

OUTPUT 3. PROFESSIONALS AND OTHERS TRAINED AS FACILITATORS OF THE PARTICIPATORY RESEARCH APPROACH

Guide for Documenting Experiences with Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation⁷⁰

Researchers: Vicente Zapata⁷¹; Vivian Polar⁷²; Susan Kaaria⁷³

Introduction

Documentation is a basic task that is carried out by all those who wish to share their experiences, their accomplishments and conceptualizations with others who have similar interests. Documentation is an essential tool for expanding dialogue and constructing new forms of interpreting and dealing with reality.

In this guide we have outlined the steps to be followed for documenting an experience. There are a number of ways for carrying out this task, available in a variety of documentation manuals. In this guide, we show some components and provide a sequence for their presentation to make the narration interesting for the readers.

This Guide will be used in the Workshop on Documenting Experiences, which has been organized by the FOCAM (Promoting Change) Project in Bolivia. The workshop participants will prepare stories about the application of methods of participatory monitoring and evaluation (PM&E), in which they have participated. We wish to highlight the importance that these stories have for the PM&E processes in the strengthening of the local capacities for orienting development. If we have a series of stories about PM&E with the same structural framework, we can look at the similarities and differences that exist among them, observe successes and failures that are repeated, and derive general principles that can be used in new experiences.

The documentation of PM&E experiences is part of the methodological proposal for developing institutional and local capacities proposed by the FOCAM Project. Once those who are going to lead the PM&E processes in the communities have been trained, they formulate action plans, in which the different ways that they are going to apply the methodology are described. These applications take place in the phase immediately following the training. That is when it is necessary to document the processes in order to gather lessons from the same, which will then be used as key inputs for the workshops to reflect about the process.

⁷⁰ This document is the result of contributions from Boru Douthwaite about the form of writing stories on innovation. Later, based on the contributions made by Susan Kaaria, it was transformed into a guide for documenting cases of PM&E.

⁷¹ Training Officer - Senior Research Fellow - Project Coordinator FIT 8. EdD, Communities and Watersheds Project and IPRA Project

⁷² Agronomist, Researcher for the pilot area of the high Andean plateaus, FOCAM Project. v.polar@cgiar.org

⁷³ Agricultural economist – Senior Research Fellow – IPRA Project – CIAT - Africa

Objective

The Guide for Documenting Experiences presents the steps of the process of documenting the application of PM&E methodologies so that they can be used for orientation during the workshop to prepare stories about said application.

Components of the Story

The story that we want to develop should include a total of eight essential components. The authors are free to reorder them so that each story has its own stamp, and not all of them will have an identical structure. They can also emphasize some components that they consider help enrich the comprehension of the experience or to highlight important elements. These components are:

1. A brief description of the physiographic, socioeconomic and institutional context in which the application of the PM&E methodology was carried out. In other words, they should describe the site where they were carrying out the application of the method, “paint” it for the readers in narrative form, just as one would introduce a story of a local event.
2. Description of the characteristics (ethnic, social, cultural, etc. of the group that is applying or has applied the PM&E methodology). This characterization includes proper names of the people that are participating and a little about them, what they do and the way in which they live.
3. Overview of the application of the methodology. In order to give an overview, the narration can be based on answers to the following questions:
 - When and how was the process of introducing the methodology begun?
 - What was the motivating element for introducing this methodology?
 - What problems or opportunities are related to the application of the methodology?
 - In what area or activity was the methodology introduced?
 - How was the planning of the process for introducing the methodology done?
 - Who participated in the planning?
 - What support tools were used during the phase of planning and introducing the methodology?
4. Specific aspects for establishing the methodological process. To cover these aspects, the authors can also refer in narrative form to the following questions:
 - Who and how many people participated in the initial meetings or workshops?
 - What strategies or steps were implemented to build capacities in the target group and establish the PM&E process?
 - What tools or materials did the facilitator use to establish the methodology?
 - How many events were necessary to establish the PM&E methodology?
 - What results or outcomes were generated during the process? (data gathered, results, processes, indicators, objectives, etc.)

- What challenges have they had to overcome in working with the target group to establish the PM&E processes?
- What unexpected events or results arose as a result of this phase of establishing the methodology?
- What strategies or activities gave the best results? Which ones did not work well?

5. Consolidation of the PM&E system. This part of the narrative focuses on what the target group accomplished as a result of establishing the PM&E methodology. Perhaps these accomplishments are not yet evident in some cases, in which case it will be necessary to clarify that the process is still in the establishment phase. The following questions can help write this part:

- How is the PM&E process being managed in the target group?
- Has there been a leader within the target group throughout this process? What has this leader done?
- Of what use has the PM&E process been to the target group?
- In what type of information is the target group interested, and how is it being used? We refer to the information that resulted from the instruments prepared within the process of establishing the system.
- Who uses this information at the level of the community?
- What aspects need to be improved in the day-to-day application of the methodology?
- What challenges arise for the facilitator and the target group as a result of applying the methodology?
- If this process were to be established with another target group, what aspects would need to be changed?

6. Other aspects of importance. In this part emphasis is on aspects that were not considered in other components but that in the experience of the person who narrates the story are of great importance. Some of the following questions can help get answers about important aspects of the process:

- How were the group and site where the PM&E methodology was going to be applied selected (that is to say, what selection criteria were used?)
- Who participated in the selection of the site and the group?
- What previous experience did the facilitator or the target group have with this type of methodology?
- What degree of organization did the group have with whom the methodology was established?
- Were modifications made to the methodology during its introduction or establishment?
- Are there particular skills that a group or a facilitator should have in order to be able to establish the PM&E methodology successfully?

7. About the diffusion of the methodology. This section of the story is dedicated to those who feel motivated about establishing a PM&E system.

- If anyone wishes to establish a PM&E system, what are the conditions without which this process cannot be established successfully? (Reference is made to the institution, the target group and the facilitator.)
 - What difficulties have been most evident and distressing? What errors do you think were made? In what way could they be overcome?
 - If we were to change key aspects of the PM&E process (steps, components, strategies for working, strategies for gathering information, etc.), which do you think would be necessary and why?
 - What lessons have you learned from the overall process?
 - What were the most satisfying aspects of establishing and implementing the PM&E methodology?
 - In what aspects should the approach of those who induced you to promote PM&E processes in the first place change?
8. Ending the narration. In this part a summary is made of everything that was said, and a series of phrases about the immediate future are drawn up.

Third Phase

- Are the users to whom the methodology was presented applying it?
- If it is not being applied, what are the reasons?
- How was the area of application selected?
- Who selected it?
- Who were the first interest groups that gained experience from the initial presentation of the methodology?
- How were these interest groups selected?
- What experiences did they have with the use of the methodology?
- What modifications were made to the methodology, why and with what results?
- What events took place to begin the application and consolidate it?

Fourth Phase

- Was the methodology adopted? If not, why? If so, for how long?
- Who is applying this methodology optimally?
- What adaptations did this person make?
- Were there outstanding results?

Fifth Phase

- Has any event been held to disseminate the methodology?
- Where were these events held?
- How is this methodology being replicated?
- What requirements exist for being able to replicate it?
- What transformations could this methodology undergo in the future?

General questions

- What was your principal motivation for doing this work?
- What have you gained from doing this work?
- If you were going to apply the methodology again, what would you change?
- What were the most difficult aspects of the application?
- What were the most satisfying aspects of the application?
- What was the greatest frustration that you had?

Summary report on the status of monitoring and evaluation systems in selected KARI Centers and some intervention strategies

Researchers: Jemimah Njuki⁷⁴, Peterson Mwangi⁷⁵, Virginia Kamonji⁷⁶

Introduction

The Strengthening Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) processes project conducted reconnaissance field visits at five Kenya Agricultural Research Institute (KARI) Centers from January to March 2004. The objectives of the field visits were to analyze existing PM&E systems within five KARI Centers to conduct an internal SWOT analysis as a strategy for identifying the key entry point in the development and strengthening of the PM&E system.

Specific objectives of the Center visits

- ✓ Create awareness of the project among the KARI scientists and their partners
- ✓ Conduct an inventory and review the current M&E approaches applied by the Centers and their partners.
- ✓ Assess how various stakeholders (communities, farmers, donors, management and government) have been involved in the development of the M&E
- ✓ Identify the critical gaps and opportunities in the existing M&E systems and identify entry points for PM&E
- ✓ Determine training needs and the resources required for the various projects necessary to establish sustainable PM&E system
- ✓ Select pilot projects for implementing PM&E systems at the five Centers and identify a coordinating team in each of the five Centers who will act as the focal points for PM&E within these Centers and within KARI

Inventory and review of current M&E systems

Twenty KARI projects or programs were reviewed, with an average of four projects per Center. The review was conducted in a workshop process, where each project presented its current M&E systems. Guidelines were developed to guide the assessment⁷⁷.

Summary of results from the review workshops

- Generally, all the projects were doing some form or other of M&E and had different levels of stakeholder involvement as well as documentation procedures. In addition to project level

⁷⁴ Social Scientists –Kenya Agricultural research Institute - CIAT Africa, P.O. Box 6247, Kampala, Uganda.

⁷⁵ Socioeconomist in KARI's socio-economics and biometrics division

⁷⁶ Scientist and Research Assistants, CIAT-Africa, PO Box 759-00606, Nairobi, Kenya.

⁷⁷ Guideline document is available on request from: Jemimah Njuki, CIAT-Africa, c/o Kenya Agricultural Research Institute, National Agricultural Research Laboratories, P.O. Box 759-00606, Nairobi, Kenya

M&E, Centers have formal processes for M&E, which include Center Research Advisory Committees (CRACs) and Regional Research and Advisory Committees (RREACs).

- Scientists felt that the project was long overdue since most of them were keen to implement M&E in their projects and programs but did not have the necessary skills and technical support to do so.
- After the discussions there was a change of perception of M&E as an internal learning process versus a policing and supervisory tool or as an activity that is done by outsiders (i.e., mainly donors and external experts) to check on the accountability and resource management by project implementing teams.
- Discussions on the role of PM&E in the project cycle highlighted the importance of including PM&E during the planning and project development phase. The majority of the projects reviewed did not include PM&E at the project development stage; rather it came in as afterthought. It was agreed that new projects should include an inbuilt M&E system and that there should be a budgetary allocation for this.
- During the visits it was clear that most Center directors were keen to include M&E as a key requirement for approving new projects.

Critical issues in implementing and supporting PM&E systems in KARI

The twenty projects identified the objectives of their M&E systems and some critical gaps and opportunities for improving their current system. The key results are summarized below.

The role of M&E in KARI projects

- ✓ Evaluate and assess impact of technologies
- ✓ Assess performance of projects against benchmarks
- ✓ Enhance participation of farmers and other stakeholders in technology development and transfer
- ✓ Assess project implementation vis-à-vis work plans and determine necessary changes in implementation strategy
- ✓ Enhance stakeholder involvement in project implementation
- ✓ Assess appropriateness and effectiveness of methodology/approach
- ✓ Accountability; i.e. ensure resources are utilized according to plan

Critical gaps and opportunities in existing M&E systems

A SWOT analysis was done for some of the project/program M&E systems, and the summary below outlines these as well as the challenges and gaps presented during individual presentations.

Opportunities in the existing M&E

- ✓ Some projects have existing institutional structures that facilitate M&E including logical frameworks and steering committees.
- ✓ There are committees that are involved in activities such as project reviews at Center level; e.g., CRACs.
- ✓ A number of scientists have capacity in PR tools and gender analysis tools

- ✓ Wide range of partners (IARCs, CBOs, NGOs, farmers, private sector), and stakeholders involvement in project implementation in KARI
- ✓ Strong willingness by farmers to participate in project activities
- ✓ Scientists (biophysical and social) willing to get involved in PM&E

Critical methodological gaps. The majority of the projects considered that they did not have the necessary skills and technical expertise to establish and support PM&E systems. Specifically, the scientists identified weaknesses in the following areas:

- ✓ No clear systematic process in the development of measurable indicators
 - Quantitative vs. qualitative indicators
 - Limited involvement of stakeholders in indicator development
 - Different levels of indicator development-resources, activities, outputs, outcomes, impact, processes and approaches
 - Skills in integrating equity and gender considerations into the process
- ✓ No clear linkage between baseline, M&E and impact assessment
- ✓ Lack of inbuilt PM&E during project development and well-defined frameworks for M&E
- ✓ Lack of skills in data collection, analysis, interpretation and use
- ✓ Existing M&E systems do not always give enough room for feedback and taking corrective measures/actions; sometimes the lag period is too long between data analysis and feedback so that they do not offer opportunities for learning.

Institutional issues affecting PM&E processes

- ✓ Several projects identified donor inflexibility (e.g., donor inflexibility in adjusting projects once a budget is established) as a major limiting factor to the development of PM&E systems.
- ✓ High demand on the scientists' time, which keeps them from monitoring and evaluating a given project continuously.
- ✓ Irregular flow of project funds, which interrupts work plans and monitoring activities
- ✓ Opinion, especially among biophysical scientists, that baselines, M&E and impact assessment are the responsibility of the social scientists

Farmer-related issues. Various scientists felt that it was difficult to involve farmers or local communities in the PM&E process because they lack the necessary skills.

Critical areas for intervention

Several areas for intervention were identified during the review workshops:

- ✓ Build capacity of scientists in establishing and supporting PM&E systems. Capacity building should include the following topics:
 - Identification of different stakeholders (including farmers and other community members) and their roles in the PM&E process
 - Strategies on developing appropriate qualitative and quantitative indicators
 - Integration of gender and equity issues into the PM&E process
 - Facilitation skills for scientist/farmer/other stakeholder interactions

- Capacity building for data analysis in PM&E at different levels
- Data management, analysis, interpretation and use, this would include synthesizing PM&E data to facilitate its use for decision-making at different levels and to provide feedback and learning
- ✓ Facilitating scientists to build the skills of communities and other local stakeholders in PM&E
- ✓ Building skills for attitude change amongst scientists and other stakeholders
- ✓ Action learning in implementing PM&E systems

Strategy for project implementation

Selection of pilot projects

In each Center, two projects were selected for the pilot phase of this project. These projects will provide an action-learning opportunity for the scientists within the Center and in the scaling-up strategy. Selection criteria for the projects were varied, but the emphasis was on:

- ✓ Different M&E methodologies to allow for different dimensions of learning
- ✓ Projects at different levels of implementation process
- ✓ Adequate funding to support project activities
- ✓ Willingness of the project team to participate in the pilot phase of PM&E
- ✓ Projects with on-farm activities in order to take advantage of both project- and community level PM&E
- ✓ Projects that will be ongoing for the next 1 1/2 to 2 years
- ✓ Wide range of partners and donors
- ✓ Projects dealing with a diversity of activities and approaches

The selected projects are funded by a variety of donors including: Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA), Department for International Development (DfID), International Development Research Center (IDRC) and the Rockefeller Foundation. These projects are the Soil Management Project; Crop Protection Project (CPP) that is evaluating participatory methodologies; Cassava Dissemination Project; two biotechnology projects; and a Soil and Water Management project.

Selection of a project coordination team

Each Center selected a 3-5 member team to coordinate internal PM&E activities. The team members were selected on the basis of their willingness to train other scientists and partners in PM&E and their belief in its importance and its role in improving project performance and empowering project beneficiaries. The team will have a dual role of coordinating the pilot activities in the Center and building the capacity of other scientists and KARI partners.

Supporting action plans for pilot implementation

- It was agreed that CIAT would take on the roles of capacity building, technical backstopping and supplementary funding to support the integration of a PM&E component in existing projects.
- Providing supplementary funds is important because all the projects selected are at different stages of implementation; and the majority lacks an inbuilt mechanism for PM&E and therefore no budgetary allocation. Several strategies will be explored to provide these teams with additional funds, including approaching the donors of these projects such as the Rockefeller Foundation, DfID, IDRC and SIDA for supporting the PM&E component of the project.

Conclusions

The Center visits provide an insight into the existing systems in KARI, on which the PM&E project will be building. The visits have also encouraged scientists to open up and look at monitoring as a self-improvement tool as opposed to monitoring as a policing or fault-finding tool and to look at M&E as an activity that should be incorporated in projects during the planning and project development phase. The critical gaps and opportunities identified by specific projects and also by the groups of scientists provide a good entry point for the PM&E project, which aims at strengthening these systems.

Scientists' skills in developing and supporting these PM&E systems need to be strengthened for these systems to work. These include skills not only in establishing PM&E systems but also in such areas as facilitation, analysis of qualitative data, gender analysis and use of results from gender analysis and project management.

Attitude change is also an important component if these systems are to work. For a long time, biophysical scientists have looked upon social scientists to carry out baseline studies, M&E and impact assessment. Given the current shortage of social scientists, not only within KARI but also in other institutions, biophysical scientists will need to start looking at baselines, M&E and impact assessment as part and parcel of their projects and as activities that need to be funded within their projects.

In terms of institutionalizing PM&E within KARI Centers, there was keen interest by all scientists to acquire the skill in implementing PM&E systems as soon as possible. As the first group of scientists from each Center gets trained, it will be important to put in place action plans for transferring these skills to the other scientists and to the partners that KARI is collaborating with in their projects to go hand in hand with the implementation of PM&E systems in the pilot projects. KARI scientists have gone through various training courses; however, the key to successful application of the skills obtained is to provide mentoring and practical on-the-ground training as implementation takes place, which will require significant resource investment.

Strengthening Participatory Monitoring And Evaluation Systems In Research And Development Institutions

Workshop held at the Izaak Walton Inn, Embu, Kenya (29th march to 3rd April 2004)

Facilitators: Colletah Chitsike, Susan Kaaria, Jemimah Njuki, and Pascal Sanginga

Background

An initial study was conducted to inventory PM&E methods being applied by different organizations and within the Regional Research centers of the Kenya Agricultural Institute (KARI). The centers surveyed Kisii, Mtwapa, Kakamega, Embu and Kitale. A total of twenty projects / programs were reviewed between January and March 2004, with an average of four projects per center. The objectives of the study were to assess the critical issues, opportunities, and gaps in existing PM&E systems, and to document lessons and experiences, as a strategy for developing an appropriate strategy for intervention.

The review found that a majority of the scientists felt that they did not have the necessary skills and technical establish and support PM&E systems. Specifically, the scientists identified weaknesses in the following areas: Development of different levels of indicators: activities, outputs, outcomes, impact, processes and approaches; Skills in integrating equity and gender considerations into the process; skills in how to involve different stakeholders in PM&E process; and Lack of skills in data collection, analysis, data interpretation and use.

In this regard, a training workshop was held in March 2003 in Embu, Kenya.

The objectives of the workshop were to

- i) Develop a common understanding of the concepts and principles of PM&E
- ii) Strengthen the skills of participants in developing a PM&E performance frameworks for projects
- iii) Develop skills in engaging different stakeholders and communities in developing the PM&E systems
- iv) Skills in developing local concepts for M&E and Use of graphics
- v) Strengthen skills for supporting PM&E systems, such as facilitation and communication skills
- vi) Develop Action Plans for implementation of PM&E in selected projects

Overview of the course

A total 27 scientists from five centers (representing 3 per center) attended the workshop. The participants were representatives from five Kenya Agricultural Research Institute (KARI) centers Kisii, Mtwapa, Kakamega, Embu and Kitale; Kenyatta University; Farm Africa; Ministry of Agriculture Extension staff; CIAT-Arusha; and CIAT-Uganda.

The capacity building included the following topics: (i) The key steps in establishing and supporting PM&E systems (see Box 2). (ii) Identification of different stakeholders and their roles in the PM&E process (including farmers, other community members, etc). (iii) Strategies on developing appropriate qualitative and quantitative indicators. (iv) Integration of gender and equity issues into the PM&E process. (v) Facilitation skills for scientist/ farmer/other stakeholder interactions. (vi) Capacity building for data analysis in PM&E at different levels. (vii) Data management, analysis, interpretation and use, this would include synthesizing PM&E data to facilitate its use for decision-making at different levels and to provide feedback and learning.

Box 2
Key steps in establishing PM&E systems
1. Identifying and engaging stakeholders
2. Building stakeholders capacity for PM&E
3. Defining and agreeing on what to monitor and evaluate: objectives
4. Developing and formulating Indicators
5. Gathering Information
6. Managing and analyzing data
7. Reflection, Sharing and using results of PM&E
8. Learning and Change; Closing the loop

A Field Activity was organized for the participants with the aim of equipping them with practical skills to establish PM&E systems and to facilitate farmers to identify changes they expect from R&D projects, stimulate the community to start thinking about M&E in their projects, identify indicators to track these changes, disaggregated by gender and develop locally appropriate tools for collecting, analyzing, reflecting and utilizing the information. Other skills incorporated in the field activity were planning and reporting PM&E field activities and reflecting on what

had worked, what had not worked and making corrective adjustments.

Results

a) Development of Action Plans

During the training workshop, each center team started on the development of action plans to incorporate PM&E in the selected pilot projects at the center. Some of the activities integrated in the action plans include, stakeholder analysis and stakeholder engagement, developing objectives and results at different levels (outputs, outcomes, impacts and processes, engaging communities in PM&E, systematic collection of baseline data, data collection and analysis, PM&E review meetings among others. The action plans were further developed after the training workshop to include budgets.

b) Implementation of the PM&E action plans

- **Mentoring and practical training at the center level to strengthen skills and knowledge**

The mentoring and practical training activities have been implemented in three of the centers (Kisii, Mtwapa, and Kitale). These activities have been implemented in a step-by-step process that has involved both classroom and practical training activities for the project teams, made up of research scientists, NGOs, Ministry of Agriculture extension staff and other partners. To ensure appropriate scaling out to other projects at the centers, training activities have involved all the scientists at the center.

- **Development of PM&E frameworks**

Each of the project implementation teams of the pilot projects developed a PM&E framework that included expected results at different levels (outputs, outcomes, impacts), processes, activities, and their indicators; targets for their indicators, frequency of measuring the indicators and baselines for the indicators where this was available. Some of the indicators had baseline collected earlier during previous surveys, from literature and from key informant interviews while others did not. In cases where baselines do not exist, activities are now underway to develop tools to collect this data.

Participation in training events related to PR.

Date	City & Country	Event	Participating Institutions	No. of Participants
Oct. 6-10/03	Colombia, CIAT-Cauca.	Participatory methodologies for interacting with community organizations (Kellogg Networks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kellogg Foundation - World Vision- Haiti - Cbenteotz A.C. - Presidency, Municipality of Tepuxtepec, Mexico - SINERGIA A.C. - U. of Chapingo, Mexico - Commonwealth of Yeguaré, Honduras - EAP-Zamorano, Honduras - Botacoes Foundation, Colombia - U. of Caldas, Colombia 	22
Oct. 8-9/03	Cochabamba, Bolivia	Workshop on methodologies for identifying and prioritizing demands for technological innovation in Bolivia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ministry of Agriculture - PROINPA - PRODII - Office of the Mayor of Llallagua - APPLA - PADEM - CIOEC - IDS - FODUR - INNOVA - CEDES - FAO - PROTAL - PNS - IIAV - PROSUKO - CCIMCAT - AMDECO - CPP - ATICA - FDTA-Valles - ASAR - CARENAS - IRD 	44
Nov. 10-15/03	Cochabamba, Bolivia	Methodologies for PR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FODUR - Diogracio Vides Intercommunity Rural Organization - FOCAM - PROINPA Foundation - ASAR 	30

Date	City & Country	Event	Participating Institutions	No. of Participants
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FDF - Agrocentral, Chuquisaca - AFRUTAR - MAPA Project - FDTA-Valles - CIAT-Bolivia - MEDA - CEDES - ANAPO - AGRISEC 	
Jan. 5-10/04	Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of Congo	Baseline study design for the Congo Livelihood Improvement and Food Security Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CIFOR - ICRAF - CIAT - Innovative Resources Management - U. of Kinshasa - INERA - Ministry of Agriculture - INADES - Avocats Verts 	25
Feb. 1-5/04	Hai, Tanzania	Community training in leadership, team building and gender	Hai District Agriculture & Livestock Development Office	18 men and 16 women.
Feb. 23-27/04	Bulindi, Uganda	Integrated agroenterprise project design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NARO - AFRICARE - National Agricultural Advisory & Development Services (NAADS) - HODIFA (Hoima District Farmers' Association), Africa 2000 Network - CIAT - Local Government 	18
Mar. 3-5/04	Cochabamba, Bolivia	Reflection and analysis of participatory methodologies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PROMMSEL - PROINPA - PROSUKO - RC-CAD - PRODII - CIAT - JAINA - SEDAG TARIJA - ASAR - Diogracio Vides Intercommunity Rural Organization - FDF 	31

Date	City & Country	Event	Participating Institutions	No. of Participants
Mar. 23-26/04	Hai, Tanzania	Market chain analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hai District Agricultural Development Office - World Vision-Sanya - Agricultural Development Programme - TIP - Ministry of Agriculture - Faida Mali - CIAT 	15
Mar. 29-Apr. 4/04	Embu, Kenya	National training workshop on establishing and supporting PM&E systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - KARI - Ministry of Agriculture - FARM-Africa - Kenyatta U. - ECABREN 	25
Apr. 12-16/04	Monteagudo, Bolivia	Workshop on training in PM&E of the Commonwealth of El Chaco Chuquisaqueño	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - URPSFXCH - PROINPA - PRODEISMACH - MATEC - HAMM - San Roque Cooperative - PROSAT - MMCH - DEPROA - CETEP - HAMH - ASOGAM - ASOFRAM - APROFRU - APAJIMPA - AMPROM - AFRUMO 	43
May, June, & Sept./04	Kitale, Mtwapa, and Kisii, Kenya	Regional workshops on establishing and supporting PM&E systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - KARI-Kenya - Ministry of Agriculture - VI Agroforestry Project - Kwale Rural Support Project Kenya - CIAT-Uganda - CIAT-Malawi - CIAT-Tanzania - NARO-Uganda 	112
May 6-7/04	Arusha, Tanzania	Design of PM&E systems for ECABREN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Selian Agricultural Research Institute - Hai District Agricultural Development Office - ADRA - Farm Africa - ECABREN - CIAT 	15

Date	City & Country	Event	Participating Institutions	No. of Participants
May 11-12/04	Quito, Ecuador	Workshop on learning alliances in rural innovation	- TUCAYTA - DIPEIB-C - World Neighbors - CEMOPLAF - Humanistic Movement - MACRENA - FUNAN - MAG - IIRR	19
June 23/04	Colombia, Valle	Training in participatory evaluation of forages for producers from Roldanillo, Valle	- INTEP of Roldanillo. - National U. of Palmira - UMATA of Roldanillo - Producers from the region	18
June 25-July 1/04	Lilongwe and Kasungu	Community training in leadership, team building and gender	- Plan Malawi - Lilongwe Agricultural Development Division	52 men and 35 women
July 5-10/04	Moshi and Lushoto Tanzania	Community training in leadership, team building and gender	- Traditional Irrigation & Environmental Program	24 men and 8 women.
July 12-16/04	Cochabamba, Bolivia	Workshop to systematize experiences in participatory methodologies	- PRODII - JAINA - AGROCINTI - INNOVA - PROINPA - FDF - UMSS graduate program - PROSUKO - TRADES - CAD	27
Sept. 20-29/04	Jinja, Uganda	Training in facilitation skills	- TIP & Hai Tanzania - Plan Malawi - LADD Malawi - AFRICARE Uganda - A2N Uganda Bulindi NARO Uganda	22
Oct. 25-29/04	Nairobi, Kenya	Managing and analyzing data from PR	- KARI-Kenya	18
TOTAL		19	152	637