CIAT
Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical
International Center for Tropical Agriculture

A report prepared for

Asian Development Bank

Improving Livelihoods of Upland Farmers Using Participatory Approaches to Develop More Efficient Livestock Systems (RETA No. 6067)

Semi-Annual Report – January to June 2003

Selling forage planting material is good business in Vietnam

For further information contact
Werner Stür, CIAT
c/o IRRI, DAPO 7777
Metro Manila, Philippines
Email: w.stur@cgiar.org

Cover photo: A family in Tuyen Quang, Vietnam, prepares planting material for sale to other farmers (photo by Jim Holmes)

Table of Contents

Summary

1. The TA agreement between the Asian Development Band and CIAT was signed on 7 January 2003. The first six months of the project was a time of putting in place management and implementation arrangements. This process commenced with an inception workshop from 26 – 31 January 2003 attended by representatives of the national implementing agencies, ADB, CIAT and ILRI. Participants reviewed achievements of the previous FSP project, and discussed the objectives and outputs of the new project. Country representatives started to develop implementation strategies for their countries, a process that continued after the workshop. The technical assistance framework was reviewed during the workshop and revised. The designated full-time international resource specialist to lead the project, Dr. Ralph Roothaert, left the project in April 2003 to take up a new position with CIAT in Africa. CIAT proposed to ADB and project partners to change the management arrangement by employing a half-time international resource specialist (Dr. Werner Stür) who would coordinate the project together with two regional research fellows (Mr. Francisco Gabunada, Philippines and Mr. Phonepaseuth Phengsavanh, Lao PDR). All are experienced in livestock research and development; Dr. Stür was the project coordinator of previous related projects from 1994 to 2000, and Mr. Gabunada and Mr. Phengsavanh were well-respected collaborators in the FSP project. This arrangement ensures that project staff can support project and site activities much more that if a new full-time international resource specialist had been recruited. The new management arrangement was approved by project partners at the inception meeting.

2. Dr. Stür traveled extensively during the first few months to visit national implantation agencies to negotiate Letters of Understanding and assist country partners to develop implementation strategies and workplans. Mr. Phengsavanh and Mr. Gabunada were released from their organizations to start working with the project in May 2003, and immediately commenced site visits to assist with the development of workplans and activities and support training activities.

3. Some progress was made already towards project outputs. The project places high emphasis on improving livestock productivity to ensure that farmers receive maximum returns on their investment. Ways of improving animal productivity has been discussed for various sites and farmer experimentation with improved feeding systems has been planned. A first workshop to review and capture experiences of project partners with scaling up has been held in northern Mindanao, Philippines. Further workshops are planned for the second half of 2003. The project also supported a training course on 'Participatory Livestock Research and Development' by PCARRD, Philippines and sent 5 project partners to an international training course on agroenterprise development as a first step towards developing suitable methodology for output 4. Participants identified two methodologies which may help the project to identify market opportunities and analyze the production and market chain. Finally, a new issue of SEAFRAD News has been edited and produced by our Chinese partners.

4. In conclusion, good progress has been made with setting up management and implementation arrangements. Some progress has already been made towards project outputs and this is expected to accelerate strongly during the second half of the first year.

Background

5. The Asian Development Bank (ADB) funded project RETA No. 6067 – Improving Livelihoods of Upland Farmers Using Participatory Approaches to Develop More Efficient Livestock Systems, started in January 2003 for a period of three years. The project was given a short name by project participants and will be known as 'Livelihood and Livestock Systems Project' (LLSP). The overall goal of the LLSP is to contribute to reducing poverty in upland areas through increasing the welfare of men and women farmers and the resilience of the farming system (ADB[1], 2002). Participating countries are Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam.

6. This LLSP follows the ADB-financed project RETA No. 5866 – Developing Sustainable Forage Technologies for Resource-Poor Farmers in Asia. The previous project developed forage technologies with smallholder farmers and demonstrated that adoption of forage technologies led to increased livestock production, reduced labor requirements for animal production, and improved soil and water conservation on small crop-livestock farms in the uplands. The LLSP will determine how these outputs contribute to more sustainable livelihoods and how they can be disseminated more widely. The project focuses on reducing poverty through increased and more efficient livestock production. The new project includes Cambodia and has a reduced level of activities in Lao PDR and Thailand.

Purpose and outputs

7. The **purpose** of the project is to:

1. improve the sustainable livelihood of small farmers in the uplands through intensification of crop-livestock systems, using farmer participatory approaches to improve and deliver forage and feed technologies; and
2. improve delivery mechanisms in participating DMCs for the dissemination of these technologies.

The **outputs** of the project will be:

1. integrated feeding systems for livestock, that optimize the use of improved and indigenous fodders and crop residues, and farm labor;
2. improved methods to develop forage feed systems and extend them to new farmers, optimizing the use of M&E for feedback to others in the community;
3. Increased capacity in DMCs, at different levels, to expand the use of improved forage and feed systems and respond to local needs;
4. comparison of development opportunities, and market and logistic constraints, for intensification of smallholder livestock systems across sites in five countries;
5. improved regional interaction and linkages with national and donor funded development projects that ensure synergistic and multiplier effects.

[1] Asian Development Bank 2002. Proposed Technical Assistance for the Seventh Agriculture and Natural Resources Research at International Agricultural Research Centers. ADB, TAR:Res 36472, Manila, Philippines.

8. The executing agency of the LLSP is the Centro International de Agricultura Tropical (CIAT), a Future Harvest Center (www.futureharvest.org). The DMCs implementing agencies in participating countries are:

Cambodia	National Animal Health and Production Investigation Centre, Department of Animal Health and Production, Phnom Penh.
China	Chinese Academy of Tropical Agricultural Science (CATAS), Danzhou, Hainan.
Indonesia	Livestock Services of East Kalimantan, Samarinda, East Kalimantan, and Directorate General of Livestock Services, Ministry of Agriculture, Jakarta.
Lao PDR	National Agriculture and Forestry Research Institute (NAFRI), Vientiane.
Philippines	Philippine Council for Agriculture, Forestry and Natural Resources Research and Development (PCARRD), Los Baños, Laguna.
Thailand	Department of Livestock Development, Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives, Bangkok.
Vietnam	National Institute of Animal Husbandry (NIAH), Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development(MARD), Hanoi.

9. The implementing agencies in participating DMCs coordinate the implementation of the project with research being carried out by local collaborators at farmer participatory research sites. In many cases local collaborators are development oriented extension services.

Progress towards Project Objectives

Project inception and management structure

10. The TA agreement between the Asian Development Bank (ADB) and the Executing Agency CIAT was signed on 7 January 2003.

11. The project commenced with an inception workshop held at the Chinese Academy of Tropical Agricultural Science (CATAS), Hainan, P.R. China, from 26 to 31 January 2003 and was attended by 34 participants representing the national implementing agencies of participating countries, the commissioned executing agency CIAT, the donor ADB and representatives of ILRI which manages a closely related RETA project. Country representatives presented an assessment of achievements of the previous project or, in the case of the new country Cambodia, a review of livestock development. Overall achievements were summarized by Ralph Roothaert including lessons learned and research needs for the new project. Objectives of the new project were presented and discussed, and countries indicated the priorities they would like to allocate to each output. Country representatives developed country specific research objectives and an implementation strategy. An attempt was made to develop workplans for the first year but country representatives felt that they need to consult and involve site collaborators in the development of workplans. The presentations and country strategies were summarized in Proceedings of the Workshop and a copy of the proceedings is submitted with this first semi-annual report.

12. Ms. Pratima Dayal, the ADB senior agricultural specialist, presented guidelines for improving indicators included in the TA framework. Working groups discussed ways of making indicators more realistic and more closely related to project purpose and outputs. Based on these discussions the TA framework was revised to reflect the judgment of project partners of what is desirable and achievable. The revised TA framework is attached in Appendix 1. There is a need to review the TA framework frequently and revise indicators and output targets with project partners during the next Annual Regional Meeting of the Project. A meeting session will be devoted for this purpose.

13. The project coordinator of the previous project, Dr. Ralph Roothaert, has left the project in April 2003 to take up a new position with CIAT in Africa. Management and technical support for the LLSP will be provided by a part-time senior resource specialist, Dr. Werner Stür, two full-time regional research fellows, Mr. Francisco Gabunada and Mr. Phonepaseuth Phengsavanh, an administrative officer, Ms. Dea Bonilla and a resource economist, Ms. Jindra Samson. Dr. Rod Lefroy, the Coordinator of CIAT in Asia, will supervise the project and additional technical support will be provided by CIAT staff and outside consultants as needed. Dr. Stür is responsible for the overall implementation of the project; Mr. Gabunada will work primarily with project partners in P.R. China, Indonesia and Philippines and Mr. Phengsavanh with project partners in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Thailand and Vietnam, although both are expected to contribute to all activities. Contracts for leave of absence were negotiated with the employers of Mr. Gabunada (Leyte State University, Philippines) and Mr. Phengsavanh (National Agriculture and Forestry Research Institute, Lao PDR) to allow them to take up the Research Fellowships with the LLSP. The two regional research fellows commenced duties in May 2003. Ms. Dea Bonilla and Ms. Jindra Samson continued their involvement from the previous project with Ms Samson being tasked with development of participatory monitoring and evaluation methodology, and impact assessment at all sites. This management arrangement ensures that LLSP partners will receive more on-site input and training than would have been possible with a single coordinator position, particularly if a completely new scientist were to be recruited. Both Mr. Phengsavanh and Mr. Gabunada have been involved in the development of participatory approaches for technology development and dissemination during the Forages for Smallholders Project and are recognized and respected by project partners (and others in the region) for their advanced skills and knowledge in the area of participatory approaches to agricultural development.

14. Dr. Stür visited national implementation agencies and potential project sites in Cambodia, Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam from 17 February to 22 March 2003 and Cambodia, Lao PDR and the Philippines from 18 May to 7 June to negotiate Letters of Understanding (also called Letters of Commitment), and discuss implementation strategies and implementation arrangements. Letters of Understanding (LoU) have been finalized and signed with all participating countries.

15. As reported in the first quarterly report, two of the contact persons in the DMCs' implementing agencies (Page 28, Appendix 2 of the TA document) have changed. In Indonesia, Ir. Ibrahim has been replaced by Ir. Munief Muchsinin, Head of the Livestock Service of East Kalimantan. This change has occurred as Ir. Ibrahim has been promoted to Head of Agriculture of Penajam Paser Utara district. He will continue to be involved in the LLSP as this district is in the project area. The second change is in Viet Nam, where Dr. Huoang Kim Giao has been replaced by Mr. Vu Chi Cuong, Deputy Director of the National Institute of Animal Husbandry. Dr. Giao has been promoted to a position in the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development. The contact persons in the DMC implementing agencies are usually Head of Divisions and, in several cases, they have appointed one of their staff

members as national coordinators for the LLSP while continuing to supervise activities. The full list of appointed national coordinators is shown in Table 1.

Table 1: National Coordinators in participating countries

Country	Implementing agency	Official contact person	Appointed national coordinators
Cambodia	National Animal Health and Production Investigation Centre, Department of Animal Health and Production, Phnom Penh	Dr. Sorn San	Dr. Sorn San
Indonesia	Dinas Peternakan TK. 1 Kaltim, Samarinda, East Kalimantan In collaboration with the Directorate General of Livestock Services (DGLS), Jakarta	Mr. Munief Muchsinin	Joint Coordinators: - Mr. Yacob Pangendongan (Livestock) - Mr. Ibrahim (Agriculture) DGLS Liaison Officer: - Mr. Djodi Suparto
Lao PDR	National Agriculture and Forestry Research Institute (NAFRI), Vientiane	Dr. Bounthong Bouahom	Mr. Bounthavone Kounnavongsa
P.R. China	Chinese Academy of Tropical Agricultural Sciences (CATAS), Danzhou, Hainan	Mr. Yi Kexian	Mr. Yi Kexian
Philippines	Philippine Council for Agriculture Forestry and Natural Resources Research and Development (PCARRD), Los Baños, Laguna	Dr Edwin Villar	Mr. Eduedo Magboo
Thailand	Department of Livestock Development, Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives, Bangkok	Mrs. Chaisang Phaikaew	Mrs. Chaisang Phaikaew
Viet Nam	National Institute of Animal Husbandry (NIAH), Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD) Thuy Phuong, Tu Liem, Ha Noi	Mr. Vu Chi Cuong	Mr. Le Hoa Binh

16. In Indonesia, the LLSP was designed to work only in East Kalimantan. The Directorate General of Livestock Services (DGLS) in Indonesia expressed the desire to expand the LLSP to other provinces as they feel that the technologies and participatory approaches developed by the LLSP are suitable for expansion to new areas. However, they also accepted that the LLSP is a research project developing technologies and methodologies rather than a development project responsible for delivering these outputs throughout the country. DGLS agreed that they will try to obtain government funding for expansion beyond the scope of the LLSP, with the LLSP supporting expansion with methodologies, technologies and training of trainers. This is well within the scope of the LLSP as described in the TA document. Approximately 15% of research and training funds for Indonesia have been allocated for this purpose and Mr. Djodi A.H. Suparto, Head of the Feeds Section at DGLS has been appointed as liaison officer responsible for managing expansion to other provinces.

17. In Cambodia, the National Animal Health and Production Investigation Centre (NAPHIC) of the Department of Animal Health and Production (DAHP), Phnom Penh, was confirmed as the national implementation agency in Cambodia. Dr. Sorn San will be the national coordinator for Cambodia. Dr. Sorn San is also the coordinator of the ILRI Project "Development and Testing of an Integrated Approach to the Control of Gastro-Intestinal Parasites of Small Ruminants in South and South East Asia". The two projects agreed to collaborate by working together in villages in Kampong Cham province, some 80km northeast of Phnom Penh, with LLSP providing forage and feed technologies and ILRI providing animal disease management options to farmers. The LLSP will concentrate its efforts to starting activities in Kampong Cham. Once this has been achieved, options will be investigated for working in a second contrasting environment in another province.

18. There are no significant deviations from the original TA document.

Output 1: Integrated feeding systems for livestock that optimize the use of improved and indigenous fodders and crop residues, and farm labor.

19. Feeding system technology development commenced during FSP-II was continued by local partners. This output of the LLSP needs to be strengthened considerably to take account of the new direction of the project. Although many farmers are continuing to expand and integrate forages into their farming system and receive considerable benefits such as reduced labor requirements, improved income from sales of animals and manure, improved soil fertility through application of manure, and improved soil conservation by planting of contour hedgerows and cover crops, only few farmers are achieving a high level of animal production. Some farmers are feeding insufficient quantities of feed, most farmers are feeding forages that are too old (poor quality) and almost all farmers are feeding insufficient amounts of protein (e.g. protein supplements of forage legumes) to achieve high levels of animal production. At sites with extremely low soil fertility, such as in East Kalimantan, planted and native forages are lacking in minerals required for animal production, leading to poor animal production and susceptibility to diseases.

20. One effect of planting improved forages has been an increase in confinement of animals in pens or tethered near houses. The reason is that farmers now have a feed resource located conveniently near the house. This has had clear advantages: Many farmers provide supplementary feed to animals in the morning and evening, resulting in better animal feeding. Farmers do not have to spend time bringing animals to far-away fields for grazing when they are busy with other tasks, and they can collect manure easily which can be sold or used on their own crops. Also, parasites are less of a problem and animals have less contact with other animals thus limiting the spread of diseases. However, there have also been disadvantages: Animals can no longer select the feed they eat by themselves (and they are very good in picking the best feed when allowed to graze freely) but depend on the farmer for their diet. As animals were allowed to graze freely in the past, many farmers have limited knowledge of the feed requirements of their animals. Confining animals also has consequences for breeding of animals. While the farmer now has control over breeding, a prerequisite for genetic improvement, the animals depend on the farmers to recognize estrus cycles and to facilitate mating at the right time.

21. The LLSP is making a concentrated effort to address these issues. This requires some change by site collaborators who are still very much in a 'dissemination mode' of the previous FSP project. Extensive consultations with local partners are needed to ensure that

sufficient emphasis is placed on output 1. The first workshop on this issue was held in northern Mindanao, Philippines, in late June (see report in Appendix 4). A similar workshop is planned for July in East Kalimantan, Indonesia.

Output 2: Improved methods to develop forage feed systems and extend them to new farmers, optimizing the use of M&E for feedback to others in the community.

22. Previous projects have developed a methodology for participatory technology development[2] and this methodology provides the basic framework for working with farmers. In addition, the previous project developed tools and methods for scaling up or participatory dissemination of forage technologies. We recognize that each participating partner country (and maybe each site) has modified the methodology to some extent to fit their particular needs and situation. This is not only due to differences in farming systems but also to differences in culture and administrative structures. In the new project we would like to review experiences of our partners in each country and develop country-specific methodologies which will be sustainable beyond the life of the project. As a first step, we will convene workshops in each country to review and describe these approaches. These workshops will help our partners to learn from each other and improve their approaches. Successes with tools and methods will be shared across all countries. The information from workshops will also serve as a basis for comparing approaches across countries and help us to document each approach.

23. The first in-country workshop to review experiences and lessons learnt from participatory dissemination during the FSP was held in northern Mindanao, Philippines, from 23 – 27 June 2003. The workshop was called a 'write-shop' indicating the emphasis on reviewing and documenting the experiences of participants. 26 collaborators from FSP/LLSP sites in northern Mindanao and two collaborators from our NGO partner Mag-uugmad Foundation in Cebu participated in the write-shop which was facilitated by Ms. Marie Alo and Mr. Ed Magboo of the Livestock Research Division, PCARRD, and by Francisco Gabunada, CIAT-LLSP. The facilitators used a variety of PRA tools to enable participants to share their experiences in a relaxed but organized discussion. Visualization sessions started with link mapping (when, where), followed by process diagramming (how, extent of participation), success rating (what worked well and what needs to be improved) and impact-benefit matrix (assessing the impacts of the tool/method at the personal, farm, household, community and institutional level). The two main tools reviewed in this first write-shop were cross visits and field days. A detailed report on the meeting is attached in Appendix 4.

24. Similar 'write-shops' are planned for Indonesia and Vietnam, and contact has been made with the Forages and Livestock Systems Project (FLSP) in Lao PDR to compare experiences with the FLSP. The outcomes of these reviews will be the basis for country-specific methodologies.

[2] P. Horne and W. Stür (2003). Developing agricultural solutions with smallholder farmers: How to get started with participatory approaches. ACIAR Monograph No. 99, 120 pages.

Output 3: Increased capacity in DMCs, at different levels, to expand the use of improved forage and feed systems, and respond to local needs.

25. The LLSP supported two training courses / workshops in the Philippines and sent 5 collaborators to an international training course on agroenterprise development (Table 2). In the Philippines, the LLSP supported a training course on participatory livestock technology development for 17 researchers and extension workers (municipal, provincial and regional government staff by providing training material and Mr. Francisco Gabunada as a trainer. The training course was organized and financed by our national implementation agency in the Philippines, PCARRD. A full report of the training is attached in Appendix 5.

Table 2: List of training courses / workshops

Country	Topics	Period	Participants
Vietnam	International Training Course 'Sustainable Agro-enterprise Development in a Micro-regional Context'	31 March – 18 April 2003	Mr. Yi Kexian, PRC; Mr. Yakob Pangedongan and Mrs. Maimunah Tuhulele, Indonesia; Mr. Truong Tan Khanh, Vietnam; Mr. Seuth Phengsavanh, Lao PDR
Philippines (organized and funded by PCARRD)	Regional training course 'Participatory Livestock Research and Development'	2 – 6 June 2003	17 staff from LGU and Department of Agriculture in northern Philippines
Philippines	LLSP 'Write-shop' to capture experiences with dissemination and workplan development	23 – 27 June 2003	26 LLSP site collaborators from sites in northern Mindanao and 2 from Cebu

26. Details of the LLSP 'write-shop' capturing experiences of LLSP collaborators with participatory dissemination were already included in Output 2. An additional part to this workshop was a discussion of objectives and outputs of the LLSP emphasizing the changed direction of the new project. Participants developed workplans and discussed the overall strategy of the LLSP in the Philippines. The outcome of these discussions was the basis of the overall workplan for the Philippines. A report on workplan development is attached in Appendix 5.

27. Five collaborators of the LLSP, Mr. Yi Kexian from P.R. China, Mr. Yakob Pangedongan and Mrs. Maimunah Tuhulele from Indonesia, Mr. Truong Tan Khanh from Vietnam, and Mr. Phonepaseuth Phengsavanh from Lao PDR (and later employed as CIAT regional research fellow in the LLSP) participated in the second Southeast Asian Course on "Sustainable Agro-enterprise Development in a Micro-regional Context" held from 31 March to 18 April 2003 in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. The LLSP was lucky that this international training course coincided with the start of the project. It enabled us to send LLSP collaborators to this training course to be exposed to agroenterprise development ideas, approaches, tools and methods, which was an ideal start to initiate work on Output 4. Two of the methods presented during the course are of particular interest to the LLSP. These are the 'Identification of market opportunities' and 'Analysis of the production and market chain'. Other modules dealt more with post-harvest value adding which is of less immediate relevance to the LLSP. A full report on the training is attached in Appendix 5.

Output 4: Comparison of development opportunities, and market and logistic constraints, for intensification of smallholder livestock systems across sites in five countries.

28. Following the agroenterprise training course in Vietnam, the LLSP participants were tasked with evaluating and adapting concepts and methods learnt in the course for use in the LLSP. The aim is to develop methods and tools which can be used by our local partners to identify constraints and opportunities in local livestock production and marketing systems. The results of the analysis will be used to target interventions designed to maximize the benefit derived from livestock production. A first evaluation of methodologies is planned for Daklak, Vietnam during the second half of 2003. The experiences and results from this evaluation will then be used at other sites.

Output 5: Improved regional interaction and linkages with national and donor funded development projects that ensure synergistic and multiplier effects.

29. The LLSP inception workshop was held from 26 – 31 January 2003 at the Chinese Academy of Tropical Agricultural Science in Hainan, P.R. China (see section on project inception and management structure). During the meeting it was agreed to hold subsequent regional meetings in different countries to enable delegates to directly learn from regional experiences during a field day organized as part of the meeting. The next meeting is planned for January or February 2004.

30. The newsletter of the 'Southeast Asia Feed Resources Research and Development Network' (SEAFRAD) will continue to be produced by country editors on a rotational basis, although the timing will be more flexible. During the Inception Meeting, Mr. Yi Kexian, P.R. China, volunteered to edit and produce the next two issues. The first of these two issues has been completed and was mailed out in June 2003. A new project-internal email newsletter called 'LLSP Connections' is under development and will commence shortly.

31. Participants at the inception meeting accepted an abbreviated version of the otherwise lengthy project title 'Improving livelihoods of upland farmers using participatory approaches to develop more efficient livestock systems'. The project will be known as 'Livelihoods and Livestock Systems Project' (LLSP). A new logo, reflecting the gender focus, feed resources and livestock systems direction of the LLSP, was presented which generated some discussion. After the inception meeting, several collaborators expressed doubts about the new logo and disappointment that the well recognized and respected FSP logo was lost. An email vote among collaborators resulted in a 60:40 split in favor of the old FSP logo. Considering the close vote we returned the logo to the artist, challenging him to find a compromise solution which takes account of the comments made by collaborators. A new version was presented to collaborators which incorporates aspects of both the old and new logos. This has been put to a second round of voting in the first project-internal newsletter 'LLSP Connection' and results are expected soon.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Revised TA Framework (revision of 15 February 2003)

Design Summary	Performance Indicators/Targets	Monitoring Mechanisms	Assumptions and Risks
A. Goal			
To reduce poverty in upland areas of Southeast Asia	• Within 10 years (by 2013): 30% reduction in poverty in crop-livestock farms in districts where the project operates	Government statistics and reports	Project contributes to this goal
B. Purpose			
1. Improve the sustainable livelihood of small farmers through intensification of crop-livestock systems, using farmer participatory approaches to improve and deliver improved forage and feed technologies	At focus sites by 2005 • 15% increase in farm income (including consumption and asset value increases) from improved crop-livestock productivity of farm households participating in the project in Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam. 10% increase in PRC • At least 100 farmers using one or more improved forage technologies on their farms in Cambodia • 20% increase in labor use efficiency in livestock production, expressed as hours/day per animal unit of persons aged >15 years on participating farms in Indonesia, Philippines, Vietnam and PRC • 30% of participating farmers in Indonesia, Philippines, P.R. China and Vietnam grow forages in contour hedgerows or as covers for soil conservation on hillsides protecting at least 20% of sloping land on their farms. • 50% of participating farmers derive additional income from the sale of manure or benefiting indirectly by applying this manure on their crops for improved crop production	• Participatory Monitoring & Evaluation (PM&E) of project outputs and outcomes at focus sites by site partners • Impact assessment reports based on results of PM&E in 2005 by CIAT and country partners • Project completion project report in April 2006	• Continued government priority and support to development of diversified smallholder farming system • Continued support and collaboration from participating DMCs
2. Improve delivery mechanisms in participating DMCs for dissemination of improved forage and feed technologies	• Improved participatory approaches to development and dissemination adopted by partner agencies in Indonesia, Philippines, P.R. China and Vietnam by 2005 • Additional farmers (not involved in FSP) are applying forage and feed technologies at focus sites: 250 in the Philippines, 250 in Indonesia, 250 in Vietnam, 250 in P.R. China and 100 in Cambodia	• Report on survey of implementing agencies of collaborating DMCs in 2005 • PME reports, cited in semi-annual progress reports and project completion report	• Government policies continue to advocate use of demand-driven approaches in research and extension

Design Summary	Performance Indicators/Targets	Monitoring Mechanisms	Assumptions and Risks
C. Outputs			
1. Integrated feeding systems for livestock that optimize use of improved and indigenous fodders, crop residues, and farm labor	At all focus sites in 3 years: • The three most common indigenous forages identified • 25% of farmers at focus sites in China, Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam have incorporated legumes into their feeding system or feed other protein sources to improve animal productivity • Farmer experimentation demonstrated a 20% increase in livestock productivity (measured as liveweight gain or increased reproductive performance) at three focus sites in China, Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam.	• Reports of results of farmer experimentation by site partners upon completion of experiments • Semi-annual progress reports and country reports at annual regional meetings • Report of survey of 30 randomly selected farm households at each focus site by CIAT and country coordinators in 2005 • 5 case studies each in China, Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam documenting successful forage and feed technologies by CIAT and country coordinators in 2005	• Continuing market demand for livestock products • Incentive for farmers to adopt sustainable management practices
2. Improved methods to develop forage feed systems and extend them to new farmers optimizing the use of M&E for feedback to others in the community	In 3 years: • Document improved methods for participatory technology development and dissemination through workshops and consultations in P.R. China, Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam • 5 farmer-to-farmer extension activities (such as field days, cross visits and farmer group meetings) carried out at each focus sites in Cambodia, P.R. China, Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam • PME system established that monitors adoption of forage and feed technologies, and demand and supply of forage planting material at each focus site in participating countries	• Published a manual on participatory approaches to dissemination by CIAT and country coordinators in 2005 • Semi-annual progress reports • Country reports at annual regional meetings	• Continued enthusiastic collaboration of district and provincial officials
3. Increased capacity in DMCs, at different levels to expand the use of improved forage and feed systems and respond to local needs	In 3 years: • 150 field workers from focus sites and 25 other staff from partner agencies received training in participatory approaches, animal nutrition, forage technologies and experimenting with farmers in Cambodia, P.R. China, Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam • Partner agencies have extended new technologies to areas beyond focus sites of the project in P.R. China, Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam • Thai partners train 10 key farmers and	• Semi-annual progress reports • Country reports at annual regional meetings • Training reports by organizers available within 1 month of completion of training events • Report on survey (or case studies) of	• Personnel assigned to positions for duration of project

Design Summary	Performance Indicators/Targets	Monitoring Mechanisms	Assumptions and Risks
	technicians from Vietnam in forage seed production Participatory approaches developed by the project have been taken up in other sections of partner agencies in P.R. China, Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam	uptake of participatory approaches by CIAT and country coordinators in 2005	
4. Comparison of development opportunities and market and logistic constraints for intensification of smallholder livestock systems across sites in the five countries	• Methods for analysis of constraints and opportunities for intensification of smallholder livestock production systems identified and trialed at one focus site in Vietnam by 2003 • Analyze the livestock production and market chain to identify constraints and opportunities for farmers and suggest possible interventions at one focus site each in P.R. China, Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam in 2004 • Interventions to overcome key constraints or exploit opportunities identified in analysis (see above) implemented at sites where the analysis was conducted by 2005 • 10% increase in financial return from livestock production due to introduced interventions to participating farmers by 2005	• Report on suitable methods following an international training course in Vietnam in 2003 by sponsored course participants • Report on testing of methods by CIAT and Vietnamese partners in 2003 • Analysis report for each of the 4 focus sites within 1 months of completion by CIAT and country coordinators • 15 case studies site of impact of interventions across focus sites by CIAT and country coordinators in 2005	• Secondary data is made available
5. Improved regional interaction and linkages with national and donor funded development projects that ensure synergistic and multiplier effects	• Held Annual Regional Meetings to review progress and plan activities with country coordinators • Published the SEAFRAD Newsletter to publicize results of the project to the wider community and contributed to other relevant newsletters • Improved linkage with ILRI, sharing information and experiences through joint meetings, research and publications on forage and feed systems • Uptake of forage and feed technologies by at least one development project in each collaborating country	• Proceedings of Annual Regional Meetings collated by CIAT every year • Publication of 2 issues of SEAFRAD per year • Semi-annual progress reports • CIAT in Asia website • Project completion report	• Countries share their results and experiences • Development projects express interest in working with project

Activities	Monitoring mechanism
0. Activities (not yet revised)	
Output 1. Integrated feeding systems for livestock that optimize use of improved and indigenous fodders, and crop residues, and farm labor	
• Botanical survey with farmers of indigenous fodders and collection of samples for identification and nutritive analysis.	Participatory M&E:
• Farmers' focus groups, facilitated by researchers, identify, quantify and qualify feed resources for strategic use during different seasons.	For activities 1-5, indicators are selected and monitored by farmer focus groups (facilitated by district staff)
• Train interested target farmers methods to evaluate legumes.	
• Monitor and evaluate adoption of new feed systems with farmers, and expansion of areas of forages planted over time at sampled farms.	
• Development of feed budgets for most important livestock types at each site, for use by farmers and field workers.	Reports
• Livestock growth trials at each site with improved and relevant feed budget options, on-station or on-farm.	Feedback from supervisors
• Carry out case studies of the dynamics of labor use in the whole household	Reports
• Provide support to national researchers and development workers	
• Document successful forage technologies and feed systems	Data reports available for project staff
• In representative households, record data of the impact of forage technologies on productivity, labor and outcomes, disaggregating data for men and women	
Output 2. Improved methods for dissemination of forage and feed technologies	
• Select new sites for dissemination activities through secondary information, visits, and meetings with stakeholders.	For activities, 1-6, M&E mechanism set up in each district
• Plan strategies for local adaptation and adoption with district officers and key farmers at new sites	
• Facilitation and training of farmers who can become farmer-extensionists and provide training.	Effectiveness assessed during field visits by project staff
• Facilitate field days, cross visits and farmer-to-farmer extension using farmers from focus sites	
• Facilitate group and individual forage multiplication systems in new sites	
• Produce and distribute information on forages and feeding systems to farmers	Draft manual available in 2003
• Train district officers to carry out M&E	
• Modify M&E systems to improve management practices at the community level	
• Use M&E information as one tool in planning district activities	
• Produce and publish a practical manual on M&E for use by district officers	
• Revise manual on dissemination and translate into national languages	Manual available in 2005
• Gather available socio-economic and bio-physical data at district level and enter into GIS database	6-monthly report
• Undertake spatial analysis studies to predict potential areas for forage adoption in association with ILRI and IRRI	Publication
Output 3. Increased capacity for dissemination of potential technologies	
• Conduct training for NAREs personnel in forage agronomy, animal nutrition, use of participatory approaches, and managing information from M&E	Activities 1-3: 6-monthly reports to ADB
• Establish a key group of 'trainers-of-trainers' in each country through formal and on-site training	
• On-site mentoring of national coordinators and other personnel to strengthen skills	Site visits
• Set up and monitor core 'learning groups' within district/ provincial offices to assist in institutionalizing use of participatory approaches	Reports 6-monthly reports
• Evaluate use of this 'core group' approach	
• Training courses for farmer seed production systems in each country using expertise from Thailand	

Output 4. Development and market opportunities

- Conduct studies of market opportunities and constraints at each site
- Establish mechanism for providing market information on livestock products to farmer groups
- Conduct training in market awareness of the potential for livestock products
- Assess options for agroenterprise development
- Socio-economic study of livestock systems and their contribution to livelihoods

Consultants' and regular reports
Field visits
Semi-annual reports to ADB

Output 5. Enhanced regional interaction and linkages

- Conduct annual workshops involving all member countries for project and selected other participants
- Support effective communication by e-mail and publication
- Facilitate sharing of information within countries
- National coordinator produces and distributes information in national language
- Publish and distribute regional newsletter with ILRI
- Interact with ADB rural loan projects through information sharing, visitation and advice, on-site training
- Provide feedback to institutional leaders and policy makers through progress reports, site visits and presentations
- Exchange of personnel and materials with development projects

Proceedings
Copies of communication
Newsletters
Books and brochures
Newsletters
Field visits
Activities 7 and 8:
6-monthly reports to ADB

E. Inputs (not yet revised)

1. Research Personnel

- International resource specialist in Forage Agronomy (US$ 240,000 for 36 months)
- International short-term experts (Monitoring and Impact Assessment, Agroenterprise development, GIS) (US$ 60,000 for 6 months)
- Local project support staff (administrative and technical assistance) (US$ 40,000 for 108 months)

2. Equipment

- Office equipment (computers, printers, scanners)
- Field testing equipment

3. Research, support, training and workshops

- Contracts with national partners to undertake research, dissemination and training activities

4. Administration costs

- Supplies and services
- Communication and networking
- Overhead

Appendix 2: Travel of project staff in 2003

Period	Traveler	Countries visited	Purpose
26 – 31 Jan	LLSP delegates from participating countries	P.R. China	Inception meeting at CATAS, Hainan, P.R. China
17 Feb – 22 March	Werner Stür	Cambodia, Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam	Meeting with Ralph Roothaert in the Philippines to discuss project strategy and implementation issues, and meetings with national implementing agencies in DMCs visited to discuss Letters of Understandings (LoU) and selected site visits.
18 May – 7 June	Werner Stür	Philippines, Thailand, Lao PDR and Cambodia	Attend ILRI–CASREN meeting; discuss administrative arrangements with staff and IRRI, meet with national implementing agencies to discuss strategy and workplans and site visits in Philippines and Cambodia
2 – 6 June	Francisco Gabunada	Philippines	Training course at CLSU, organized by PCARRD
3 – 24 June	Phonepaseuth Phengsavanh	Cambodia and Vietnam	Meeting with national implementing agencies to discuss strategy and workplans
22 – 29 June	Francisco Gabunada	Philippines	Assist PCARRD with planning workshop with all LLSP collaborators

Appendix 3: Contacts for Country Coordinators

Cambodia
Dr. Som San
National Animal Health and Production
Investigation Centre,
Department of Animal Health and Production,
Monivong Blvd. N. 74, Sangkat Wat Phnom,
Khan Doun Penh, Phnom Penh
Tel: +855 12 939629
Email: san@forum.org.kh

China
Mr. Yi Kexian
Tropical Forages Division
Tropical Field Crops and Animal Husbandry
Institute, CATAS
571737 Danzhou, Hainan
P.R. China
Fax: (86-890) 3300157 /0440
Email: yikexian@21cn.com

Indonesia
Ir. Yakob Pangedongan
Dinas Peternakan TK.I Kaltim
Jalan Bhayangkara No. 54,
Samarinda, East Kalimantan 75121
Tel: +62 812 5899449
Email: yacob_pangedongan@yahoo.com

Ir. Ibrahim
Dinas Pertanian Penajam Paser Utara
Penajam, East Kalimantan
Tel: +62 81 155 8783
Email: ibrahimfsp@samarinda.org

Laos
Mr. Bounthavone Kounnavongsa
Livestock Research Division
National Agriculture and Forestry Research
Institute (NAFRI)
Vientiane
Tel (856-21) 222 796
Fax (856-21) 222 797
Email: flspvte@laotel.com

Philippines
Mr. Ed Magboo
Livestock Research Division
PCARRD
4030 Los Baños, Laguna
Philippines
Tel: (63-49) 536 0020
Email: ecmagboo@laguna.net

Thailand
Dr. Chaisang Phaikaew
Division of Animal Nutrition
Department of Livestock Development
Phya Thai Road
Bangkok 10400, Thailand
Tel (66 2) 6534491
Fax (66 2) 6534933
Email: fspthai@ksc.th.com

Vietnam
Mr. Le Hoa Binh
National Institute of Animal Husbandry
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
Thuy Phuong, Tu Liem
Hanoi, Vietnam
Tel (84 4) 8385 022
Fax ((84 4) 838 9775
Email: fspvietnam@hn.vnn.vn

Appendix 4: Trip reports by project staff

Trip report to Philippines, Vietnam, Cambodia, Thailand and Indonesia (17 Feb – 22 Mar 2003)

Werner Stür

Objectives

- Familiarisation with status of research conducted during FSP-2 (2000-2002).
- Finalise the identification of the collaborators in the LLSP, particularly in Cambodia, where there has been no previous collaboration on forages with CIAT.
- Negotiate implementation arrangements with national partners and prepare Letters of Understanding for participating countries
- Assist collaborators with development of a strategy for project implementation and workplan for 2003.

Key people met

Vietnam:

- Mr. Vu Chi Cuong, Deputy Director, NIAH, Hanoi
- Mr. Nguyen Manh Dzung, International Projects' Assistant, NIAH, Hanoi
- Mr. Le Hoa Binh, Head - Forage Section, NIAH, Hanoi (National Coordinator)
- Ms. Vu Hai Yen, Livestock Officer, Tuyen Quang (Site Coordinator)
- Mr. Truong Tan Khanh, Lecturer, Animal Science, Tay Nguyen University, Daklak (Site Coordinator) and colleagues

Cambodia:

- Ms. Phaloeun, Deputy Director, CARDI, Phnom Penh
- Dr. Sorn San, Director – AHPIC, DAHP, Phnom Penh
- Mr. Khiew Borin, FAO, UTA and DAHP, Phnom Penh
- Dr. Sen Sovann, Deputy Director, DAHP, Phnom Penh
- Mr. Terry O'Sullivan, Project Manager, CAAEP, DAE, Phnom Penh (and several project advisors)

Thailand:

- Mr. Chirawat Khemsawat, Director - Division of Animal Nutrition, DLD, Bangkok
- Dr. Chaisang Phaikaew, Head - Forage Research Section, DLD, Bangkok (National Coordinator)
- Ms. Ganda Nakamanee, Forage Researcher, DLD, Pakchong (Site Coordinator)

Philippines:

- Mr. Ed Magboo, Animal Scientist, PCCARD, Los Baños (National Coordinator)
- Dr. Edwin Villar, Head, Livestock Research Division, PCARRD, Los Baños
- Dr. Doug Gray, Regional Coordinator, ILRI Asia, Los Baños
- Dr. Somkiat Saithanoo and Dr. Danilo Pezo, ILRI, Los Banos
- Mr. Francisco Gabunada, LSU
- Dr. Perla Asis, City Veterinary Office, Cagayan de Oro (Site Coordinator) and staff
- Ms. Judith Saguinhon, Municipal Agriculturist, Malitbog (Site Coordinator) and staff
- Agricultural extension officers, Impasugong

Indonesia:

- Mr. Munief Muchsinin, Head, Livestock Services of East Kalimantan, Samarinda and staff

- Mr. Yacob Pangendongan, Production Section, Livestock Services of East Kalimantan, Samarinda
- Mr. Ibrahim, Head, Agricultural Services Penajam Paser Utara, East Kalimantan
- Mr. Soepodo Boediman, Director, Direktorat Budidaya Peternakan, DGLS, Jakarta and other members of his Directorate
- Mr. Djodi A.H. Suparto, Head, Sub directorate of Feeds, DGLS, Jakarta

Itinerary

17 Feb	Brisbane – Manila
18-19 Feb	Discussions with Ralph Roothaert
20 Feb	Manila – Hanoi
21-22 Feb	Field visit to Tuyen Quang and discussions on site objectives and outputs with Ms. Yen (Site coordinator of Tuyen Quang)
23 Feb	Negotiate implementation arrangement at NIAH
24 Feb	Hanoi – Nha Trang; discussions with Mr. Khanh and colleagues on site objectives and outputs for Daklak
25 Feb	Nha Trang – Ho Chi Minh City Prepare LOU for Vietnam
26 Feb	Revise Log-frame for LLSP; Ho Chi Minh City – Phnom Penh
27 Feb – 2 Mar	Discuss possible implementation arrangements with CARDI, DAHP and CAAEP, and field visits to Kampong Cham and Kampott Provinces. Discussions with Rod Lefroy, CIAT Coordinator for Asia.
2 Mar	Phnom Penh – Bangkok
3-4 Mar	Site visits at Pakchong, negotiate implementation arrangements at DLD, Bangkok, and prepare LOU for Thailand
5 Mar	Bangkok – Manila
6-7 Mar	Participate in ILRI – CASREN meeting, Los Baños
8 Mar	CIAT office
9 – 13 Mar	Field visit to northern Mindanao with Ed Magboo
14-15 Mar	CIAT office
16 Mar	Manila - Jakarta
17 – 21 Mar	Discuss possible implementation arrangements with DGLS, Jakarta, and Dinas Peternakan, East Kalimantan and brief field visit in East Kalimantan with Mr. Djodi and partners in East Kalimantan
21 – 22 Mar	Jakarta - Brisbane

Summary

The new direction of the project was discussed with national implementation agencies and local collaborators. We reached agreements on national coordinators of the LLSP and drafted mutually-acceptable Letters of Understanding. Implementation strategies were discussed and these were further developed with local collaborators after my visit. In Cambodia, we selected Mr. Sorn San, NAHPIC, Department of Animal Health and Production (DAHP), as national coordinator and DAHP as national Implementation Agency in Cambodia. It became apparent, that national coordinators need to put a lot of effort into explaining the new direction of the project to local site collaborators who are very much in a forage dissemination mode.

1. Philippines

Several days were allocated for discussions with Dr. Ralph Roothaert to discuss progress during FSP-2 and needs and opportunities for the new project. These discussions helped me to better understand the development at sites and to formulate an initial implementation strategy. I also held discussions with Dea Bonilla on administrative matter, Jindra Samson on M&E and field staff at the seed unit.

Ed Magboo, the national coordinator for the Philippines, and I visited field sites of FSP-2 in northern Mindanao. Good progress has been made at all sites and it was pleasing to see the amount of tree legumes planted by farmers in northern Mindanao; these will be a great advantage in improving the feeding systems in the area. We also saw the limitation imposed by only working with forages as there were several instances where farmers had originally planted forages but other problems like marketing of milk, problems with conception rates and other 'non-feed' issues had prevented farmers to receive the full benefit from having planted forages. This was a good illustration for the need for a new direction of the new project, broadening to improve the production system as a whole to ensure that farmers maximise the returns for their efforts. There was also an instance where traders mentioned that forage-fed beef obtains a premium in the Cagayan de Oro market, however, not many farmers are aware of this and might be able to receive higher prices if better informed and organised. We discussed the changed scope of the new project with site collaborators; this received a mixed reception and indicated that a workshop may be needed to discuss the new project in detail with site collaborators. Ed Magboo agreed to develop a concept note for such a workshop, combining it with a review of experiences session. It was also evident that many field workers had only limited knowledge in animal nutrition and emphasized the need for training in this area.

Discussions were also held with Ed Magboo and Edwin Villar, PCARRD on implementation arrangements for the LLSP. In the previous project, Ed Magboo and staff of the FSP-2 project made research contract directly between sites and CIAT. This was an old arrangement between CIAT and PCARRD which avoided complications with government regulations on dispersal of funds in the Philippines. As PCARRD is now coordinating many overseas projects they have worked out a system which works well and they would like the new LLSP project to course funds through PCARRD rather than directly to sites. This seems reasonable and will bring our arrangements with PCARRD in line with arrangements in other countries where funds are dispersed through the national implementing agencies. PCARRD will prepare a LoU based on the new arrangement.

2. Vietnam

Visited field sites in Tuyen Quang with Mr. Le Hoa Binh and Ms. Yen. The farmers we visited had all integrated substantial areas of forages into their farming system and intensified livestock production. In several cases, farmers had planted forages for fattening cattle in areas previously grown to rice or maize. These tended to be slightly marginal areas where water was not guaranteed every year and forages were a good alternative. Farmers reported that they receive higher income from fattening cattle than from crops. We discussed the new direction of the project and developed an outline of a workplan. We also met with Mr. Bui Huu Vien, the Secretary of the Communist Party of Yen Son District to discuss the new project and received his full support.

In Hanoi, Mr. Binh and met with Mr. Vu Chi Cuong, Deputy Director of the National Institute of Animal Husbandry (NIAH) and Mr. Nguyen Manh Dzung, International Projects' Assistant to discuss and negotiate a Letter of Understanding (LoU) between CIAT and NIAH.

I intended to visit the second site in Daklak but was refused permission to enter the province because of a recent political incident. In future, all foreigners need to give at least 2 weeks notice to allow processing of the necessary clearances. Instead of visiting Daklak, Mr. Khanh and local collaborators met me in Nha Trang to discuss the new project. We reviewed experiences and developed a new workplan for Daklak. This was further refined by Mr. Khanh after my visit and was the basis for budget allocations to Daklak.

3. Cambodia

The main reason for visiting Cambodia was to select a national implementing agency for the LLSP. I discussed options with CARDI (Ms. Phaloeun), Department of Animal Health and Production (DAHP - Dr. Sorn San, Dr. Sen Sovann and Mr. Khiew Borin) and with Mr. Terry O'Sullivan of the Cambodian-Australian Agriculture Extension Project (CAAEP) with the Department of Extension. Working with CARDI would have been too expensive for the LLSP since CARDI had no scientist working on livestock and would have needed to hire a person with project funds. The most suitable arrangement seemed to be to work with Dr. Sorn San, Director of the Animal Health and Production Investigation Center (AHPIC) who has good contacts with provincial staff. Additionally, Dr. Sorn San is the main counterpart of an ILRI project on parasite control in goats which opened the possibility of working together with ILRI on goat production. Before leaving Cambodia, I agreed in principle with Dr. Sorn San and DAHP, and over the following weeks developed a signed a LoU.

Dr. Rod Lefroy joined me for some of the time in Phnom Penh and we were able to do a field visit to Kampong Cham Province where the ILRI project is operating. The farming system is extensive and much of the province is typically lowland with small pockets of upland areas. Much of the land is flooded during the height of the rainy season and farmers have difficulty feeding their livestock during that time. Most farmers have two bulls for draught and transport, and some farmers have small cattle herds for breeding. Livestock productivity is low and there is a lot of room for improvement.

4. Thailand

I visited the Animal Nutrition Research Center in Pakchong with Mrs. Chaisang Phaikaew, Mrs. Ganda Nakamanee and Mr. Supachai, the Head of the Center. We reviewed previous research and discussed ways of how we can bring this research to a fruitful conclusion. We also visited farmers who were part of participatory forage technology development conducted by Ms. Ganda. We agreed on completing research into new anthracnose-resistant *Stylosanthes guianensis* varieties and varietal testing of lablab. We also agreed that there is a need to review the experiences with on-farm work conducted so far to have a basis for further planning.

In Bangkok, Mrs. Phaikaew, Mrs. Nakamanee and I met with Mr. Chirawat Khemsawat, Director, Division of Animal Nutrition, Department of Livestock Development (DLD), to explain Thailand's role in the new project and negotiate LoU between CIAT and DLD. We were able agree on a draft LoU which was later signed by the Director General. DLD also agreed to organise training course on seed production for other countries involved in the LLSP and we

discussed the request of Vietnam to send farmers and field workers to Thailand later in 2003 for a practical training course on grass seed production.

5. Indonesia

In Indonesia, I visited the Directorate General of Livestock Services (DGLS) to discuss the new project and reach agreement on an implementation strategy for Indonesia. I met with Mr. Djodi Suparto, Head of the Sub-directorate of feeds, and with Mr. Soepodo Boediman, Director, Direktorat Budidaya Peternakan, DGLS and several of his staff. They expressed strongly that DGLS wanted to expand the participatory "FSP" approach to other provinces and were looking for ways of including this expansion into the new project. I explained that the LLSP is a research rather than a development project and did not have the funds to expand the participatory approach to technology development and dissemination to a large number of provinces. I did agree that the LLSP would be willing to assist with developing a strategy for expansion, provision of training material, training of trainers to assist DGLS in this endeavour. DGLS would have to find government funding to pay for training of larger number of staff and drive expansion.

Mr. Djodi and I then visited our collaborators and briefly some field sites in East Kalimantan. In Samboja, many farmers have increased their forage areas under coconuts and this system continues to spread to new farmers and nearby districts. The livestock system is based entirely on grazing native vegetation with supplementation of grass cut from forages under coconuts. There are few, if any, legumes in the feed and it seems likely that productivity of cattle would be improved if more protein was fed to cattle. This is clearly an opportunity for the new project – supplementation of different protein sources and possibly minerals. We briefly visited a few farmers in Sepaku, where we saw interesting integration of forages for erosion control into pepper and fattening operations. However, there were also many farmers who grow forages but are still only achieving low animal production. The likely cause is the extremely low soil fertility in the area which means that any feed grown is also low in minerals and protein. There are almost no legumes in the feed. Again there is an opportunity to improve animal production considerably by supplementing minerals and protein. We found a similar situation in Makroman where farmers had disease problems with goat production. Again, the poor soil fertility results in low nutritive value of feeds translating into poor production. The FSP was highly successful in finding forages which grow in these poor soils and this has resulted in less labour for farmers, soil conservation and some animal production improvements but much more can be done to ensure that farmers get the full benefit of animal production.

We discussed the new direction of the LLSP with Mr. Munief Muchsinin, Mr. Yacob Pangedongan and other staff at the office of the Livestock Services of East Kalimantan. We reviewed progress at FSP sites and discussed an implementation strategy for the LLSP in East Kalimantan and drafted a LoU acceptable to both DGLS and Dinas Peternakan. We agreed that the LLSP would be jointly coordinated by Ir. Ibrahim (now Head of Agricultural Services of the new district Penajam Paser Utara which includes FSP sites in Sepaku and Semoi) and by Ir. Yacob who is a staff member of Dinas Peternakan. This arrangement is necessary since Ir. Yacob is new to the project and needs to work with Ir. Ibrahim to learn how to manage the project in East Kalimantan. The role of Mr. Djodi of DGLS will be that of a liaison officer responsible for extending the Participatory Approach developed in East Kalimantan to other provinces. A LoU was developed and subsequently signed by DGLS and Dinas Peternakan in East Kalimantan.

Trip report to Philippines, Thailand, Lao PDR and Cambodia 18 May – 7 June 2003

Werner Stür

Objectives

- Follow-up on administrative arrangements of the LLSP office at IRRI and discuss implementation of the LLSP with staff in the Philippines
- Meet with the two new regional research fellows, Francisco Gabunada (Papang) and Phonepaseuth Phengsavanh (Seuth) to discuss the LLSP and implementation arrangements
- Finalise LoUs with Thailand, Lao PDR and Cambodia
- Assist with strategy and workplan development in Lao PDR
- Visit Cambodia with Seuth Phengsavanh to assist with strategy and workplan development

Key people met

Philippines:

- Mr. Ed Magboo, Animal Scientist, PCARRD, Los Baños (National Coordinator)
- Ms. Dea Bonilla, Ms. Jindra Samson and Mr. Francisco Gabunada, CIAT

Thailand:

- Dr. Chaisang Phaikaew, Head - Forage Research Section, DLD, Bangkok (National Coordinator)
- Ms. Ganda Nakamanee, Forage Researcher, DLD, Pakchong (Site Coordinator)

Lao PDR:

- Mr. Seuth Phengsavanh, CIAT-LLSP
- Drs. Peter Horne and Rod Lefroy, CIAT

Cambodia:

- See trip report by Seuth Phengsavanh

Itinerary

18 May	Brisbane – Manila
18 – 28 May	CIAT-LLSP office in Los Baños, Philippines
28 May	Manila – Bangkok
29 May	Discussions with Dr. Chaisang Phaikaew and Mrs. Ganda Nakamanee, DLD, Thailand
30 May	Bangkok – Vientiane
30 May – 3 June	Discussions with Lao partners, FLSP and CIAT in Vientiane
3 June	Vientiane – Phnom Penh
3 – 5 June	Discussions with Cambodian partners
5 June	Phnom Penh – Bangkok
6 June	Finalise workplans with DLD
6 – 7 June	Bangkok – Brisbane

Summary

This visit was dominated by implementation and administrative matters. Contracts and insurance were finalised for the two regional research fellows, and many administrative arrangements such as downsizing of our office at IRRI, phasing out of the seed unit at IRRI, office space for the two research fellows, etc. I discussed project goals, activities, outputs and desired impacts of the LLSP with Papang in the Philippines and Seuth in Laos. I visited Laos to discuss collaboration between FLSP and LLSP, and discuss the LoU and workplans. On the way, I met with our Thai collaborators to discuss the planned seed production training for Vietnamese farmers and technicians. Seuth and I visited Cambodia together to meet with Sorn San, the national coordinator and visit field sites for initial field activities. For details on Cambodia see a separate trip report by Seuth.

1. Philippines

The visit in the Philippines was largely taken up with discussions about administrative matters such as contracts and conditions for the regional research fellows and staff based at IRRI. We decided to downsize the office at IRRI and to phase out the seed unit. I also negotiated administrative arrangements with IRRI.

I discussed overall project strategy with Francisco Gabunada (Papang) and also met with Ed Magboo, PCARRD to discuss progress with implementation arrangements in the Philippines. LLSP site collaborators in the Philippines are finding it difficult to develop suitable workplans; they are inclined to continue previous activities, mainly dissemination such as field days and cross visits, rather than embrace the changed direction of the project. Ed and Papang decided to hold a workshop with all people involved in the LLSP in northern Mindanao to further discuss the new direction of the project to help local partners to better understand the aims and outputs of the LLSP. This will be combined with a review of experiences with participatory dissemination of forage technologies and this will be documented by PCARRD. Mrs. Marie Alo, PCARRD, will help to facilitate this workshop planned for the last week in June.

2. Thailand

I met with Dr.. Chaisang Phaikaew and Mrs. Ganda Nakamanee to discuss course content and arrangements for the planned training course on seed production for Vietnamese farmers and technicians. This is planned for October in northeast Thailand and concentrates on practical aspects of grass seed production. I am very pleased that DLD agreed to conduct this training for LLSP partners in other countries. DLD clearly subsidises this event with staff time, provision of transport and equipment – and I believe the project needs to look for ways of reciprocating this kindness.

We also discussed other workplan activities.

3. Lao PDR

I met with Peter Horne, FLSP and other CIAT staff to discuss the objectives, outputs and desired impacts of the LLSP, and to look for ways of collaborating with related CIAT projects. There are good reasons for collaborating closely with the Forages and Livestock Systems Project (FLSP) headed by Peter Horne. Many of the issues are similar; while many LLSP sites are further advanced in terms of forage technology development and dissemination, the

FLSP has developed a much closer link with local partners and put more energy into building the capacity of local partners. This has had good results and I believe that the LLSP could learn a lot from FLSP experiences of how to work more effectively with farmers and farmer groups.

I met with Rod Lefroy to discuss implementation arrangements, in particular contracts and conditions for regional research fellows and accounting procedures. Our regional research fellow, Phonepaseuth (Seuth) Phengsavanh will be based at the FLSP office with Dr. Peter Horne in Vientiane which ensures good collaboration between LLSP and FLSP activities.

Peter Horne, Seuth Phengsavanh and I discussed how the LLSP and FLSP can work together, and what the LLSP can do in Laos which complements the efforts of the FLSP. We agreed on an outline of a strategy and workplans, and Seuth was going to discuss this with NAFRI, our implementing agency in Laos. Unfortunately, I was unable to meet with Dr. Bounthong, the DG of NAFRI on this visit but a LoU was prepared and later signed, negotiated by Seuth. The Lao coordinator for the LLSP is going to be Mr. Bounthavone Kounnavongsa, based at the Livestock Research Center at Nam Suang. We agreed on a range of activities for the 2003 workplan.

5. Cambodia

See trip report by Seuth Phengsavanh for details.

Trip Report to Cagayan de Oro
22-29 June 2003

Francisco Gabunada, Eduedo Magboo, Ana Marie Alo

Objectives

- Assist in the conduct of LLSP Philippine workshop to:
  - document the technology transfer strategies adopted by FSP1 and 2, and
  - prepare the LLSP Philippine site workplan

Collaborators involved
Staff from FSP2 sites

I. Workshop on Technology Transfer Strategies

Participants

Cagayan de Oro	Impasugong	Malitbog	Manolo Fortich
1. Perla T. Asis	1. Eriberto Bangis	1. Judith Saguinhon	1. Ernesto Ducusin
2. Josue M. Ledres	2. Elsie Gabonada	2. Willie Nacalaban	2. Antonio Guillermo
3. Rey Dapanas	3. Nida Jacutin	3. Nelson Badilla	3. Cynthia Velasco
4. Eveslyn Payla	4. Milaflor Torrefranca	4. Gaspar Velasco	4. Gemma Canias
5. Elvin Elorde	5. Josie Magbojos	5. Gregorio Paderog	
6. Edward Paasa	6. Permelita Dal	6. Junjie Emata	
7. Fernando La Victoria	7. Honradez Hernandez	7. Mimi	
		8. Jong	

The objective of the workshop was to document technology transfer strategies (farmer to farmer cross visits and field days) adopted by FSP in Cagayan de Oro, Malitbog, Impasugong and Manolo Fortich. The term *"writeshop"* was coined for this activity.

Ana Marie P. Alo (Marie) and Eduedo C. Magboo (Ed) of the Livestock Research Division, PCARRD, facilitated the workshop. Two staff from Mag-uugmad Foundation Inc. (Timoteo Llena and Patricio Damaolao) in Cebu, were likewise invited to help in facilitation and share their experiences in the conduct of cross visits and field days. Marie served as lead facilitator. The rest assisted her.

The original plan was to devote the first 3 days for the writeshop. However, in the course of the writeshop it was felt that the time was not enough and that the information being gathered was worth the waiting. As such, the writeshop took four days. Despite the one-day lag, it was felt that the participants' outputs were of good quality. Moreover, the methods used and time allocation given did not get the participants bored. The methods also allowed just enough pressure for them to enjoy writing their experiences, rather than get them to consider writing as burdensome. The major learning here is that an activity aimed at getting participants'

points of view and experiences should move with the pace of the participants. The participants' pace may not be easy to capture during the initial planning process. Thus schedules have to have a certain extent of flexibility.

The plan formulated by Ed and Marie (see Annex 1) should be given due credit. The plan enabled the use of PRA tools (mostly involving visualization) to get the participants to share their experiences. Most of the participants were not used to writing up the type of reports required in the writeshop. If the writeshop was handled in a different way, the results as well as the attitude of the participants might have been different.

The methods used facilitated participation and enabled the participants to bring up front their experiences. The methods reflect the breadth of experience of the facilitators in obtaining effective participation of the stakeholders involved. In the duration of the writeshop, one can sense that the participants were comfortable and not hard up with sharing their experiences. They were allowed to use their dialect and minimal translation was actually necessary because most of the media used were visual.

The visualization sessions started with link mapping, which was basically aimed to show when and where the cross visits were done, and who were involved. This was followed by a process diagramming session to show how the cross visit was done (from preparation up to after the activity), as well as the extent of participation of those involved. The third session was on success rating, which was aimed to show how the participants rate the degree of success as well as other ways of improving the cross visit in the future. The next session was doing the impact-benefit matrix. This was aimed at assessing the impacts or effects of the cross visit to those involved at the personal, farm, household, community and institutional levels.

Talking with Marie and Ed, we realized that it was important to allow adequate time for the participants to visually represent their ideas. We thought that it was best to get them to make one visual output (or use one tool) for every half-day session. This may seem too long for the readers but it certainly is adequate for the participants, based on our experience. The trick is to choose the appropriate tool to capture the desired information. This aspect was well done by Ed and Marie.

After the visualization sessions, the participants then started the actual writing up. They were not hard up at this stage since all that they have to write about were already illustrated in their visualized outputs. The facilitators provided an outline to guide the participants on how to structure their output. A short lecture was done before the actual writing.

At the end of the writeshop, all the participants submitted an output, which was suitable for editing. Since some groups were writing in the local dialect, it was decided that F. Gabunada would do the initial editing (mostly for content). The participants submitted all their outputs, which include the first draft of their report as well as notes that they recorded while making each of the visualizations. Marie and Ed will do the final editing.

Another lesson learned was that it is important that the participants would direct their concern on the substance of what they will write, rather than be conscious of how to write it (*e.g. many times during the actual writing, participants were expressing their concerns on the grammar and form of writing. The facilitators assured them that their papers will be edited to improve the format but the editor will not be able to improve the content; as such, they should dwell more on what contents were missed, rather than how grammatically good or acceptable their*

English was). Future writeshops of this nature might need to emphasize this. Also there is a need for translators later on when the papers or outputs they will produce will be written up. This way, we would not miss on the substance because of our concern for the form of the outputs. However, this also means that facilitators should be well versed during the writeshop and concentrate mainly on contents/substance of the report. It would be helpful for facilitators to get a prior knowledge/idea on what information needs to be included by the participants.

The Conservation Farming for Tropical Uplands (CFTU) network, where the Leyte State University (LSU) and Mag-uugmad Foundation Inc., (MFI) are members, have just released a facilitator's guide for the conduct of cross-visits. This is a useful guide for facilitators. However, caution must be made so as to make sure that the facilitators will not lead the participants to follow the format of the facilitators' guide. Also it would not be worthwhile to give this to the participants as it might pre-empt their way of writing their report (they might think that this is the only right way of doing cross visit and would make sure they write was written in the guide). This guide must serve only as a reference for the facilitators to make sure that they don't miss certain aspects/information to be taken from the participants from the writeshop. This facilitators' guide is available at LSU at P32/copy.

II. Workshop to Plan LLSP Activities.

Ed served as the primary facilitator for this activity.

First, Ed presented the notes we had with interactions with Werner. These notes basically gave a background on what were accomplished during FSP1 and FSP2. Then Ed posed the objective of LLSP.

The major points stressed by Ed were as follows:

a) LLSP does not aim to be helped by the agencies of the participants (*i.e. LLSP does not want the agencies to do something which is outside the agency's mandate*). Rather, LLSP wants to help the agencies in aspects that are within the mandates of both LLSP and the respective agency. Thus, LLSP doesn't want the technicians involved to consider the LLSP activities as separate from their existing jobs.

b) The major question that LLSP is asking to the agencies is, *"Do you have an existing livestock project/activity which is aimed at improving livelihood of your clientele?"* This indicates that LLSP has an emphasis (or maybe a bias) towards livestock activities that have a bearing on farmers' livelihood.

c) The emphasis of the LLSP is not only on forages. Rather its emphasis is on the livestock production system, up to product marketing system. At this stage, the LLSP would consider working with focus groups consisting of farmers that have a common production system. These farmers don't necessarily have to be in the same barangay. However, they have to be proximate enough to each other so as to allow adequate flow of information and sharing of experiences.

d) LLSP can offer trainings for technicians and farmers, forage planting material, and support for farmer experimentation.

e) LLSP will deal more with focus groups of farmers and aim to go deep rather than go wide (*i.e. involving too many farmers*).

f) LLSP aims to come up with methodologies/process. Rather than emphasizing on the number of farmers we work with, LLSP would be more concerned on the process of generating technologies with farmers' participation.

The collaborators first expressed their concerns on what will happen to the other barangays/groups that would not be part of the focus groups. The response was that their respective agencies are expected to continue the work in those areas if they feel these were needed.

Another concern was also on what would happen to the other technicians who would not be involved with the focus group. The response was that these technicians would be considered in the trainings for technicians that LLSP might offer. The same was true if there were cases where other sites of the FSP could not become a part of the LLSP.

Basically, the first 2 hours in the morning was spent for these discussions. After which, each site was asked as to whether they have plans/activities, which could be helped by LLSP. Each group was given one hour to discuss among themselves. After one hour, each group's output was tabulated on the board and discussed.

Basically, all the sites were interested to do farmer experimentation, farmer trainings similar to the livestock field schools as well as trainings for technicians. The groups were also able to give an indicative decision as to which barangays and production systems they will work with.

It was felt that at that stage, all the participants have already had a certain extent of knowledge about LLSP and how it would work. Moreover, their plans were already sufficient for making the country workplan of the Philippines. In discussions with Ed, it was decided that he would draft the country workplan based on the outputs of the participants.

While waiting for the review and approval of CIAT and the transfer of funds, Ed will come back to visit the sites to make a detailed plan together with the staff.

Other notes from interactions with Ed:

Ed was thinking of organizing a technical working group to help out in generating ideas (putting science) on how to improve the production systems of the focus groups in the sites. This would preferably consist of technical people within the vicinity of the sites.

In the marketing aspect (agroenterprise development), the idea evolved was to support efforts in trying out new products (*e.g. satay from goats, or any other product which could be produced by the focus groups*) in the local market. Once the product becomes popular or once it is proven not to be sellable, the LLSP will stop supporting the one involved in promoting the product.

A hypothetical example was to try out satay in Cagayan de Oro. First, a volunteer/willing farmer/entrepreneur would be assisted in determining how much *satay* can be produced from one goat. This will be a basis on the pricing. The he will be assisted in selling out the product (*basically trying to find out whether it would be sellable and in which areas would it be sellable – e.g. bus terminals? Near markets?, etc).* Once the product is established as sellable or not, then LLSP would leave the entrepreneur on his own.

PROGRAM FOR THE LLSP PLANNING WORKSHOP AND WRITE-SHOP
Cagayan de Oro City
23 TO 27 JUNE 2003

Day/ Technique	Purpose	Expected Output
Day 1-am Energizers and loosening up f sessions	To allow participants to gear up for the activities ahead.	
Leveling off on what the weeklong activity is all about	To level off on the expected outputs	
Day 1-pm Link-mapping	To level off on the promotional project activities done and understand the participants' current feelings about these.	Maps and stories
Day 2-am Process diagramming	To graphically understand how each of the activities was done, who were involved and what benefits were derived.	Process diagram + extent of participation matrix
Day 2-pm Success rating Effect/Impact Evaluation	To understand how successful each activity is viewed and what indicators are used to measure such impact. To understand how the activity has affected the stakeholders concerned	Output to be based on success indicators to be identified; indicators will determine PE tool to be used.
Day 3-whole day	Lecturette on *Animating Report Writing* Write-shop	Report per site
Day 4- am	Visioning exercise on what they want to see in their respective areas now that FSP has been completed Briefing on the new ADB-CIAT RETA Project Paradigm Shift - a mind setting exercise for the new LLSP Leveling-off on the new thrust of the LLSP (Brainstorming technique/Card and Chart method)	Common understanding of the thrust and objectives of LLSP

Day/ Technique	Purpose	Expected Output
Day 4 – pm	Formulation of objectives for the each focused sites Exchange of experiences to draw out those that can help in the formulation of workplan for LLSP Presentation of focused objectives per site	Focused objectives of the LLSP in their area.
Day 5 – am	Formulation of individual workplan (by focused site)	LLSP workplan per site
Day 5 – pm	Presentation and Critiquing of the workplan	

WORKSHOP WITH FSP STAKEHOLDERS
VIP Hotel, Cagayan de Oro City
June 23-25, 2003

General Objective:

- To assist the FSP local stakeholders document some of their activities with the farmers, particularly the cross visits and farmers' field days.

Specific Objectives:

- Help the FSP secondary stakeholders understand their "extension realities" through the use of visualization and storytelling; and
- Help them document in writing their experiences in conducting field days and cross visits, and verbalizing their effects and impacts on the farmers and the communities in general.

Timetable of Activities

Day/ Technique	Purpose	Expected Output
Day 1-am Energizers and loosening up f sessions	To allow participants to gear up for the activities ahead.	
Leveling off on what the weeklong activity is all about	To level off on the expected outputs	
Day 1-pm Link-mapping	To level off on the promotional project activities done and understand the participants' current feelings about these.	Maps and stories
Day 2-am Process diagramming	To graphically understand how each of the activities was done, who were involved and what benefits were derived.	Process diagram + extent of participation matrix
Day 2-pm Success rating Effect/Impact Evaluation	To understand how successful each activity is viewed and what indicators are used to measure such impact. To understand how the activity has affected the stakeholders concerned	Output to be based on success indicators to be identified; indicators will determine PE tool to be used.
Day 3-whole day	Lecturette on *Animating Report Writing* Write-shop	Report per site

Reference used for the writeshop

Animating Report Writing[3]

Anna Marie P. Alo[4]

This module tackles the means by which community mobilizers and project stakeholders can make report writing an interesting, objective and systematic endeavor. It introduces the audience to tools and techniques designed and developed by the author specifically for documenting and evaluating cross visits and field days of the FSP-Philippines. Although the basic principles of these tools and techniques were developed for the ILRI-IFAD TAG 443 project, the current set has been adjusted and redesigned to conform to the needs of FSP.

"Reports that are just filed without being read, or thrown in the trash, or just used to wrap groundnuts, are useless"...so goes the article of Phil Bartle (2003). Well, no one can argue that for it is common knowledge that the essence of any report is to be read and to generate action. However, for one who is not a writer, the task can be daunting, sometimes boring.

Organizing one's thoughts, experiences and observations is not an easy task; hence field workers almost always dread report writing. But this activity can be animated to become not only interesting but also participative, challenging and a worthwhile endeavor.

Why write reports?

Report writing is an activity that is essential and required in any development undertaking. Not only will it communicate progress, but it will also help lay down problems needing actions. By practicing the art of report writing, a community facilitator can also assist communities write their own community progress reports. In essence, there are three main reasons why we need to make reports: for information, assessment and encouragement. Bartle (2003) summarizes the benefits derived from report writing by the different actors of development programs (Table 1).

---

[3] *Paper presented during the FSP Workshop on Documenting Cross-visits and Farmers' Field Days, June 23-27, 2003, VIP Hotel, Cagayan de Oro City*

[4] *Sr. Science Research Specialist, Livestock Research Division, PCARRD-DOST and Country Coordinator ILRI-IFAD TAG443 Participatory Diagnosis of Gastrointestinal Parasites in Goats in the Philippines*

Table 1. Who benefits from reports?

Who Benefits?	How Do they Benefit from Reports?
The author(s) of the report	Through writing, the author(s) learn skills *(how to organize ideas, how to write)*, identify weaknesses, identify failures and successes, and identify strengths *(many hidden until written)*. Writing *(itself)* improves assessment abilities.
The community engaged in the project	Just as *"seeing"* helps the driver of a car check on its speed and direction, so a community *"sees"* its progress through monitoring and reporting. Results *(reaching desired objectives)* make community members feel happy and encouraged *(to do more)* (especially verbal reports).
Any other community	By seeing or hearing about a community's progress, people in any other community get their awareness raised; they learn that such things are possible. When the read or hear about the community's achievements, they are also given courage *(encouragement)* to undertake their own community projects.
Researchers	Researchers can use well-written reports as sources of research data.
Donors and contributors	Donors and contributors can learn how their donated money, labor, land, or donations in kind are being used, by reading or hearing reports. Remember that all the community members are donors. Do not think that only outsiders are donors.
Government: Central, District, and Local	Community project reports and mobilizers' reports help by providing vital information that is needed for informed and effective planning, at the central, district and local level of Governments. As in the other cases above, reports are also a source of encouragement, useful to Governments as well as others.

In essence, reports have many useful purposes and they play an integral part in the success of community work. Therefore, it is imperative to write reports, have them read, and generate necessary reactions from such reports.

How do we make reports?

The manner of making the report depends on the objective of the activity. But in all report writing, the basic principle is to ***report on results of your activities—this requires some form of analysis that goes beyond mere descriptions of activities.***

All reports include some basic parts, such as:

- Identifiers ---title, author/s with title and position, period and location the report covers.
- Highlights---the last to be written but the first to be seen; this is the abstract or summary of the whole report and gives a bird's eye view of what is to be expected from the report.
- Body---here you describe your objectives and desired results, activities undertaken, outputs and outcomes achieved as you worked through your desired result.

Bartle (2003) suggest the following:

1. Indicate the degree to which the objectives or desired results were achieved;
2. Indicate the reasons for the level of success *(contributing factors);*
3. Indicate the hindrances, constraints, reasons why 100% was not reached;
4. Describe what lessons were learned.

Do this for every objective.

- Recommendations---based on what you have analyzed in the body, make recommendations on whether to continue or change (how and why) the activity/ies. Be sure to identify to whom the recommendations are for.
- Appendices---include any information that supplements the above.

What makes a good report?

Learning to write good reports takes practice and a good amount of visualization. Writing is best achieved with the participation of people who have been with you in the community project.

A good report is obviously one that is animated, read and action taken because of it (not just filed and ignored). For a report to be read it must be easy to read. An easy reading material is concise (i.e. brief but complete). Short reports are more likely to be read than long reports; but reports that miss important information are disappointing. Hence it should contain all the necessary information but without flowery language, esoteric vocabulary and long, convoluted sentences. It must be written is simple, straightforward language, with easily recognizable words, short simple sentences, and subtitles to separate sections. Passive sentences should also be avoided.

Reports should also vividly depict the real situations as expressed by the actual actors. One good way to do this is to include all visualizations done and interpreted by the audience. This will not only break the monotony of words but will somehow bring the reader to the field reality.

Write and rewrite! Only practice makes perfect. You should write at least three drafts—first draft, second draft and final draft. If necessary have your peer evaluate your work and rewrite again.

To guide you through, make an outline of the important things you want to say before you start writing. Rearrange the topics as you move along.

How can we make report writing fun and challenging?

As has been my experience with the ILRI-IFAD project, one way to make an activity interesting and worth learning is to employ the learn-by-doing approach. This approach requires that each learner be given the chance to work out his own problem at his own pace and within his own experiential sphere.

In this particular workshop, my objective was to assist the FSP local stakeholders document some of their activities with the farmers, particularly the cross visits and farmers' field days. Specifically I was requested to help the FSP secondary stakeholders understand their "extension realities" through the use of visualization and storytelling; and help them document in writing their experiences in conducting

field days and cross visits, and verbalizing their effects and impacts on the farmers and the communities in general.

To help my audience get down to writing their experiences, several visually-oriented tools were introduced, with the hope that step-by-step, the participants can decode their feelings and put them down in writing.

The following session guides will help you, dear community facilitators, facilitate the same processes among your farmers or other audiences, and make report writing fun and challenging.

Activity 1: Link Mapping

Objectives

To level off on the promotional project activities done by the farmers and the other secondary project stakeholders and understand the participants' current feelings about these.

Session Flow

1. Introduction (2 min)

The facilitator (F) introduces what the session is all about and what is expected of the participants (P).

2. Exercise (60 min)

Participants will be grouped by project site and asked to draw and story-tell about their project site vis-à-vis the areas they visited during the ***cross visits***. They will be made to identify in the drawing the dates and locations of the travels, persons met, sites seen, and meetings attended, among others.

Using these maps, the Ps will then be made to add icons, words and arrows to show how each site relate to the other (**relationship map**).

For each group, there should be a recorder (responsible for jotting down the discussions of the group), lead and alternate "sketchers" (responsible for getting the map in order), and a reporter. But all the members will interact to have the output completed.

3. Processing

All outputs will be posted on the board and each reporter will be given 10 minutes to discuss his group's output. The F will elicit from the P their feelings regarding the activities. Everyone will validate each output and these validations will serve as springboard for the next visualization exercise.

Activity 2: Process Diagramming

Objectives

To graphically understand how each of the activities was done, who were involved and what results were derived.

Session Flow

1. Introduction

Using the previously drawn maps as springboard, the F asks the Ps to regroup

(5 min) and graphically illustrate the process they went through to arrive at the activities.

2. Exercise (60 min) Participants are regrouped and asked to make a diagram of the processes they went through in conducting the cross visits and the field days. They are first asked to write their purpose in doing the 2 activities.

Using a brown paper and a pen, the F makes a big square at the top right corner and designates that as the output (i.e. the field day and the cross visit). The Ps are made to link it to a series of activities undertaken and outputs produced using papers in 2 shapes:

□ - activity undertaken

□ - results produced

Ps are asked to describe the activities (during storytelling) and analyze the outputs or results of these activities. Specifically they must be able to answer the following questions:

Did you achieve your purpose? To what extent?
How far has the objective been reached? Why?
What unexpected observations did you & the other stakeholders make?
What consequences do those observations have?
What problems did you encounter and why?
What can be done to avoid these problems in the future?
What conclusions did you and the group make about the activity?

They must be able to describe the factors that led to the achievement of each objective or the hindrances that led to their non-achievement.

Ps should also explain how funding was co-shared—by whom, how much per stakeholder.

Just like in the previous activity, each group should have a recorder (responsible for jotting down the discussions of the group), lead and alternate "sketchers" (responsible for getting the diagram in order), and a reporter. But all the members will interact to have the output completed.

Using the activities identified in the previous diagram, the Ps will be made to prepare an ***Extent of Participation Matrix***, where they will identify which set of stakeholder has a bigger participation in each of the activity and what effect that participation bring. They will be made to use weights. The following activity matrix will be followed:

Activity	*Proj.Leader*	*MAO/AT*	*Farmers*
1.			
2.			
...			

3. Processing All outputs will be posted on the board and validated by everyone. These validations will serve as springboard for the next evaluation exercise.

Activity 3: Success Rating

Objectives

To understand how successful each activity is viewed and what indicators are used to measure such impact.

Session Flow

1. Introduction (5 min)

Using the previously drawn process diagrams as springboard, the F asks the Ps to answer the focused question, *Were the activities (i.e. the field day/cross visit) successful, failures, or somewhere still in between?* Using a scale of 1-5, (1, being the lowest and 5, the most positive), the groups are asked to rate the two general activities.

2. Exercise (30 min)

Using cards, F generates from the Ps their concept of a SUCCESSFUL activity. For each rating given, the F generates indicators from the Ps that made them give their activity that rating. For every success indicator, the F probes if the activity was able to meet that particular indicator; field evidences are then gathered. F uses the appropriate tool from the Basket of PE Tools (see list below), to measure the impact of such activities on the various stakeholders.

1	2	3	4	5
Specify indicators for saying 1	Indicators	Indicators	Indicators	Indicators

F asks other questions such as:

1. What barriers did you experience in doing the activities?
   - Timing
   - Money
   - Human resources
   - Attitudes
   - Culture
   - Politics
2. What happened to the farmers and to you as a result of participating in the activity?

Basket of PE Tools: Impact-Benefit Matrix

Objectives — To assess effects and impacts or perceived impacts of the activity on each stakeholder's personal competence, household and/or community.

Session Flow

1. Introduction (5 min) — The facilitator (F) introduces what the session is all about and what is expected of the participants (P).

2. Exercise (30 min) — Using metacards, the F solicits responses to the table below. Or the groups can be allowed to regroup and discuss among themselves their perceived effects of the activities on the farmers involved.

Level	Effects	Impact	Evidence	Rank
Personal				
Household				
Community				

Basket of PE Tools: Spillover Map

Objectives — To assess the sphere of influence of the participating farmers on their communities.

Session Flow

1. Introduction (5 min) — The facilitator (F) introduces what the session is all about and what is expected of the participants (P).

2. Exercise (30 min) — The F asks the group to make a community map. The P are made to mark the location of each of the original participating farmer using a colored paper. The Ps are then asked to mark with another shade of paper the other farmers who were influenced to adopt the technologies promoted during the "activity" (e.g. field day).

Basket of PE Tools: With-without SitAps (situational appraisals)

Objectives — To compare the 'with' and 'without' project situations.

Session Flow

1. Introduction (5 min) — The facilitator (F) introduces what the session is all about and what is expected of the participants (P).

2. Exercise (30 min) — Using metacards, the F solicits responses to the table below. Or the groups can be allowed to regroup and discuss among themselves their perceived effects of the activities on the farmers involved.

Category	Situation B4 (without Proj)	Situation with Proj
e.g. Number of forage species known		
Enterprises		
Problems		

Basket of PE Tools: Activity Suitability Matrix

Objectives To assess the suitability of the activity to the needs of the farmers.

Session Flow

1. Introduction (5 min) The facilitator (F) introduces what the session is all about and what is expected of the participants (P).

2. Exercise (30 min) F regroups the Ps and allows them to discuss among themselves the applicability of the field days and cross-visits using the matrix below:

Activity	OK (check if ok; then write what aspect of the activity is "ok")	Needs Improvement (enumerate what aspects of the activity needs improvement)
Field days		
Cross Visits		

Activity 4: Write-Shop

Objectives To document in writing the activities done and their effects on the various stakeholders.

Session Flow

1. Introduction (2 min) The facilitator (F) recaps all the maps and evaluations done and asks the Ps to regroup. F introduces to them that they will make a write-up or report of how they did the field days and cross-visits, what effects the activities had on the farmers and what impacts they had on the communities.

2. Lecturette (15 min) F shares some pointers on writing reports and gives the format for the report:
   I. Identifiers—Title of write up, authors, title, position, agency
   II. Body
   - Backgrounder about activity-- dates and locations of the travels, persons met, sites seen, and meetings attended (get from link-mapping exercise)

- Processes followed—get from Process diagramming exercise, participation matrix
- Effect and impacts—get from evaluation exercises done
- Lessons learned, needed changes
- Summary---was the objective met?

III. Recommendations (specify to whom recoms are addressed)
IV. Appendices (include all your maps and matrices)
V. Abstract

3. Exercise (1 day)	Using the exercises done and considering the group discussions made, F asks the Ps to regroup and make a write-up about their field days and cross visits.
4. Critiquing	At the end of the day, the participants are made to present their reports and critique the works of the others to enhance their effectiveness.

References:

Alo, Anna Marie P. 2003. Some tools for participatory evaluation: the ILRI-IFAD TAG 443 Philippine experience. (Handout given during the Training Course on Participatory Livestock R&D, June 2-6, 2003, Small Ruminant Center, Central Luzon State University, Munoz, Nueva Ecija)

Bartle, Phil. 2003. Writing reports: a guide to community mobilizers @ www.scn.org/cmp.htm.

Trip report to Cambodia and Vietnam 3-24 June 2003

Phonepaseuth Phengsavanh

Objectives

- Meet with collaborators in Cambodia and identify sites for forage evaluation with farmers (together with Werner Stur).
- Assist collaborators with finalisation of workplans in Cambodia and Vietnam.
- Familiarise myself with the LLSP sites Tuyen Quang and Daklak in Vietnam.

People met

Dr. Sorn San, Mr. Kao Phal, and Werner Stur in Cambodia
Le Hoa Binh and Troung Than Khanh and Yen in Vietnam

Itinerary

3 Jun	Vientiane – Phnompenh, Cambodia
3-10 Jun	Discussions in Phnompenh and site visit to Kampongcham
11 Jun	Phnompenh – Hanoi, Vietnam
12-18 Jun	Discussions in Hanoi and site visit to Tuyen Quang
19 Jun	Hanoi - Daklak
20-23 Jun	Site vist in Daklak and discussions in Ho Chi Minh City
24 Jun	Ho Chi Minh City - Vientiane

Summary

The trip to Cambodia and Vietnam was fruitful, as in Cambodia we were able to meet with local collaborators, especially Dr. Sorn San, National Coordinator of LLSP and his team. In the discussion, we have talked about the project strategies, two main objectives of improve livestock productivities and methodology development, and how we will work together in the project. Site visit was made to Kampong Cham, where we visited 5 villages to select for forage evaluation with farmers this year.

Field visit in Vietnam was interesting, farmers integrate and use forages in different ways. Forages are generally integrated into crop plantation and cut and carry plots. Forages are used for not only ruminants but also pigs and fish. Many farmers have benefited from selling planting material and forage for feed, especially in Tuyen Quang, where farmers sell forage cuttings to local dairy farm.

We had discussed with local collaborators about workplan for this year, where the workplans for each country have been drafted. Workplan for Cambodia was focused on forage evaluation with farmers and capacity building for local collaborators on both of forage technologies and also approach of working with farmers. For Vietnam, workplan are focused on improving livestock production by using forages and other local feed available, and methods for dissemination. Local expansion of forage technologies and also trainings are also included in the workplan. The details of workplans will need to be discussed and revised again.

1. Cambodia

We visited 5 villages in Kampong Cham province. The situation of livestock production was similar in all villages, animals were herded or grazed freely. In four of the five villages many farmers kept goats. Goats are herded by family members or hired labour. Goats are grazed in the field from about 8-12 am and from 2-5 pm. The problem of livestock production was feed shortage during the flooding period, which was mentioned by farmers as the most difficult time of the year for finding feed as large areas are flooded and farmers have to cut feed in high-lying areas and road sides.

There were a few farmers in the first village we visited who grew small plots of forages (King grass and *P. maximum*) for use in the wet season. The forages were promoted by staff of the provincial animal health and production section. However, the forage areas for each family were small and will not be enough for feeding animals in the flooding period.

Some farmers in the villages expressed interest to try growing forages to enable them to keep animals, especially goats in pens or near to the villages. However, there was a problem for most of these farmers because there is limited land available for growing forages as most of the land is allocated for fruit trees, vegetable and other food crops.

It is can be summarised that in Kampong Cham province:
(1) There is a significant problem with feed shortage during the peak wet season when most land is flooded. During that time, farmers work very hard to get enough feed for their animals. However, there is very little that LLSP can help farmers to solve feed shortage problem, as there is limited land for growing forages.
(2) DAHP is working mainly through VVW (village veterinary workers), which could work OK since VVWs interact frequently with farmers owning livestock. However, it could also be negative if they receive a lot of help and become another type of model farmer.
(3) There is a great need to improve the approach of working with farmers for the local staffs, since the interaction between vets and farmers is very traditional with Vets telling farmers what to do and almost ignoring the farmers.

(4) Forage options:
- tree legumes, grass fodder bank for wet season (lots of fertiliser)
- ground covers like *Arachis pintoi, Stylosanthes hamata* and CIAT 184
- tree legumes around the house lot (gliricidia, Leucaena)
- legume shrubs like *Codariocalyx gyroides* and *Desmodium cinerea*
- heavily fertilised grass fodder bank, maybe especially established for the wet season near the house (napier, King, *Paspalum atratum, Panicum maximum*)
- all forages used for cut and carry

(5) Guidelines
- If possible, work with the same farmers or villages as ILRI (parasite control of goats) to maximise the benefit from interventions
- No need to only work with ILRI farmers
- Can also work with cattle not only goats

From the 5 visited villages, there were only three looked promising or have potential for the project to help farmers to improve livestock production, especially goats. In order to get a

broader of production systems in the areas, Socheat (provincial staffs) and his team will visit more villages in a soon time and base on the information and observation will discuss and agree on what villages that we will work in.

(6) Suggested next steps at Kampong Cham

- June/July: Complete / confirm village selection for planting of village nurseries this wet season. Som San and So Cheat will continue to visit some more villages to compare and make final selection of villages.
- July: Seuth to bring seed, hold a short agronomy training course (how to plant and manage) for technicians and farmers, plant the forages
- September: Another short training course for technicians and farmers on forage management and utilisation
- December / January: Diagnosis etc. and identify farmer focus groups (including training)
- Work with focus groups from now on

(7) Selection of second target area (Battambang)

More potential sites will need to be selected. We are planning to visit Battambang province, where the Cambodia-Australia Agriculture Extension Project (CAAEP) currently work in the area. The visit plan was developed to:

- Select an upland site for the LLSP in Cambodia
- Assist with training on participatory approaches and the development of a "TIP" on forages (last week of August)
- Take the opportunity to visit potential areas for forage development with Lex Freeman (advisor for CAAEP in Battambang) – likely to be after the training course
- See if Papang can come to help with site selection and coordination of activities with Seuth
- Combine visit to Battambang with a short training course on forage management and utilisation for technicians and key farmers in Kampongcham.

2. Vietnam

The two project sites in Vietnam - Tuyen Quang and Daklak were visited:

- Tuyen Quang: We went to two villages (Ngoi xanh village, Phu Lam commune, Yen Son district and village No 22, Duk Ninh commune, Ham Yen district) where farmers started working with forages since FSP phase I and II. Farmers have moved from forage evaluation to integrating forages into farming systems. The forage technologies are integrated into farming systems in different ways depending on the resources available for farmers (Cut and carry plots, integrated in tea and fruit tree plantation etc). The impact of forage technology development are starting to be realized in these areas, especially in Ngoi Xan village, where about 25 farmers not only plant forages to feed their animals, but also sell forages to dairy farms in the district. Some farmers have changed their paddy fields to forage plots, saying that the benefit from forages is double compare to rice (one crop of rainfed rice per year only). In Duk Ninh village, there are about 56 farmers who grow forages mainly for fish. By planting forages farmers can save the time for cutting feed from half day to about 15-20 minutes as well as increased fish production. For instance, one farmer reported an increase in fish production from 50-60 kg to 170 kg from his pond of 700 m^2.

- Daklak: We went to visit several farmers who planting forages for fish and fattening of cattle. The benefit from forages is not only for feeding animals, but also from selling planting materials. At the present the demand for forages is high as some coffee farmers change from coffee to other crops and to livestock production. One farmer in Suanfu commune, for instance, has sold about 5 tons of cuttings this year.
- There are some points that have to be considered for both sites in Vietnam. Firstly, there is a need for improved sharing of experiences and technical information. Although some farmers put the manure or fertilizer back to the forage plots, but some of them not and forages (Guinea grass) looks yellow. Therefore, the important thing for us now is to share information about nutrient declining in cut and carry plots with other farmers. Other problems are cutting times and lack of legumes in all villages that we visited, the quality of feed can be better by adding some legumes.
- There is a need to visit more farmers and existing LLSP sites. We had a chance to visit only few areas, and they look like the best sites, so it will be good idea to visit more areas to compare and see if is there any farmers gain the same impact and, if not, why? This can help us to understand about in which systems that forages and which working approach has more impact.

Summary of workplan development in Cambodia and Vietnam

- Cambodia: The main activities for Cambodia this year will be (1) Site selection and bring a range of suitable forage varieties to farmers for evaluation. (2) Build up the capacity of technicians on forage technologies and participatory approaches - how to work with farmers to develop suitable forage technologies.
- Vietnam: The workplan is focused on study of development and integration of forages and other feed systems into existing livestock production; also on the methods for dissemination of successful technologies to other farmers and areas.

Appendix 5: Training reports

Summary of training course on sustainable agro-enterprise development in a micro-regional context, Ho Chi Minh, Vietnam (31 Mar - 18 Apr 2003)

Phonepaseuth Phengsavanh (Lao PDR), Troung Thanh Khanh (Vietnam), Maimuna Tuhulele (Indonesia), Yi Kexian (China) and Yakob (Indonesia)

Objectives of the course

- The course seeks to strengthen institutions that support sustainable rural development through market-oriented agro-enterprises in an area-based context, and by placing emphasis on:
  - Local participation and empowerment in the development processes
  - Approaches, methods and tools for market identification, agroenterprise project design, implementation and evaluation, and provision of sustainable support services
  - Gaining hands-on experience through fieldwork and case studies

Participants from LLSP

1. Maimuna Tuhulele (Indonesia)
2. Yakob (Indonesia)
3. Troung Thanh Khanh (Vietnam)
4. Yi Kexian (China)
5. Phonepaseuth Phengsavanh (Lao PDR)

Summary of the course

The course was consisted of lecture, group discussion, exercises, case study analysis, and field visits to rural enterprises and communities. There were several tools and methodologies were introduced during the courses, however, most of the methodologies were developed in South America, where the situation might be different from Asian one, so there will need some adjustments and best understanding, and maybe more trials on applications of the methodologies as the case studies before they can be used for agroenterprise development in SE Asia.

The training course is comprised of five modules:

Module I – Rural development: opportunities and challenges

The introduction of the module was focused on the rural definition, Key concepts, basic understanding of rural development. Then the presentations continued with policies, development trends and implications of rural development in SE Asia, especially with examples of successful agroenterprise and rural development program from Vietnam, where participants can see the opportunities and challenges of rural development in the region.

The concepts and models of rural agroenterprised development was also introduced with Asia context that described about traditional model, problems and opportunities; new emerging models and services.

The approaches for development of agro-enterprise such as micro-regional and area-based approaches were discussed.

Module II – Learning from our experiences

The aim of the module was to help all participants get to know each other better by sharing their experiences in agroenterprise and rural development in their areas. Participants of the course were from many different organizations, but their goals are to help rural people out of poverty. Therefore, this module provided an opportunity for participants to understand each other and their work better. Participants from each organization presented their own works and followed by discussion.

Module III – Locally driven rural development

In general, there were several tools were introduced in order to help participants to understand and learn the skills on how to work better with local authorities and particularly farmers, because these people are key actors in identifying and developing agroenterprises that meet their social, economic, and environmental goals. These tools are: Interest group forming and mapping, facilitation of consensus, collective action, and the most important tool is market identification.

Module IV – Supporting agroenterprise development

The module was focused more on marketing (orientation, prospects and risks, trends and new products and participatory market research), financing (finance for agroenterprise project, assessing financial feasibility and business plan), and the main part was the strengthening supply chain in agroentherprise projects.

There were also field trips to different enterprise development types (Local government led, community led, sector led and private around Ho Chi Minh city, Vietnam.

Module V – Designing better rural agroenterprise projects

The module consists of field study and presentation of the result. Participants practiced to use the tools in the field to work as a group with local authorities and farmers to collect information and develop action plan for Agroenterprise project. The exercise consisted of (1) District Profile & Production Clusters, (2) Livelihood Strategies, (3) Supporting Agencies for RED, (4) SWOT of RED, (5) Production Chain & Critical points, (6) Market Chain and (8) Action Plan

Useful tools and methodologies for LLSP

The course helped us to understand more about the chain where before we looked just only in production, because our task to do so about study on the production and market chain in order to help farmers to access to this information and can play as the key actors in the chain.

There are two methodologies of market opportunity identification and production chain analysis that can be useful for LLSP to try in the study of development opportunities and market and constraints in order to intensify smallholder livestock systems. These two

methodologies can help us to understand the market opportunities for the products and also find out the problems in the chain, that many actors (group) in the chain need to help each other to find the appropriate solutions.

The bellow is a rough summary of each methodology, as there are more details of how to do and each tools that used in each methodology (Please look at more details in course materials):

1. Market opportunity identification

There are tools in market opportunity identification:

1.1 Rapid market identification/study

This will help us to identify market opportunities for products that are already or can be produced in an area, and also help us to understand and able to analyse the conditions of buyers for the products.

The strategies for the rapid market study are aimed to: Detect the products with high or intermediate growth in demand; identify products that are in scarce supply and why; study trends in demands for products that has a competitive advantages; trends in demands for traditional products of the target region.

There are steps to do rapid market study, which consist of (1) Definition of objectives and strategies (2) Development of research plan (3) collection of information (4) Data processing and analysis and (5) final report.

There are some useful tools for analysing the market for product identified, which called Product-market growth matrix, which will help us to understand market and will be able to develop strategies for the products. Other tools help to design or develop types of questionnaires, identification of sources of secondary and primary information and types of contacts. All of these tools will help to capture information on product categories related to the overall goals and objectives.

At the end of the rapid market study should come up with the list of products with market potentials and evaluate them to select the final options (There are the guidelines how to select the market options which including:

First step:

- *Definition of selection criteria*, which based more on feasibility of production for smallholders; contribution to production sustainability and also attractiveness as a business.
- Characterization of market options (Based on agronomic, commercial, economic). There is a tools for doing this, which called characterization matrix.
- First discard of market options, if it does not respond to one or more of the evaluation criteria.

Second step:

- Participatory evaluation of market options (The methodology for conducting this will be described in the next)
- Second discard the market options

1.2 Evaluation of market option.

Participatory evaluation of market options will help to determine the preferences of small rural producers regarding market options. It can be any products. Secondly it can determine the decision criteria of the small rural producers when selecting crops, and the third one is to detect the variation in decision criteria of different producers.

There are several tools that have been used in conducting of participatory evaluation of market options including the steps including: Basic decision making, survey of producer's decision criteria, designing product cards, meeting, data analysis. There are also forms for conducting preference ranking of options from different types of producers. The forms will contain of reasons for preferences and rejecting of different producers.

The result of participatory evaluation of market options will come up with the list of products for each micro-region/zone and type of producers.

2. Production and Market chain analysis

This methodology will help us to look at the chain or the linkage between actors that move a product from production to final consumption, which will allow us to understand and think more about profitability, adding value to the products rather than only the productivity.

There are some steps for conducting the production chain analysis:

2.1 Prioritising the production chain

There are a tools that can help to prioritise the production chain if there are large number of options, but for LLSP (My personal idea) will focus on just existing livestock products (at least in the beginning to start with)

2.2 Identifying the actors

The key question to be asked when we analyse the production chain is how to identify the actors, their roles and relationship? The aim is to find the key group of actors and the representatives from each group to participate in the analysis of the production chain.

2.3 Analysing the chain

Three steps in production chain analysis:

2.3.1 Mapping the production chain – This will show the flow of the products from the points of view of the different key groups of actors, and based on information from each group to develop the common map, which will lead or facilitate the analysis of the chain.

To do analysis in here there the information required are: The actors, market characterization (volume, demand, supply vs demand etc), pricing along the production chain (The cost in each stage in the chain, income distribution among the actors etc), rules of the game (form of payment, quality requirement, relationship amongst actors and so on) and business development services (who offers the services, what services, quality of services ...).

2.3.2 Evaluating the support services – this will help us to identify the support services proving to the chain, quality and demand of services, gaps and missing services.

2.2.3 Recent chain history – this will help us to know more about lessons learnt, effects, participating groups, existing knowledge, the changes and why.

2.4 Analysing the critical points of the chain

The aim of the activity is to identify, rank and analyze key limitations in the production chain from the point of view of each group of actors and as a total system.

There are steps how to do the analysis, they are as follows:
- Ask each group of participants to identify and describe key limitations from their point of view.
- Rank limitations in each part of the chain.
- Share key critical points among chain actors and identify 3 to 5 common chain limitations (problems that affect chain competitiveness) to focus on.
- Analyse causes and effects of these limitations, develop common problem tree for chain.
- Move from problem tree to solution tree.

There are several tools used in each step, including:
1. Ranking techniques (eg, double entry matrices, rank from the votes)
2. Cause and effect analysis using the problem tree

2.5 From problems to solutions

All groups will work together to find the solutions for the critical points of the chain, and develop action plan and strategy for improving the chain, which could be broken down to short, medium and long term.

Training Course on Participatory Livestock Research and Development Small Ruminant Center, Central Luzon State University (2-6 June 2003)

Francisco Gabunada

A training course on Participatory Livestock Research and Development was conducted at the Small Ruminant Center of the Central Luzon State University, Nueva Ecija, Philippines on 2-6 June 2003. The course was initiated by the Philippine Council for Agriculture, Forestry and Natural Resources Research and Development (PCARRD).

The course was attended by 17 participants coming from Regions 1, 2 and 3 of the country. It was facilitated by staff from the Livestock Research Division of PCARRD (Anan Marie Alo, Ed Magboo and Emily Lambio) and F. Gabunada of the LLSP. Ed is the LLSP/FSP National Coordinator in the Philippines while Marie and Emily are staff of the ILRI-IFAD TAG 443 Project (a farmer participatory research project on goat parasite control).

Rationale

The conventional approach to developing technologies is to identify and improve potential technologies in experiments on-station, which are then given to extension workers who encourage farmers to adopt them. This approach is based on the assumption that researchers can develop "finished" technologies on research stations with little input from farmers. With few exemptions, this approach has not resulted in successful adoption of technologies by smallholder farmers. There are many reasons for this low rate of adoption including lack of logistics and understanding by farmers and the extension workers about how the technology can be used.

An alternative approach to the development of technologies is through Farmer Participatory Research (FPR). In FPR farmers' ideas and suggestions are included in every stage of the development of the technology. The potential benefits of FPR include:

1. Better understanding of farmers' problems, which can be used to guide both on-station and on-farm testing of the technologies;
2. Inclusion of farmers' knowledge into technology development;
3. Improved chances of adoption of the technologies, because farmers are involved in developing and evaluating them from the beginning; and
4. Improved efficiency of research by avoiding technologies that farmers say will not be useful.

In this regard, a 5-day course on the application of PR&D on livestock researches was designed and conducted by PCARRD for livestock researchers-cum-extensionists engaged in or seeking to apply participatory approaches in their R&D programs. This was held at the Small Ruminant Center, CLSU from June 2 to 6, 2003 with facilitators coming from PCARRD and the Leyte State University.

Objectives

The course hoped to develop among the participants:

1. A better appreciation of the value adding potential of participatory approaches in livestock R&D; and
2. The necessary skills in designing PR&D projects on livestock in their respective places of work.

The weeklong course also hoped to strengthen bonding among the different participating institutions and foster collaboration among them.

Methodology

The methodology basically revolved around experiential learning activities such as exercises, fieldworks, case analyses and lecture discussions. The course focused on participatory project planning, action research and participatory evaluation. In essence, the participants were capacitated with non-conventional methodologies on participatory R&D.

Participants

This training course was the first of its kind and was initially offered to 15 researchers/extensionists from Regions 1 and 2. Priority was given to those already involved or are implementing livestock R&D project.

Facilitators

All facilitators are adept at participatory approaches, as they have been active practitioners, implementing projects revolving around people participation.

They are the following:

1. Eduedo C. Magboo
   Sr. Science Research Specialist, LRD-PCARRD
   and Country Coordinator,
   Livelihood and Livestock Systems Project

2. Anna Marie P. Alo
   Sr. Science Research Specialist, LRD-PCARRD
   and Country Coordinator,
   ILRI-IFAD TAG443 Participatory Diagnosis of Gastrointestinal Parasites in Goats in the Philippines

3. Francisco G. Gabunada
   Assistant Professor, Leyte State University;
   Sub-Regional Coordinator for China, Indonesia and the Philippines, Livelihood and Livestock Systems Project
   and Team Member, ILRI-IFAD TAG443 Project

4. Emily T. Lambio
   Science Research Specialist 2
   ILRI-IFAD TAG443 Project on Participatory Diagnosis of Gastrointestinal Parasites in Goats in the Philippines

Lesson Plan

Getting prepared to be a Community Mobilizer

Module 1 - Involving community people in the design of PR&D projects

Learning Objectives:

1. To appreciate the basic difference between the conventional approach to technology development and farmer participatory research.
2. To understand some of the important terms used in the training course.

Module 2 - Necessary facilitation skills

Learning Objective:

To understand the principles and develop practical skills in facilitating PLR&D projects with farm people.

Topics:

1. Facilitating participatory processes of adults: beyond the principles
   Objective: To understand the principles that govern adult learners and share experiences on how problems on communicating with them can be overcome.

2. Exercising neutrality and effective listening and questioning skills: keys to effective communication with farmers
   Objective: To understand the importance of neutrality when working with farmers; to learn to listen and practice open-ended and probing questioning skills

3. Understanding adults' nonverbal cues
   Objective: To give meaning to adult actions and offer solutions to problematic cues.

Organizing the community for your PLR&D Project

Module 3 - Participatory situational and problem analyses: crucial prerequisites

Learning Objective:

To develop skills in analyzing problems and situations around which livestock technologies are to be incorporated.

Topics:

1. Assessing need for livestock technologies
   Objective: To be aware that in PD, participatory processes must be substantiated with secondary data.

2. Guide to site selection
   Objective: To learn from the experiences of the facilitators and co-participants and identify the crucial requirements in selecting the proper project sites.
3. Doing participatory diagnosis (PD)

a. Story mapping tools
   - Community maps
   - Calendars

b. Problem identification tools
   - Problem tree
   - Causal models
   - QRA/RMP

Objective: To become aware of the concepts, principles and practical aspects of these tools and techniques.

4. Community action planning
   Objective: To have the skill in facilitating over the production of an action plan by the community after understanding both the problems and the situation.

Analyzing progress of your PLR&D Project

Module 4

Monitoring PLR&D projects with stakeholders –what do we consider?

Learning Objective:

To understand the on-farm evolution of the monitoring process with farmers, the value of exposure trips and the roles of extensionists in implementing PR&D projects

Module 5

Participatory evaluation

Learning Objective:

To develop practical skills in using tools and techniques of participatory evaluation.

Field exercise for the Training

Objective:
Given the array of tools for participatory diagnosis, experience the following:

- Negotiating with group members in identifying the tools to use in appraising and understanding a community; and
- Applying the tools in a natural farm setting with actual livestock keepers.

Methodology:

The participants will be grouped with 4-5 members each, assigned to one site and made to do participatory diagnosis of that community. They will be given the freedom to choose the PD tools and techniques they prefer. Their simple mission: to determine the most appropriate livestock project to introduce in such village.

Participants

NAME	POSITION	AGENCY	ADDRESS
Noli V. Buen	DVM; Sr. Agriculturist	Office of the Provincial Vet – Tuguegarao	Tueguegarao City, Cagayan
Roberto C. Busania	Agriculturist I; Farm vet	DA-Upland Research Outreach Station	Aglipay, Quirino
Lemuel M. Castro	Instructor	Small Ruminant Center	CLSU, Muñoz, Nueva Ecija
Theresa A. Concepcion	Agriculturist II	Office of the Agriculturist - Isabela	Ilagan, Isabela
Rhodora Domingo		Office of the Provincial Vet – Batanes	Basco, Batanes
Evangelene Esguerra		DA-Hillyland Research Outreach Station	Bagabag, Nueva Vizcaya
Mel V. Francisco	Agricultural Technicians	Municipal Agriculturist Office	Calasiao, Pangasinan
Gabrielle Gonzales	District Veterinarian	Office of the Provincial Vet – Pangasinan	
Catherine Mones	Agriculturist II	DA-ILIARC	DMMMSU Cmpd., Bacnotan, La Union
Juvidel Jay G. Pascasio	Farm Worker	DA- ISRACS	Ilagan, Isabela
Noel Perloan	Agricultural Technicians	Office of the Municipal Agriculture	Umingan, Pangasinan
Aracely G. Robeniol	District Veterinarian	Office of the Provincial Vet – Pangasinan	
Angelito R. Saliganan	Agriculturist I	DA – Isabela Breeding Station	Gamu, Isabela
Demetrio D. Tang	Farm Foreman	DA- Cagayan Breeding Station	Solana, Cagayan
Virginia M. Venturina	Assistant Professor	College of Veterinary Science and Medicine	CLSU, Muñoz, Nueva Ecija
Larina Zabala	Agriculturist II	DA-ILIARC	DMMMSU Cmpd., Bacnotan, La Union
Geronima Zulueta	Livestock Inspector	Office of the Municipal Agriculture	Sta. Barbara, Pangasinan