during the 12 month period – which was unreliable – has been replaced by the number and distribution of the households that reported to be able to consume self-grown corn during 11 months of the year.

Table 98. Number of Rice Growers Able to Consume Self-Grown Rice

Districts	Number of households		Month in which food from self-grown rice was available (*)											
	with rice harvest	with 12 m. consumption of rice	Oct 2010	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep 2011
Ainaro	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Aileu	21	20	21	21	21	21	21	20	20	20	21	21	21	21
Baucau	147		19	13	15	18	16	15	20	41	96	106	107	64
Bobonaro	78	21	45	40	45	41	45	52	52	57	59	57	56	50
Covalima	31	1	2	2	3	4	8	9	10	20	25	26	17	15
Dili	0													
Ermera	41	2	10	15	19	20	21	25	26	28	29	23	19	17
Liquiça	2				1	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1
Lautem	37	8	32	27	27	29	25	22	16	13	10	13	12	13
Manufahi	18	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	18	18	18	18	18	18
Manatuto	57	41	45	45	45	43	43	46	46	46	48	47	50	50
Oecussi	145	7	16	17	15	12	12	20	68	127	128	108	81	48
Viqueque	102	21	63	69	67	57	58	50	51	51	51	55	69	68
Total	685	144	276	272	281	269	274	284	335	428	492	481	457	371
Male respondents	428	106	186	183	191	188	187	186	203	252	312	308	302	248
Female respondents	257	38	90	89	90	81	87	98	132	176	180	173	155	123

(*) The figures in the columns of the months include the overestimated # of households that reported to be able to consume self-grown rice during all 12 months.

Table 99. Number of Months of Self-Sufficiency for Rice of Rice Growing Households

District	Total number of rice farmers (*)	Number of months in which rice was available from self-grown rice												
		12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Ainaro	0													
Aileu	2				1									1
Baucau	148						2	9	16	42	59	18	1	1
Bobonaro	62	4	4	6	7	5	7	5	1	5	5	9	3	1
Covalima	32					4	2	1	6	4	5	8		2
Dili	0													
Ermera	39				4	6	7	6	4	6	3	3		
Liquiça	2			1							1			
Lautem	32				1	2	2	6	5	8	4	1		3
Manufahi	1							1						
Manatuto	16						1	2	3	3	2	5		
Oecussi	140	1	1		2	2	7	6	30	42	29	14	5	1
Viqueque	87	1	1	2	1	4	12	22	26	6	1	6		5
Total	561	6 1.1%	6 1.1%	9 2%	16 3%	23 4%	40 7%	58 10%	91 16%	116 21%	109 19%	64 11%	9 2%	14 2%

(*) This number of rice farmers is a corrected figure. The original number and distribution of households that reportedly could consume self-grown rice during the 12 month period – which was unreliable – has been replaced by the number and distribution of the households that reported to be able to consume self-grown rice during 11 months of the year.

Table 100. Number of Peanut Growers Able to Consume Self-Grown Peanut

Districts	Number of households		Month in which food from self-grown peanut was available (*)											
	with peanut harvest	with 12 m. consumption of peanut	Oct 2010	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep 2011
Ainaro	13	4	10	9	7	6	6	4	4	7	6	6	5	5
Aileu	1								1	1				
Baucau	30		5	6	7	7	6	8	12	10	8	5	8	7
Bobonaro	76		26	32	32	20	26	32	19	20	21	17	11	19
Covalima	13		1				1	3	5	7	6	7	8	7
Dili	0													
Ermera	21	1	1	15	17	17	15	12	7	7	4	3	3	3
Liquiça	42	1	1	3	4	16	28	36	34	31	25	17	13	12
Lautem	26		20	18	13	10	7	4	3	2				
Manufahi	31	11	20	20	20	13	12	12	15	15	19	23	24	24
Manatuto	34	14	21	21	20	16	14	17	17	15	21	25	27	24
Oecussi	76	1	1	1	1	2	2	8	35	62	59	30	11	6
Viqueque	62		4	8	8	9	11	38	48	51	51	50	47	44
Total	425	32	110	133	129	116	128	174	200	228	220	183	157	151
Male respondents	257	23	65	89	86	82	93	115	127	135	132	116	101	98
Female respondents	168	9	45	44	43	34	35	59	73	93	88	67	56	53

(*) The figures in the columns of the months include the overestimated # of households that reported to be able to consume self-grown peanut during all 12 months.

Table 101. Number of Months of Self-Sufficiency for Peanut of Peanut Growing Households

District	Total number of peanut farmers (*)	Number of months in which peanut was available from self-grown peanut												
		12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Ainaro	11								3		2	2	2	2
Aileu	1											1		
Baucau	30							1		6	13	10		
Bobonaro	79					2		5	17	15	16	15	6	3
Covalima	13							2	1	3	3	3	1	
Dili	0													
Ermera	22						3	1	6	6	3	1		2
Liquiça	42				1	2	8	5	9	7	7	1	1	1
Lautem	31							1	3	3	8	9	2	5
Manufahi	20					1	1	3	2	4	8	1		
Manatuto	20						1	1	1	7	5	4	1	
Oecussi	78						1	1	3	6	29	32	3	3
Viqueque	65	1	1		1	2	19	19	11	5	3	1		2
Total	412	1 0.2%	1 0.2%		2 0.5%	7 2%	33 8%	39 9%	56 14%	62 15%	97 24%	80 19%	16 4%	18 4%

(*) This number of peanut farmers is a corrected figure. The original number and distribution of households that reportedly could consume self-grown peanut during the 12 month period – which was unreliable – has been replaced by the number and distribution of the households that reported to be able to consume self-grown peanut during 11 months of the year.

Table 102. Number of Cassava Growers Able to Consume Self-Grown Cassava

Districts	Number of households		Month in which food from self-grown cassava was available (*)											
	with cassava harvest	with 12 m. consumption of cassava	Oct '10	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep '11
Ainaro	73	67	70	71	70	69	69	70	71	71	70	70	70	70
Aileu	70	49	49	49	50	50	52	54	59	62	64	65	70	69
Baucau	164	2	30	27	31	25	24	23	25	38	54	61	99	82
Bobonaro	153	32	82	86	90	74	85	75	88	81	100	91	94	80
Covalima	100	3	13	6	6	6	7	13	13	20	30	54	91	82
Dili	67	5	8	8	8	12	16	24	32	40	51	54	54	45
Ermera	208	102	115	155	161	163	165	168	176	184	187	186	187	184
Liquiça	116	36	45	52	65	79	89	94	110	107	102	88	79	74
Lautem	101	6	72	67	81	60	51	37	28	21	18	9	8	7
Manufahi	85	55	75	76	76	63	57	57	56	57	60	73	77	76
Manatuto	65	49	59	58	58	53	52	52	50	53	56	59	61	62
Oecussi	130	102	107	107	106	104	105	108	110	119	126	125	121	114
Viqueque	135	12	27	31	35	40	44	71	82	90	122	116	111	104
Total	1,469	520	752	793	837	798	816	846	900	943	1,040	1,051	1,122	1,049
Male respondents	911	306	438	467	500	484	497	525	560	594	662	658	701	658
Female respondents	558	214	313	326	337	314	319	321	340	349	378	393	421	391

(*) The figures in the columns of the months include the overestimated # of households that reported to be able to consume self-grown peanut during all 12 months.

Table 103. Number of Months of Self-Sufficiency for Cassava of Cassava Growing Households

District	Total number of cassava farmers (*)	Number of months in which cassava was available from self-grown cassava												
		12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Ainaro	7	1	1				1	2		1	1			
Aileu	22			1		2	2	4	4	2	1	5		1
Baucau	163					2	1	2	14	35	42	62	4	1
Bobonaro	137	3	3	2	6	13	14	27	11	11	8	22	4	13
Covalima	102					1	4	3	9	9	30	39	2	5
Dili	63	1	1		3	4	5	6	11	13	8	9	2	
Ermera	143	36	36	6	2	9	12	10	10	10	5	6		1
Liquiça	89	4	4	2	14	6	12	27	11	2	1	1		5
Lautem	103			2		1	5	5	17	26	28	12	1	6
Manufahi	30				1		1	10	3	8	6	1		
Manatuto	17	1	1	1			2	2	3	3	3	1		
Oecussi	34	1	1	1		1	1	3	4	6	8	3		5
Viqueque	131	6	6	2	6	5	28	20	16	36	1	3		2
Total	1,041	53 5%	53 5%	17 2%	32 3%	44 4%	88 8%	121 12%	113 11%	162 16%	142 14%	164 16%	13 1.2%	39 4%

(*) This number of cassava farmers is a corrected figure. The original number and distribution of households that reportedly could consume self-grown cassava during the 12 month period – which was unreliable – has been replaced by the number and distribution of the households that reported to be able to consume self-grown cassava during 11 months of the year.

Table 104. Number of Sweet Potato Growers Able to Consume Self-Grown Sweet Potato

Districts	Number of households		Month in which food from self-grown sweet potato was available (*)											
	with sweet potato harvest	with 12 m. consumption of sweet potato	Oct 2010	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep 2011
Ainaro	89	77	81	81	82	84	82	83	85	85	83	84	84	84
Aileu	36	30	32	32	32	32	32	33	33	33	33	34	35	34
Baucau	151		24	24	24	11	10	18	27	51	55	58	74	61
Bobonaro	67	4	23	20	26	26	23	34	23	25	29	23	20	18
Covalima	26								2	3	8	20	25	18
Dili	12		1	2	2	2	2	3	5	6	8	9	9	5
Ermera	135	32	38	93	97	99	100	97	92	85	82	73	67	60
Liquiça	55	1	5	9	11	19	27	36	42	43	40	35	31	26
Lautem	77	4	47	49	54	39	32	28	17	15	15	11	8	5
Manufahi	80	50	69	69	69	57	53	53	54	53	58	72	73	75
Manatuto	47	28	37	35	35	32	30	31	31	32	39	40	42	42
Oecussi	84	2	5	5	4	7	7	10	14	54	78	56	28	10
Viqueque	108	5	13	15	19	21	26	47	62	65	97	96	93	86
Total	967	233	375	434	455	429	424	473	487	550	625	611	589	524
Male respondents	602	152	220	274	291	282	286	321	334	355	393	385	379	340
Female respondents	365	81	155	160	164	147	138	152	153	195	232	226	210	184

(*) The figures in the columns of the months include the overestimated # of households that reported to be able to consume self-grown sweet potato during all 12 months.

Table 105. Number of Months of Self-Sufficiency for Sweet Potato of Sweet Potato Growing Households

District	Total # of sweet potato farmers (*)	Number of months in which sweet potato was available from self-grown sweet potato												
		12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Ainaro	12			1	2	2	1	1		2	3			
Aileu	10	1	1		1	1					1	2		3
Baucau	153						2	1	8	24	55	57	4	2
Bobonaro	66						1	7	14	17	12	7	5	3
Covalima	26							2	1	3	7	13		
Dili	13	1	1				1	1	2	2	2	3		
Ermera	112	7	7	1	2	9	10	23	27	12	8	3	1	2
Liquiça	55				2	3	12	15	12	6	4			1
Lautem	80				1	1	2	9	9	12	25	12	2	7
Manufahi	31	1	1		1		3	9	2	8	6			
Manatuto	20	1	1				2	2	3	7	2	2		
Oecussi	86	1	1	1		1	1	1	3	8	34	31	1	3
Viqueque	105	1	1	2	3	7	21	18	12	36	1	2		1
Total	769	13 2%	13 2%	5 0.7%	12 2%	24 3%	56 7%	89 12%	93 12%	137 18%	160 21%	132 17%	13 2%	22 3%

(*) This number of sweet potato farmers is a corrected figure. The original number and distribution of households that reportedly could consume self-grown sweet potato during the 12 month period – which was unreliable – has been replaced by the number and distribution of the households that reported to be able to consume self-grown sweet potato during 11 months of the year.

Table 106. Average Period of Availability for Consumption in Months of Self-Grown Crops

Crop	Median *(Months)*	Mean *(Months)*	Standard deviation *(Months)*
Corn	5	5.5	2.3
Rice	4	4.6	2.3
Peanut	3	3.8	2.0
Cassava	5	5.1	3.1
Sweet potato	4	4.3	2.4

7.2 Household Food Insecurity

Table 107. Households Experiencing Food Insecurity Conditions [Percentage of respondents who answered positively R: Rarely S: Sometimes O: Often]

Districts	Q1. Worry about food			Q2: Unable to eat preferred foods			Q3: Eat just a few kinds of foods			Q4: Eat foods they really do not want eat			Q5: Eat a smaller meal			Q6: Eat fewer meals in a day			Q7: No food of any kind in the household			Q8: Go to sleep hungry			Q9: Go a whole day and night without eating		
	R	S	O	R	S	O	R	S	O	R	S	O	R	S	O	R	S	O	R	S	O	R	S	O	R	S	O
Ainaro	7	45	7	3	43	13	8	37	13	3	37	16	6	22	13	3	21	10	1	29	17	2	20	6	5	14	7
		60			58			58			56			42			34			46			29			26	
Aileu	3	56	22	1	53	30	2	39	32	1	47	26	2	42	23	1	42	21	0	37	10	2	17	8	1	19	7
		81			84			73			73			68			64			47			27			27	
Baucau	18	70	5	19	70	3	25	62	7	17	69	6	20	42	2	18	35	2	15	17	1	8	3	0	5	2	0
		93			93			94			92			64			55			33			11			7	
Bobonaro	36	16	1	39	8	0	21	6	0	22	5	0	15	1	0	4	2	0	8	1	0	3	1	0	4	1	0
		52			47			26			27			16			6			9			4			4	
Covalima	21	50	20	19	48	10	25	42	6	20	37	5	17	37	3	16	29	3	11	37	1	1	3	0	1	2	0
		92			77			73			62			57			47			49			4			2	
Dili	7	47	26	3	43	23	7	48	22	7	42	21	7	43	21	4	39	22	4	31	21	1	13	16	2	11	18
		79			70			77			70			71			66			57			30			31	
Ermera	20	56	6	20	56	4	21	56	4	18	38	1	19	57	2	21	51	2	12	18	0	8	8	0	9	6	0
		82			79			81			56			78			74			30			16			15	
Liquiça	29	17	1	27	19	1	28	19	1	27	21	16	25	14	1	27	7	0	20	2	0	0	1	1	0	2	0
		47			47			48			63			40			34			22			2			2	
Lautem	5	54	32	10	63	11	15	53	7	18	45	1	26	27	0	21	21	0	10	6	0	2	2	0	1	0	0
		90			85			75			64			53			41			17			3			1	
Manufahi	23	34	3	20	36	3	21	24	4	18	27	3	11	20	1	10	19	1	4	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
		61			59			50			48			32			30			12			0			0	
Manatuto	21	40	6	21	40	6	26	31	4	22	31	6	19	24	6	15	21	4	6	3	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
		67			67			61			58			49			40			8			1			1	
Oecussi	50	22	19	45	26	20	45	23	23	40	30	20	21	22	23	19	26	20	14	28	19	1	1	0	0	0	0
		91			91			91			91			66			64			62			1			0	
Viqueque	86	13	1	70	28	1	54	40	6	36	56	7	44	49	4	51	41	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		99			99			99			99			98			98			2			0			0	
Total	28	41	10	26	42	8	25	38	9	20	38	9	19	32	7	18	28	6	9	16	5	3	5	2	3	4	2
		78			76			72			67			58			52			30			9			8	
Male respondents	26	42	8	25	42	6	24	39	8	20	37	8	19	31	6	18	27	5	10	15	4	2	4	2	2	3	2
		76			74			70			64			56			50			29			8			7	
Female respondents	30	39	13	26	42	11	27	38	11	21	41	10	20	35	8	18	30	8	8	18	6	4	6	1	4	4	2
		82			79			75			73			63			56			32			11			9	

Table 108. Household Food Insecurity by Access-related Domains

Districts	Anxiety and uncertainty about the household food supply	Insufficient Quality (includes variety and preferences of the type of food)	Insufficient food intake and its physical consequences
	Q1	Q2, Q3 & Q4	Q5, Q6, Q7, Q8 & Q9
Ainaro	60%	64%	56%
Aileu	81%	88%	76%
Baucau	93%	98%	67%
Bobonaro	52%	64%	30%
Covalima	92%	98%	88%
Dili	79%	80%	72%
Ermera	82%	88%	82%
Liquiça	47%	65%	42%
Lautem	90%	89%	56%
Manufahi	61%	61%	33%
Manatuto	67%	68%	49%
Oecussi	91%	94%	67%
Viqueque	99%	100%	99%
Total	78%	84%	65%
Male-headed households	76%	83%	63%
Female-headed households	82%	86%	69%

Table 109. Household Food Insecurity Access Scale Score

Districts	HFIAS Scores		
	Male respondents	Female respondents	Total
Ainaro	8.5	9.9	8.8
Aileu	11.8	15.2	12.5
Baucau	9.3	10.7	9.7
Bobonaro	2.5	2.1	2.3
Covalima	8.7	8.1	8.4
Dili	12.9	11.9	12.5
Ermera	8.2	10.3	8.9
Liquiça	4.2	5.3	4.5
Lautem	7.9	8.1	8.0
Manufahi	4.2	6.6	4.9
Manatuto	5.4	7.5	6.0
Oecussi	10.9	9.9	10.2
Viqueque	8.6	8.8	8.7
Total	7.7	8.7	8.1

Household Food Insecurity Access Prevalence

Table 110. Household Food Insecurity Categories

Districts	Food insecurity categories			
	Food secure	Mildly food insecure	Moderately food insecure	Severely food insecure
Ainaro	33%	3%	16%	48%
Aileu	11%	9%	24%	56%
Baucau	2%	9%	55%	35%
Bobonaro	31%	36%	18%	15%
Covalima	1%	4%	44%	51%
Dili	16%	6%	21%	58%
Ermera	10%	3%	54%	33%
Liquiça	34%	1%	41%	24%
Lautem	9%	13%	60%	17%
Manufahi	38%	20%	28%	14%
Manatuto	32%	11%	44%	13%
Oecussi	6%	25%	6%	63%
Viqueque	0%	1%	89%	10%
Total	**15%**	**11%**	**41%**	**33%**
Male respondents	16%	11%	42%	31%
Female respondents	13%	11%	40%	36%

Household Hunger Scale

Table 111. Household Hunger Scale

Districts	Level of hunger in the household			Average HHS of the district
	Little or no	Moderate	Severe	
Ainaro	68%	17%	16%	1.31
Aileu	69%	20%	11%	1.24
Baucau	88%	11%	0%	0.52
Bobonaro	97%	3%	0%	0.18
Covalima	96%	4%	0%	0.56
Dili	67%	14%	19%	1.72
Ermera	84%	16%	0%	0.62
Liquiça	98%	1%	1%	0.26
Lautem	98%	2%	0%	0.21
Manufahi	99%	1%	0%	0.13
Manatuto	99%	1%	0%	0.11
Oecussi	80%	20%	0%	0.82
Viqueque	100%	0%	0%	0.02
Total	**88%**	**9%**	**3%**	**0.55**
Male respondents	90%	7%	3%	0.52
Female respondents	86%	12%	2%	0.61

7.3 Consumption of Wild Food

Table 112. Consumption of Wild Food [Percentage of respondents who consume wild food]

Districts	# of HHs consuming wild foods, and % of respondents in the district	Month in which wild food was consumed											
		Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep
Ainaro	106 98%	20 19%	16 15%	17 16%	16 15%	16 15%	19 18%	30 28%	81 76%	84 79%	63 59%	57 54%	58 55%
Aileu	89 99%	7 8%	7 8%	7 8%	7 8%	7 8%	8 9%	11 12%	56 63%	62 70%	62 70%	86 97%	84 94%
Baucau	208 89%	20 10%	16 8%	12 6%	13 6%	12 6%	14 7%	23 11%	39 19%	62 30%	102 49%	163 78%	129 62%
Bobonaro	159 88%	64 40%	48 30%	56 35%	50 31%	44 28%	30 19%	33 21%	39 25%	41 26%	33 21%	58 36%	56 35%
Covalima	122 97%	49 40%	46 38%	31 25%	20 16%	18 15%	16 13%	13 11%	16 13%	19 16%	41 34%	71 58%	65 53%
Dili	71 79%	16 23%	17 24%	18 25%	14 20%	14 20%	18 25%	16 23%	16 23%	24 34%	28 39%	58 82%	55 77%
Ermera	232 99%	114 49%	46 20%	37 16%	48 21%	47 20%	48 21%	86 37%	125 54%	155 67%	166 72%	167 72%	148 64%
Liquiça	116 92%	20 17%	14 12%	17 15%	18 16%	25 22%	25 22%	46 40%	59 51%	93 80%	97 84%	95 82%	83 72%
Lautem	123 98%	54 44%	36 29%	41 33%	44 36%	48 39%	58 47%	37 30%	42 34%	48 39%	36 29%	51 41%	38 31%
Manufahi	60 67%	23 38%	16 27%	14 23%	10 17%	9 15%	9 15%	7 12%	9 15%	20 33%	35 58%	42 70%	38 63%
Manatuto	62 86%	38 61%	27 44%	24 39%	16 26%	14 23%	15 24%	15 24%	17 27%	17 27%	31 50%	47 76%	45 73%
Oecussi	58 36%	20 34%	27 47%	22 38%	21 36%	20 34%	10 17%	3 5%	8 14%	9 16%	11 19%	11 19%	7 12%
Viqueque	137 85%	95 69%	96 70%	91 66%	88 64%	89 65%	91 66%	91 66%	86 63%	93 68%	101 74%	107 78%	107 78%
Male Respondents	1002 89%	316 32%	241 24%	228 23%	214 21%	208 21%	203 20%	253 25%	392 39%	493 49%	547 55%	682 68%	614 61%
Female respondents	541 81%	224 41%	171 32%	159 29%	151 28%	155 29%	158 29%	158 29%	201 37%	234 43%	259 48%	331 61%	299 55%
Total	1543 86%	540 35%	412 27%	387 25%	365 24%	363 24%	361 23%	411 27%	593 38%	727 47%	806 52%	1013 66%	913 59%

7.4 Purchase of Rice in the Last Year

Table 113. Number of Months Rice was bought

Districts	Number of months in which the household bought rice												# of HHs that bought rice
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Ainaro					4	11	9	3	4			76	107
Aileu		1		6	5	13	7					58	90
Baucau			1	5	6	8	14	4	7	3		185	233
Bobonaro	1	5	10	21	29	18	18	22	14	18	5	18	179
Covalima				4		4	6	3	4	10	1	94	126
Dili			1	1	4	5	1	2	3			72	89
Ermera			2	16	1	41	3	1	2	2		166	234
Liquiça		1	1	3	3	4	1	1		1		111	126
Lautem			2	2	1	4	1	1				114	125
Manufahi												90	90
Manatuto												72	72
Oecussi		1	1	6	5	15	21	35	21	8	1	47	161
Viqueque	1	13	41	29	26	19	14	1	1		1	14	160
Total	2	21	59	93	84	142	95	73	56	42	8	1.117	1.792
% of HHs	0.1%	1.2%	3.3%	5.2%	4.7%	7.9%	5.3%	4.1%	3.1%	2.3%	0.4%	62.1%	99.6%

Table 114. Months when Rice was bought

# of months rice was bought	# of HHs that bought rice	Months in which households bought rice											
		Oct '10	Nov '10	Dec '10	Jan '11	Feb '11	Mar '11	Apr '11	May '11	Jun '11	Jul '11	Aug '11	Sep '11
1	2									1			1
2	21	3		3	3	3	2	5	3	4	6	3	7
3	59	34	3	6	12	26	9	11	13	21	10	6	26
4	93	65	4	14	42	33	17	42	24	28	39	12	52
5	84	60	13	24	53	25	22	37	28	28	39	22	69
6	142	117	29	108	48	103	35	91	39	86	41	82	73
7	95	83	34	75	39	68	46	60	32	54	37	52	85
8	73	61	54	62	56	60	51	47	31	32	29	36	65
9	56	47	44	47	51	51	43	38	34	32	32	34	51
10	42	42	41	42	42	42	35	26	17	32	30	31	40
11	8	8	7	8	8	7	7	8	6	8	7	6	8
12	1117	1117	1117	1117	1117	1117	1117	1117	1117	1117	1117	1117	1117
Total	1792	1637	1346	1506	1471	1535	1384	1482	1344	1443	1387	1401	1594
% of HHs that bought rice		91%	75%	84%	82%	86%	77%	83%	75%	81%	77%	78%	89%

Table 115. Amounts of Rice bought

	Oct '10	Nov '10	Dec '10	Jan '11	Feb '11	Mar '11	Apr '11	May '11	Jun '11	Jul '11	Aug '11	Sep '11
Amount of rice bought by the sample households (kg)	66,562	52,642	58,319	57,512	60,160	53,132	57,416	52,187	55,828	53,577	52,915	64,065
Average amount of rice bought by a rice buying household (kg)	40.7	39.1	38.7	39.1	39.2	38.4	38.7	38.8	38.7	38.6	37.8	40.2

8. Agricultural Extension and Participation in Groups

8.1 Interaction of Farmers with Agriculture Extension Workers

Table 116. Farmers who know the MAF Extensionist in their Suco, and Rating of Services

Districts	Number of respondents			% of respondents in district	Rating of services				
	Male	Female	Total		Very bad	Bad	Satisfactory	Good	Very good
Ainaro	33	8	41	38%	1	1	3	36	
Aileu	47	15	62	69%		1	8	52	1
Baucau	120	43	163	70%	1	8	41	106	7
Bobonaro	89	43	132	73%	5	6	16	103	2
Covalima	46	25	71	56%	4	5	10	51	1
Dili	20	12	32	36%	1		2	29	
Ermera	15	8	23	10%		1	6	16	
Liquiça	8	2	10	8%		1	1	8	
Lautem	27	36	63	50%			16	45	2
Manufahi	37	10	47	52%	3	2	11	31	
Manatuto	43	8	51	71%	4	6	12	29	
Oecussi	28	41	69	43%	9	12	2	46	
Viqueque	4	1	5	3%		1		4	
Total	517 67%	252 33%	769 100%	43%	28 4%	44 6%	128 17%	556 72%	13 2%
Male respondents					18	30	87	371	11
Female respondents					10	14	41	185	2

Table 117. Type of Extension Services received in the past Six Months

Type of extension service	Number of respondents			% of households	
	Male	Female	Total	that receive services	in baseline survey
Visits	357	165	522	68%	29%
Seeds	143	54	197	26%	11%
Training	111	49	160	21%	9%
Chemical fertilizer	78	37	115	15%	6%
Participation in exposure visits	64	37	101	13%	6%
Advice	50	28	78	10%	4%
Chemical pesticides	31	28	59	8%	3%
Tools	26	22	48	6%	3%
Total	517	252	769		43%

8.2 Participation in Groups

Table 118. Participation in Groups

Districts	HHs in which the respondent or other HH members participate in groups		Number of groups in which the respondent or other household members participate (% of households in district that participate in groups)				
	Number	% of HHs	One	Two	Three	Four	Five or more
Ainaro	34	31%	56%	35%	9%		
Aileu	34	38%	53%	26%	15%	6%	
Baucau	140	60%	32%	36%	24%	6%	2%
Bobonaro	51	28%	71%	27%	2.0%		
Covalima	23	18%	48%	35%	17%		
Dili	32	36%	56%	34%	6%	3%	
Ermera	31	13%	94%		7%		
Liquiça	10	8%	90%			10%	
Lautem	15	12%	73%	27%			
Manufahi	5	6%	100%				
Manatuto	14	19%	93%				7%
Oecussi	21	13%	81%	10%	10%		
Viqueque	12	7%	75%	25%			
Total	422	23%	57%	27%	12%	3%	0.9%
Male respondents	310	27%	55%	28%	13%	3%	1.3%
Female respondents	112	17%	63%	24%	11%	3%	

Table 119. Type of Groups in which Respondents and other Household Members participate

Type of group	No.	% of corresponding group, by gender of respondent		% of HHs that participate in groups	% of HHs in baseline survey
		Male	Female		
Farmer groups/association	227	76%	24%	54%	13%
Adat	179	81%	19%	42%	10%
Religious group	98	72%	28%	23%	5%
Youth group	44	89%	11%	10%	2%
Savings & loans / credit groups	38	63%	37%	9%	2%
Coffee group	31	77%	23%	7%	2%
Women association/OMT	29	34%	66%	6%	2%
Farmer cooperative/association	28	86%	14%	6%	2%
Health group	20	65%	35%	5%	1.1%
Other	11	82%	18%	3%	0.6%
HHs that participate in groups	422	73%	27%		23%

Table 120. Participation in Training

Districts	Housholds in which the respondent or other HH members have participated in training		Number of training events in which the respondent or other household members have participated (% of households in district that attended training)				
	Number	% of HHs	One	Two	Three	Four	Five
Ainaro	30	28%	83%	17%			
Aileu	26	29%	58%	27%	12%	4%	
Baucau	74	32%	64%	22%	10%	3%	3%
Bobonaro	36	20%	64%	19%	14%	3%	
Covalima	31	25%	58%	29%	13%		
Dili	17	19%	82%	18%			
Ermera	16	7%	100%				
Liquiça	8	6%	100%				
Lautem	22	17%	64%	32%	5%		
Manufahi	3	3%	33%	67%			
Manatuto	11	15%	100%				
Oecussi	11	7%	73%	18%	9%		
Viqueque	11	7%	82%	18%			
Total number	296	16%	71%	20%	7%	1.4%	0.7%
Male respondents	216	19%	69%	21%	7%	2%	0.9%
Female respondents	80	12%	75%	18%	8%		

Table 121. Type of Training Events in which Respondents and other Household Members have participated

Type of training	No.	% of corresponding type of training, by gender of respondent		% of HHs that attended xtraining	% of HHs in baseline survey
		Male	Female		
Farmer Field Day	140	76%	24%	47%	8%
Seed production and storage	95	74%	26%	32%	5%
Water and sanitation	67	82%	18%	23%	4%
Nutrition	33	70%	30%	11%	2%
Integrated Crop Management	22	82%	18%	7%	1.2%
Marketing	20	70%	30%	7%	1.1%
Gender	15	53%	47%	5%	0.8%
Savings & loans	10	40%	60%	3%	0.6%
Climate change	9	78%	22%	3%	0.5%
System of Rice Intensification	4	100%		1.4%	0.2%
HHs that attended training	296	73%	27%		16%