
Appendix 4

Engagement, capacity, and impact pathways

The detailed reports included within this Appendix refer to some of the research activities undertaken within Objective 4 of the project. Each Activity Report is structured in the format of a scientific report where possible, with an introduction, description of the methods used, findings and conclusions and/or recommendations. The specific Activity Reports contained within this Appendix include,

[Activity 4.5. Demonstration and extension of research activities and outcomes to farmers and other industry stakeholders](#)

[Activity 4.11. Project stakeholder analysis and participatory impact pathway analysis](#)

Activity 4.5. Demonstration and extension of research activities and outcomes to farmers and other industry stakeholders

Prepared by: Simon Quigley

Introduction

While farmer-to-farming learning and participatory research activities are the extension approaches most likely to support practice change by smallholder farmers. However, larger group based field days still have a role in increasing the awareness of a larger group of stakeholders in research activities and new technologies or practices. From these field days more focussed extension and training activities can be conducted with farmers who express interest in adopting these new practices after participating in a field day. Within the current project two larger field days were held in October-2018 on the Vanuatu Agriculture Research and Technical Centre (VARTC) and in February-2020 in Sara village, East Coast Area Council.

Materials and methods

Both field days were advertised through Radio Vanuatu, Facebook, fliers posted around the main urban centre of Luganville and smaller villages where the project had worked and through Area Councillors and other community groups (church groups).

Both field days were single day events with a range of project related activities discussed or demonstrated where possible (Figure A4.1 and Figure A4.2). Unfortunately, extremely wet conditions limited the field day at VARTC largely to presentations and discussions under-cover, although a small break provided an opportunity to visit forage evaluation plots.

Participants attendance at both field days was registered on Commcare installed on digital devices. Whilst all participants were provided with an opportunity to complete an end of field day evaluation (Figure A4.3 and Figure A4.4); farmers who completed the evaluation form received a project hat (VARTC) or t-shirt (Sara). Transport was organised departing from Port Olry and Luganville with picks up made along the East Coast Highway. Refreshments were provided throughout both days.



Bisnis Blong Buluk Field Day Program
VARTC 26-October-2018

Time	Location	Activity
830 to 900	VARTC - Fare	Registration
900 to 925	VARTC - Fare	Welcome (Chair Keith Antfalo) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcome - VARTC CEO - Opening Prayer - Director Jimmy Rantes - Welcome - Bisnis Blong Buluk - Honourable Minister, MAFFLB - SANMA province (representative) - Overview of livestock program on VARTC - Jerine Natapu
925 to 930	VARTC - Fare	Logistics (Antoinette Nasse)
930 to 1030	VARTC - Fare	Cattle market specifications (Chair Stephenson Boe) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cattle buyers and Dept. Livestock
1030 to 1100	VARTC - Fare	Coffee break
1100 to 1115	VARTC - Fare	Introduction to session - Simon Quigley
1115 to 1130	Transfer to Stockyard and forage plots	Relocate to stockyard and forage plots
1130 to 1230	Groups alternate between two stations	Group 1 – cattle husbandry and yard design (Chair Kenny Swua) Group 2 – forages and feeding (Chair Jerine Natapu)
1230 to 1330		Group 1 – forages and feeding (Chair Jerine Natapu) Group 2 – cattle husbandry and yard design (Chair Kenny Swua)
1330 to 1345	Transfer	Relocate to VARTC Fare
1345 to 1430	VARTC - Fare	Lunch
1430 to 1530	VARTC - Fare	Bisnis skills development and farm management for smallholder cattle farmers – Keith Antfalo
1530 to 1615	VARTC - Fare	Open discussion (with coffee) Post Field day evaluation forms
1615 to 1630	VARTC - Fare	Field Day close – Director Lonny Bong, invited farmer Closing Prayer

The Bisnis Blong Buluk project gratefully acknowledges the following,

- VARTC for hosting the Field Day and ongoing support of the conduct of research on-station
- The Honourable Minister and Director General for Agriculture, Livestock, Forestry, Fisheries and Biosecurity, and the Director of Livestock and Director of Industry and the SANMA Provincial office for their participation
- All participants who attended and contributed to the discussions during the Field Day
- Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research for funding the research and the project partners for their tireless efforts



Figure A4.1. Program for field day held at the Vanuatu Agriculture Research and Technical Centre, October-2018.



**Increasing the productivity and market options for smallholder beef cattle farmers in Vanuatu
Field Day
Program**

Date : 13-Feb-2020

Venue : Sara village, East Santo

MC : Daryl Nalo, Department of Livestock, Santo

Time	Session	Person
930	Coffee and Registration (CommCare)	
930 - 1000	Welcome Welcome prayer Welcome – Sara village Response – Department of Industry Response – Department of Livestock Response – Project team	Mr Darryl Nalo (MC) Pastor Sara village (Joseph) Chief Sara village (Joshua James) Director Jimmy Rantes Representative Simon Quigley
1000 - 1200	Stories from the station - Livelihoods - Economic scenario's (and training modules) - Existing productivity of cattle systems - VARTC research – forages, grazing, water	Norah and Antoinette Keith Antfalo (Department of Industry) Mangau Navian, Joseph Sul Steglar Tabiaga, Jerine Natapu, Bani Nehiva (VARTC)
1200 - 1230	Stories from the farmers - On-farm forages - On-farm water and women's group	Micah and Jerry Iavoro Marian Ngor
1230 - 1330	Lunch	
1330 - 1400	Travel to NTM college farm	
1400 - 1530	Stories from the sites - Forage nursery / grass transplant - Legume bank - Cattle monitoring and market channels	Gilbert Joseph, Mangau, Noel Kalo
1530 - 1600	Return to Sara village	
1600 - 1615	Marketing interventions – any farmers register interest	Noel Kalo
1600 - 1630	Close Prayer Complete evaluation forms (and t-shirt)	Simon Quigley Farmer (TBC) Pastor Peter (Khole) Antoinette
1630	Kava	

Figure A4.2. Program for field day held at Sara village in East Santo Area Council, February-2020.



Field Day VARTC 26-October-2018
Participant evaluation

1. Please describe your involvement in today's Field Day
 - Cattle farmer
 - Government representative
 - Agriculture input supplier
 - Other, please describe
 - Project partner organisation team
 - Industry representative
 - Abattoir, butcher, trader
2. What new information or skills did you gain at the Bisnis Blong Buluk Field Day?
(for example, buyer specifications, cattle prices, forages, cattle husbandry)
3. What did you like most about the Bisnis Blong Buluk Field Day?
(for example, venue, catering, bisnis skills, buyer specification, animal husbandry, forages)
4. What did you like least about the Bisnis Blong Buluk Field Day?
5. What items would you like to be included in future to improve Field Days for cattle farmers?
6. What changes to your cattle marketing or management practices will you consider after attending the Bisnis Blong Buluk Field Day today?
7. What research activities would you like the Bisnis Blong Buluk project to consider undertaking in the future?
8. If you would like to participate in future Bisnis Blong Buluk project research activities please leave your name, phone number and what type of research activities you would like to participate in

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS

Figure A4.3. Evaluation form for field day held at Vanuatu Agriculture Research and Technical Centre, October-2018.



Field Day Sara - Participant evaluation

1. Please describe your involvement in today's Field Day

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cattle farmer | <input type="checkbox"/> Project partner organisation team |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Government representative | <input type="checkbox"/> Industry representative |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture input supplier | <input type="checkbox"/> Abattoir, butcher, trader |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Student | <input type="checkbox"/> Other, please describe |

2. Please select gender

- | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Female | <input type="checkbox"/> Male |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|

3. What new information or skills did you gain at the Bisnis Blong Buluk Field Day?
(for example, buyer specifications, cattle prices, forages, cattle husbandry, livelihoods)

4. What did you like most about the Bisnis Blong Buluk Field Day?
(for example, venue, catering, bisnis skills, buyer specification, animal husbandry, forages, livelihoods)

5. What items would you like to be included in future to improve Field Days for cattle farmers?

6. What changes to your cattle farming or cattle marketing will you consider after attending the Bisnis Blong Buluk Field Day today?

7. What research activities would you like the Bisnis Blong Buluk project to consider undertaking in the future?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS

Figure A4.4. Evaluation form for field day held at Sara village in East Santo Area Council, February-2020.

Results

VARTC field day

Ninety-two participants registered at the VARTC field day (Figure A4.5), consisting of 82 males and 10 females. 43 of the participants were farmers, whilst the balance were mainly government officers (21), students (13) and project team members (8). The cattle farmers attending the field day came from East Santo (26), Fanafo / Southeast Santo (12), Aore / Malo (4) and South Santo (1) Area Councils.

Twenty-five participants completed the field day evaluation, of which only 16 were cattle farmers. The majority of farmers indicated the presentations on prices and markets, pasture species and cattle husbandry were all new sources of information, with the farm business planning sessions of most interest. Feedback recommended more practical exercises and to hold the field day in the dry season, to avoid heavy rain. The farmers identified requirements for further research (and presumable extension and training) on stockyard design, water storage, cattle growth rates on improved pastures and the issue of the low prices paid for cattle.



a.



b.

Figure A4.5. Field day participants visit forage evaluation plots (a.) and at conclusion of field day (b.) at the Vanuatu Agricultural Research and Technical Centre.

Sara field day

A total of 148 people attended the field day held at Sara village (Figure A4.6). This included 109 farmers, one student, two government officials and three others registered on digital devices, and an additional 33 invited individuals (Vanuatu and Australian project team, ACIAR representatives, project reviewers and other stakeholders). A number of late arrivals did not register on the devices and so that actual number of participants was likely to be higher.



a.



b.

Figure A4.6. Field day participants inspect cattle monitoring and market assessments (a.) and visit forage legume nursery (b.) at Sara village.

Of the 115 registered participants only 3 were female. The participants that registered on digital devices at the field day came from East Santo (78%), Big Bay Saltwater (8%), South Santo Area 01 (8%), South Santo Area 02 (3%), Southeast Santo (2%), East Malo (1%) and Northwest Santo (1%). Awareness of the field day by the registered participants was via Other Farmers (42%), Church groups (24%), government officials and Area Councillors (13%), the project team (10%) and posters, radio and social media (11% combined). Approximately 80% of registered attendees were participating in their first project activity.

Eighty-one farmers completed the post-field day evaluation. Farmers indicated they received new information on forages (67%), cattle prices (31%) and buyer specifications (14%) with discussions on forages and business skills the most popular topics covered during the day. After attending the field day farmers indicated they were most likely to consider changes to their pastures and pasture management (60%), farm and business management (19%) and an increase in their herd size (11%). Farmers would like to see future project activities (research) to focus on additional training, field days and farmer interviews, strategies to increase cattle prices paid to farmers, animal production, bull selection and pregnancy testing and on supplying farmers with finance and materials to support development of their farming systems. Overall, the responses of farmers were overwhelmingly positive, and it is thought that farmers are genuinely pleased to simply be engaged in any activity that provides them with options and opportunities to improve their cattle farming systems.

Conclusions

Farmers are active participants in introductory group based dissemination activities. The use of field day provides a feasible and cost-effective method to increase awareness of project activities to a large number of farmers and other stakeholders. This awareness may potentially lead to further engagement in subsequent project activities. Participants overwhelmingly felt they had gained new knowledge or skills as a result of their participation in project field days. Farmers recommended further research on the low prices of cattle and on increased growth rates of cattle from improved forages, and training on business skills, cattle husbandry and cattle handling and water storage infrastructure.

Activity 4.11. Project stakeholder analysis and participatory impact pathway analysis

Introduction

There had been limited formal investment in research, development and extension activities within the beef sector in Vanuatu for a number of years. While significant local knowledge of people and production systems existed within the project team, for many members this was their first time to undertake research with smallholder cattle farmers in Vanuatu. As such there was a need to formally identify the stakeholders (stakeholder analysis) that needed to be informed of project activities and the implementation and impact pathway (impact pathway analysis) of the project. Whilst it would seem logical to hold a stakeholder analysis and impact pathway workshop at the design or inception stage of a project, it was felt there would be too many unknowns and assumptions for this to be reliable and useful. Therefore, it was decided to hold the stakeholder analysis and impact pathway analysis workshop approximately 12 months after the project commenced operations and project team members had a more realistic understanding of the opportunities and challenges of implementing a research project in Vanuatu, and what the engagement and impact pathways might be. The outputs from the workshop were used to assist the project team with stakeholder engagement and monitoring and evaluation of project activities.

Materials and methods

A single day workshop was held in Luganville, Vanuatu approximately 12 months after the commencement of research activities in Vanuatu. The workshop was facilitated by Strategy, Evaluation, and Engagement for Development (SEE4D) and involved a Stakeholder Analysis and an Impact Pathway Analysis. The workshop involved participants from all partner organisations. The following report, figures, tables and disclaimer were prepared by SEE4D and were made available to the project team upon conclusion of the workshop.

Disclaimers

This report: has been prepared by Strategy, Evaluation, and Engagement for Development (SEE4D) Pty. Ltd. for the University of Queensland (Client) and may only be used and relied on by the Client for the purpose agreed between UQ and the Client. SEE4D otherwise disclaims responsibility to any person other than Client arising in connection with this report. The services undertaken by SEE4D in connection with preparing and undertaking this workshop and report were limited to those specifically detailed in the Purchase Order. The opinions, conclusions and any recommendations in this report are based on conditions encountered and information reviewed at the date of preparation of the workshop report. SEE4D has no responsibility or obligation to update this report to account for events or changes occurring subsequent to the date that the report was prepared.

SEE4D has prepared this report on the basis of information provided by the Client and others who provided information, which SEE4D has not independently verified or checked beyond the agreed scope of work. SEE4D does not accept liability in connection with such unverified information, including errors and omissions in the report which were caused by errors or omissions in that information.

Results

Stakeholder analysis

The first activity of the one-day workshop included identifying important stakeholders in the Vanuatu beef cattle project, prioritising their importance with a show of hands and participation in a short role play of stakeholder groups. The workshop participants split into groups representing the different stakeholders and in a participatory way worked through questions about each stakeholder from a communications and engagement need for the achievement of the 'end of project' outcomes. Stakeholder groups wrote their responses to each question and placed their responses on a wall in a prepared template. Each then explored their contribution with the whole workshop group (Figure A4.7). Stakeholder analysis results are presented in Table A4.1.



Figure A4.7. Stakeholder analysis.

Table A4.1. Identification of key stakeholders and engagement and communication actions.

With whom do you need to engage?	Why?	Importance 1. Control 2. Influence 3. Concern	How will you engage?	What actions are needed by you?	When are actions needed?	Who does it?
ACIAR	Funding; Informing and sharing knowledge	Control	Project reports; informal briefings	Reporting; data accumulation; communication	Annual, trip, monthly reports; Newsletter development	Project Leader
Women farmers	Partners in farm businesses; Finance managers; home garden managers	Control small gardens; influence decision making	Mixed meetings; women only meetings; women's groups	Planning for women engagement; participation in small plot trials; value chain linkages for women	Now and ongoing	Cherise team; value chain team; media team
Farmer groups	Faster project impact; information dissemination	Control	Field visits; training activities; meetings	Training material development; organizing field activities and training	During project implementation	Chief/leader of communities; farmer representatives; project team
Farmers - individuals	Leading farmers implementing new actions	Control	Share experiences with other farmers	Participation with leading farmers; sharing project learning	Ongoing and now	Leading farmers and project team
Govt. Vanuatu Departments	Provide scientific basis to policy, strategy, and plan development	Control; influence and concern	Meetings; email circulars; project documentation; governance; resources	Annual review meetings; research team support; livestock industry working group support	Ongoing	Directors and key staff from GoV Departments
Chief and Community land-owner groups	Maintain social support; ensure ownership of project	Control; Influence	Storian communications	Ongoing dialogue	Ongoing and now	Project team; Chiefs/landowners/Community groups
Industry	Identifying value chain opportunities; extending innovations through industry	Control and influence	Invite industry to field days; ensure participation in project reviews, field activities and planning events	Establish relationships and linkages between producers and value chain stakeholders; create opportunities for dialogue and planning	Now and ongoing	Project ground teams; GoV Departments; Industry players
Education	Educate agricultural students	Influence in industry long-term	Curriculum development; practical training	Work with training institutions; provide technical training; build relationships	Now and ongoing	Dept. Livestock
Media	Share learnings from project	Influence decision making	Radio/TV broadcasts; Networking; Newsletter; SMS	Engagement planning and actions; inclusion of stakeholders in project	Now and ongoing	Project team; partners and contracted parties

Impact pathway analysis (IPA) and monitoring evaluation reporting and learning (MERL) framework

Overall, this Project IPA and MERL framework aims to:

- Express the project design to better demonstrate consequential steps to achieve research outputs and project outcomes by looking backwards,
- Share ownership of the project's planned outputs and end of project outcomes amongst partners,
- Improve project management through supporting continuous learning and sharing of monitoring information,
- Support partner monitoring, data collection, and reporting requirements,
- Maximise the benefits of the outputs of the project, and
- Encourage application of accepted ethical principles and standards for evaluation including gender disaggregation of monitoring data.

Best practice MERL experience identifies the following principles and tools as important:

1. Understanding and mapping the project's impact pathway analysis (IPA) as a participatory activity with partners, and
2. Building a MERL plan based on:
 - Identifying the user (who has questions/obligations) for the information derived through monitoring and evaluation data collection processes and the likely use of that information in improvement and reporting actions,
 - Determining the assumptions inherent in the project's causal steps,
 - Developing evaluation questions – evaluation questions need to be developed for the outcomes and essential causal steps (inputs, activities, outputs, capacity/behaviour changes),
 - Deciding on an evaluation research design before deciding on the monitoring method/s for monitoring key evaluation questions,
 - Identifying indicators or measures – identifying exactly what needs to be monitored to answer the evaluation questions. What changed, why, and where?
 - Identifying monitoring methods – identifying the quantitative and qualitative methods needed to measure changes expected, with rigour applied to the precise methods chosen, and
 - Collating data, analysing, and reporting results for learning aligned with the IPA format.

Specifically, the workshop activity:

- Involved 16 project participants (of whom, three were female) (Figure A4.8),
- Built a participatory impact pathway analysis (PIPA) with contributions from all partners to better understand and document the end of project outcomes expected from the investments research and extension efforts. The process supported exploration of the intermediate outcome steps expected as a result of next user adoption of research outputs,
- Undertook the development of a preliminary MERL plan based on the IPA built. The MERL plan consisted of the following section (Note: Time limitations prevented the full development of all components and the project team committed to develop further detail):
 - *Users and uses of monitoring, reporting and evaluation information:* 'Who wants to know what' and key stakeholders for the project have been identified, explored, and listed,
 - *Assumptions:* assumptions have been identified, listed, and prioritised from the IPA to form the basis for some of the more specific monitoring/evaluation questions,
 - *Monitoring/evaluation questions:* more specific questions have been identified,
 - *Indicators to be monitored:* exactly what needs to be measured to answer the monitoring/evaluative questions has been determined,
 - *Methods for monitoring:* the methods for collecting the information to inform the indicators listed have been briefly discussed, and
 - *Overall results chart and reporting template developed:* all monitoring information can now be summarised and placed in a format that reflects the IPA steps and support reporting.



Figure A4.8. Impact pathway development workshop.

The impact pathway analysis described the rationale behind the beef cattle project, including what are understood to be the cause and effect relationships between getting started, inputs, activities, outputs, intermediate or development, and end of project and longer term outcomes. The impact pathway analysis shows a series of expected essential consequences (indicators of success) from investments and this clarifies the project design (Table A4.2). Most importantly, the impact pathway analysis helps to determine what and when to monitor, so that monitoring activities assist project management and the implementation of the project. Assumptions were identified by the workshop participants and then prioritised with a constrained dot placement exercise (Table A4.3). The expected users and use of project outputs was identified (Table A4.4).

Table A4.2. Impact pathway analysis.

	Longer term outcomes 5 to 10 year						Groups of smallholder (SH) cattle farmers production, income, and value chain returns have increased							
	End of project Outcomes			Targetted groups of beef cattle SH have increased production, sustainability, and income			Some SH cattle farmers marketing and value adding improved							
↑	Intermediate outcomes													
	Group/institutional and key individual practice change			Policy environment for SH cattle framers improved			Leading SH farmers and groups have adapted and adopted production and marketing techniques							
	Confidence, knowledge, and skills change			Some leading SH cattle farmers production and marketing confidence and skills increased			Leading SH cattle farmers sharing knowledge and experience							
	Access to information													
↑	SH access to information on production and marketing increased													
	Outputs/activities		Baseline research studies completed and reported		SH farmer groups established and operating		On farm monitoring established and in operation		Pasture and management system demonstrations established		Cross project linkages formed		Industry (value chain) groups engaged	
	SH model for beef production developed			Research reports and publications established and circulated			SH beef production systems report published			Women SHs and industry groups engaged and participating in activities				
	Social, cultural, and political context of beef industry understood and shared			Chiefly, community and landowner groups participating in project activities			Project advisory group established and operating							
	Inputs			Funding provided		Project management arrangements established			Expertise sourced					
↑	Getting Ready		Contracts signed, funds available		IPA. engagement, communications and monitoring and evaluation plans developed			Partnerships/relationships agreed and established						

Table A4.3. Assumptions implicit in the project impact pathway.

<p>Long term and end of project outcomes 5 to 10 year</p>	<p>ACIAR continues the project XXXXXXXX No cyclones GoV beef policy continues unchanged XXXXXXXX No drop in market prices GoV resources should be focused on improving the beef industry over other industries X</p>
<p>Intermediate term outcomes</p>	
<p>Group or institutional practice change Key individual practice change</p>	<p>Possible to increase SH beef cattle production X SH farmers are available/want to increase production XXXXXXXX SH farmers want to improve their husbandry skills XXX SH farmers can/want to increase cattle numbers XXXXXX Land tenure arrangements support beef production XXXXX That existing SH cattle production is inefficient XXXXX</p>
<p>Confidence, knowledge, and skills change</p>	<p>Production and marketing techniques work XXXXXXXX Market strategy development will not increase competition or reduce prices XXXXX Increased market options for farmers would increase participation by farmers in the market XXX Knowledge can be shared (trust) between SH farmers XX</p>
<p>Access to information</p>	<p>No drop in beef prices</p>
<p>Outputs</p>	<p>Partnerships endure X Baseline information is reliable X No exotic disease GoV does not provide beef subsidy X Professional capacity exists XXXX</p>

Number of X's represents a ranking of priority allocated by workshop participants.

Table A4.4. Users and uses of project information.

<p>Users: Who wants to know what about what we are doing and how we are progressing with the project?</p>	<p>Uses: How will the user use the information? What will they do with the information?</p>
<p>Project team and implementing partners: XXXXXX</p>	<p>Adaptive management for project, Administrative responsibilities, Briefings of partners, Extension of knowledge and successes.</p>
<p>ACIAR and GoV funders: XXXX</p>	<p>Publications, Review of progress towards outcomes, Ensure ongoing support.</p>
<p>Farmers, value chain players and chiefs/community: XXX</p>	<p>Out scaling and upscaling of technologies, Informed change of practice, Sharing of lessons learnt.</p>
<p>Provincial Government partners: XX</p>	<p>Learning and future planning, Sharing of information, Production of project reports, Departmental reports, Continuing alignment of project investments from donors, funders, and departments, Coordination of activities in industry.</p>
<p>NGOs and other funders:</p>	<p>Share knowledge, Raise awareness of project and successes.</p>
<p>Research academics:</p>	<p>Building knowledge base for future research.</p>
<p>Number Xs denotes priority</p>	

Monitoring and evaluation questions

The monitoring and evaluation questions can take three forms:

- The overarching project outcome questions that relate to whether the project has achieved its end of project or longer term outcomes (post project and during implementation),
- Key post project evaluation questions to assess the project in terms of governance, appropriateness (relevance), effectiveness, impact, efficiency (benefit/cost), gender and/or legacy, and
- Specific monitoring and evaluation questions about progressive steps (Getting started, activities, outputs, intermediate outcomes) in the project towards achieving end of project outcomes.

Information to answer these questions is derived from measuring the indicators chosen in the MERL plan for the project.

Overarching project outcome questions (post project)

The overarching questions for the project relate to the end of project and longer-term outcomes identified for the project:

- Has there been an improvement (or is one expected) in SH beef farmer's production, income, or value chain performance?
- To what extent have SH beef farmers production, income, or sustainability poverty been improved? Why or why not?
- Has there been an improvement in SH beef farmers market access and value adding? Why or why not?
- Did relevant GoV and Provincial Government Departments, NGO's, SH farmer groups, and leading SH farmers adopt project findings? Why or why not?

The evidence to be assessed to answer the overarching questions will come from monitoring information tabulated in the results chart built for the project from regular reporting processes, including for inputs, activities, outputs, and intermediate outcomes. The evidence aggregated from the various reports and quantitative and qualitative surveys will be best assessed by a panel comprised of the project steering team, key selected partners, and farmer representatives as part of the annual review (Year 2 and 3) and final project review processes.

Key post project evaluation questions (KEQ)

The key evaluation questions are higher order questions about the project overall (Table A4.5). The project MERL plan provides a range of indicators to monitor to produce information to answer the key evaluation questions chosen for the project.

Specific evaluative questions for the project

Specific evaluation questions (Table A4.6) include whether there were unexpected outcomes, gender differences in participation and adoption, and if the planned project steps were achieved and if not, why not?

Table A4.5. Key evaluation questions user evaluation design and methods

Evaluation purpose	KEQ.	User	MERL design comment.	Indicator	Methods
Impact. Achievement of 'end of project' or longer-term outcomes planned.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What changes have occurred, either directly or indirectly produced by the project interventions? - What, if any, unanticipated (adverse) changes or other outcomes have resulted? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SHs, Provincial Gov. Departments. - NGOs and extension staff. - ACIAR/UQ. - Project management team. - GoV institutions and government agency research teams. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Currently ACIAR conducts ex post 'impact assessment' evaluations for projects using external resources in a mixed evaluation design. - There is a baseline study being conducted to gather data on impact as well as a SH monitoring process – both quantitative and qualitative data to be gathered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Targeted SHs and women farmers adopt and adapt technologies. - Intermediate outcomes e.g. access to information, sharing of knowledge by participants and beneficiaries, confidence change in targeted SH farmers and local NGO & extension officers. - Policy changes towards beef cattle industry changes by NGOs, country research and extension agencies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Purposeful sample with participant involvement in analysis of baseline and monitoring responses. - Gender needs to be observed through provision of separate spaces/interviews for men and women.
Effectiveness Achievement of project activities and outputs planned, using the inputs and techniques planned.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To what extent has the type, level and context of the inputs and activities made progress towards the desired project, outputs and outcomes, Why or why not? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SHs, GoVs extensions staff. - ACIAR/UQ. - Project management team. - Provincial institutions and government agency research teams. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project partners, stakeholders and beneficiaries report to project management as activities and outputs roll out. - This includes half year and annual review processes where information is tabled on the techniques applied to achieve the activities and outputs. Information tabulated to include monitoring data, baseline data, attendance at events, participation in training, engagement evaluations with gender disaggregated information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agreements made, resources committed and delivered. - Inputs, activities and research outputs achieved. - Engagement, communications and capacity building plans delivered and evaluated. Extension and training activities with gender information disaggregated. - SHs and women farmers' communication, engagement and capacity (gender disaggregated). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project management team is required to report on project arrangements, target SH farmer's selection, inputs, activities and outputs achieved. Activities undertaken are assessed as part of the implementation e.g. extension officer and lead SH farmer training is assessed as delivered (Training evaluation with gender disaggregation for both attendance and evaluation). - Research outputs and activities are self and peer reviewed and assessed during delivery as per the ACIAR activity and output reporting templates and annual and half yearly reviews. Information is to be noted in the format of the IPA headings as found in Table 6.

Evaluation purpose	KEQ.	User	MERL design comment.	Indicator	Methods
Appropriateness (Relevance).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Did the program meet the relevant needs of the intended beneficiaries? - To what extent are the activities and outputs proving useful in engaging and influencing the targeted stakeholders? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SHs, Women farmers. - NGOs and extensions staff. - ACIAR/UQ. - Project management team. - GoV institutions and government agency research teams. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An implicit approach is to be taken where participant and targeted SHs and women farmers can be continuously monitored both in the baseline, monitoring and more qualitative methods employed. - Purposeful sample of SHs and stakeholders, NGO & extension agents, are interviewed annually per region. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Research outputs find feasible technical options for production and marketing. - Participation (gender disaggregated) in research, training and extension activities, outputs and intermediate outcomes. - SHs and women farmers, extension & NGO officers access/use of new techniques. - Leading SHs and women farmers' uptake of new management techniques. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Baseline, monitoring on farm and purposeful sampling for qualitative methods for SHs, women farmers and, NGO's, and partners in the field over the last two years of project implementation. Both group and individual samples made with gender needs observed through provision of separate spaces/interviews for men and women using appropriate surveyors. - Participant involvement in analysis of both quantitative and qualitative information from all methods.
Legacy (Sustainability).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will there continue to be impacts over time and after the project ceases - Why or why not? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SHs, Women farmers. - NGOs and extensions staff. - ACIAR/UQ. - Project management team. - GoV institutions and government agency research teams. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An implicit approach can be taken where participant and targeted SHs and WFs can be continuously monitored and this sample can be part of any post project monitoring. - Purposeful sample of stakeholders are interviewed annually per district. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SHs and WFs group formation. - WFs and SHs participation in demo sites as a group and as individuals and their use of techniques devised. - NGO and extension agencies adoption of techniques and support for other groups. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Purposeful sampling for survey in the field 5 years after project implementation. Both group and individual interviews made with gender needs observed. - Participant involvement in analysis of responses.

Evaluation purpose	KEQ.	User	MERL design comment.	Indicator	Methods
Efficiency.	- Did project management obtain the highest value out of project resources?	- ACIAR/UQ. - Project management team.	- Project adaptive management will be supported by the project MERL plan monitoring activities. - ACIAR's ex post impact analysis should be based on the IPA and MERL plan developed for the project and be participatory.	- SHs and WFs adoption of beef cattle production and marketing practices developed. - NGO and extension agency capacity development and ongoing support for practices developed.	- Use of purposeful sample of WFs and SHs, NGO and extension people and continued interview process with additional economic analysis.
Governance.	- Did project management actions comply with the set of responsibilities and practices, policies and procedures, set by ACIAR's executive, the Australian Government and the partner country governments?	- ACIAR. - Project management team. - Institutions and government agency research teams.	- Internal audit of partner acquittal and contract processes.	- Partner agency acquittals and reporting of ACIAR project funding allocated. - ACIAR funds acquittal and reporting of such for self and partner funding. - Observance of International and Australian standards for funding for partners in development projects.	- Acquittal reporting for all partners funding for all activities. - Reporting of all defaults on partner funding acquittals.

Table A4.6. Specific monitoring questions for the project.

Project Outcomes	Specific Monitoring Questions	User	Indicator	Method	Responsibility	Timing
Intermediate outcomes						
Institutional or group practice change Leading SHs change in practice Skills and confidence change Information access Sharing knowledge	Has the policy environment for the beef industry and SH cattle farmers improved? Are leading SH farmers and groups adapting and adopting production and marketing techniques? Why and if not why not? Have some leading SH cattle farmers production and marketing confidence and skills increased? Why and if not why not? Has SH access to information on production and marketing increased? How and if not why not? Are leading SH cattle farmers sharing knowledge and experiences? How and if not why not?	NGOs and extensions staff ACIAR/UQ. Project management team. GoV institutions and government agency research teams.	Policy change. Policy implementation? SH and WFs adaption and adoption of better production and marketing techniques. SH skills level and confidence for production and marketing decisions. Ease and amount of information accessible on production and marketing by SHs and GoV institutional people. Farmer group performance, attendance, sharing level for information and experience between SHs.	Review of policy or change undertaken or planned and momentum developed for change. Purposeful sample (Women and men) of SHs, WFs, resource owners as individuals and groups and key extension, NGO and departmental participating staff to establish their experiences of the project as reflected in their confidence, knowledge, practices, and/or production/productivity/income change. Appreciative inquiry interviews to continue through the life of the project and again 5 years after project completion. Project team, key partners and targeted WFs, SHs and landowners to participate in the assessment of interview information (gender balanced).	Project management to establish 'purposeful sample' and commence appreciative inquiry interviews for agency, farmers, NGOs. The reference sites and farmer baseline survey results to be referenced to qualitative information. Project interviews to be incorporated into the post project impact assessment evaluation approach.	From year 1 to completion. After project completion.
Outputs/Activities						

-	<p>Have project advisory and reference groups been established and are they operating effectively?</p> <p>Have SH farmer groups established and are they operating? How effectively?</p> <p>Was the on farm monitoring operation established and implemented? What were the results in supporting the project outcome achievement?</p> <p>Were pasture and management system demonstrations established and did they influence anybody?</p> <p>Were cross project linkages formed and did they work or not?</p> <p>Were industry (value chain) groups engaged and how successful were they?</p> <p>Was a SH model for beef production developed and was it useful?</p> <p>Were research reports and publications established and circulated? How and how successfully?</p> <p>Was the SH beef production systems report published?</p> <p>Were women SHs and industry groups engaged and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SHs and WFs. - NGOs and extensions staff. - ACIAR/UQ. - Project management team. - GoV institutions and government agency research teams. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reference groups formed. - Stories of change from participants. - Farmer groups formed. - Women farmers participating in project. - Stories of change. - Farm monitoring system established. - Trend data established. - Participation of SHs and WFs in monitoring. - Demo's established. - Demo impact in awareness raising. - Change in SHs and WFs confidence of techniques. - Cross project linkages formed. - Participation by partners/industry in linkage activities. - Value chain engagement. - Model developed. - Usefulness to SHs and WFs and GoV officials. - Publications and usefulness to SHs, WFs, GoV officials, ACIAR, Provincial Institution policy/strategy change. - Report. - Participation of SHs and WFs in project. - Attendance of WFs and SHs at events. - Stories of change. - Relationships built. - Participation and patronage of project actions and outputs. - Baseline report. 	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All management and research and extension participants. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Half yearly and annually and continuously.
---	--	---	---	---	---	--

	<p>participating in activities?</p> <p>Was the social, cultural and political context of beef industry understood and shared?</p> <p>Were chiefly, community, and landowner groups participating in project activities?</p> <p>Was the baseline research studies completed and reported and utilised?</p> <p>Were research outputs completed as planned?</p> <p>Were key activities completed as planned?</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Usefulness of baseline data to progressing project outcomes. 			
Inputs						
-	<p>Were project funds provided and available?</p> <p>Were project management arrangements established? Were they appropriate?</p> <p>Was expertise sourced? Was it timely and sufficient?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ACIAR/UQ - GoV Institutions. - Project management team. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appropriate expenditure. - Arrangements and their effectiveness. - Expertise sourced and timeliness. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reports. - Annual reports. - Research outputs scheduling. 	-	-
Getting Ready						

-	<p>Were contracts signed? Were an IPA, engagement, communications and MERL plans developed? Were partnerships agreed and established, and were relationships built?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ACIAR/UQ. - Project management team. - GoV institutions and government agency research teams. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Partnerships and relations established. - Standard for governance of the project established across partners. - IPA and MERL plan built collaboratively with partners. - Contracts signed. - Ethical clearance achieved. - Partners engaged and participating. - Operational plan. - Funding distribution timing. - Stakeholder engagement and communications plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Purposeful sample and appreciative inquiry interviews with SHs, WFs, NGOs and Departmental people throughout the project. - Final independent review. - MERL plan evidence assessment process by the advisory committee and partners. - Project reports. - Half-term review. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project team and leader. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - After year 1.
---	---	---	---	--	--	---

Conclusions

The SHA and PIPA provided a framework for communication of project activities with stakeholders and a basis upon which, monitoring and evaluation of project outputs could be conducted. Whilst project participants found the exercise extremely worthwhile the development of the monitoring and evaluation framework itself was incomplete during the workshop. In hindsight it would have been better to conduct this over several days, however such an approach raises issues of maintaining the participation of key team members who have other commitments. Nevertheless, the frameworks developed in the workshop provided a basis upon which project progress was formerly assessed and adapted at annual meetings.