

# WORKSHOP REPORT

## Workshop on Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E)



*Prepared by*

**Pham Van Hung & Nguyen Huu Nhuan**

**Hanoi December 2010**

## **I. PM&E WORKSHOP FOR PROJECT TEAM AND ACTIVITY LEADERS**

### **1.1. Outline of activities**

A workshop on the principles and practices of Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) for project team leaders and activity leaders of the ACIAR North West Vietnam project was organised on 24 November 2010 at Hanoi University of Agriculture. The main objective of the workshop was to introduce the Framework for PM&E of the North West Vietnam Project, the PM&E guidelines and to get comments and feedback from participants for improving the proposed PM&E framework and guidelines.

There were 25 participants in this workshop. They originated from HUA (5 participants); NOMAFSI (3 participants); CASRAD (2 participants); RUDEC (4 participants); UQ – CfCSC (2 participants); ACIAR (3 participants), TBU (2 participants) and AJC (1 participant). The full list of participants is attached in Appendix 1.

In the morning, after the welcome by Prof Tran Duc Vien, HUA's rector, and the introduction of the PM&E workshop, the ACIAR Research Program manager, Mr David Shearer, presented ACIAR's Impact Assessment strategy and the plans for the NW Vietnam project's Mid-Term Review. It was followed by the presentation by Mr Oleg Nicetic from UQ-CfCSC. In his presentation, the PM&E capacity building and field practice events for field staff and extension officers conducted in Son La on 13-15 September 2010 was reviewed.

The proposed PM&E framework and methods were then presented by Dr Elske van de Fliert (from UQ) and Mr Nguyen Huu Nhuan (from HUA). Participants were divided into small groups to provide comments for improving the proposed PM&E guidelines. In the afternoon, the participants also worked in groups to discuss and identify indicators for success for the project. The detailed workshop program is attached as Appendix 3.

### **1.2. Results of group discussion**

#### **a. Major comments on the PM&E guidelines**

- The regular progress review meetings for the ICM trials are important but they should not be fixed for intervals of once every two weeks. Meetings should be based on critical stages in crop development and emerging needs in the field.
- The community feedback session should be before harvesting time.
- Meeting for discussing to solve unexpected problems (disease, natural calamity) during crop season is necessary.
- In addition to the extension officer, the commune and/or village officials, province/district staff, and heads of community groups should also be involved in the planning meetings.
- Portable projector is needed for planning meetings and should be brought at all times.
- For the photo reports, there should be an introduction to the farmer researchers to explain what the purpose of the photo stories is and what they should look out for when making photographs in their villages.
- The problem tree method may be used to guide farmers to take photos.
- Good facilitation of the meetings is necessary to obtain good engagement of all participants (farmers, extension officer and researchers). All participants, and especially the farmer researchers, should be encouraged to give their own ideas.

## b. The identification of indicators for success

| EROSION   | MAIZE ICM  | TEMP.FRUIT ICM  | VALUE CHAIN  | EXTENSION MODELS  | R4D CAPACITY   |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Evidence of new erosion reduction method applied by farmers</li> <li>•Each year (2011-2013) soil erosion is reduced by 50% compared with non-trial farm</li> <li>•Improved cropping system developed that is profitable for farmers and reduce soil erosion by 50%</li> <li>•Developed and verified soil erosion measurement method that are easy, cheap, reliable</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•After the project, productivity increased by 50%, compared to before project</li> <li>•Successful application of 2-3 new short terms maize varieties</li> <li>•Increase of income/area by at least 10%</li> <li>•Reduction of 30% of fertiliser amount used for maize and increase income/area by 15%</li> <li>•Improved maize crop system developed that improves and sustains soil health.</li> <li>•Improved maize cropping system developed that allows for 2 profitable crop cycles per year</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•100% of plum farmer researchers can apply new techniques</li> <li>•3 temperate fruit trial models</li> <li>•Reduce by 10-15% of losses by diseases</li> <li>•Develop 10-15 new fruit tree gardens</li> <li>•Increase the size of fruit by 30% and sugar brick by more than 1%</li> <li>•Increase income /area by 15%</li> <li>•Increased quality of fruits (sugar, size and color</li> <li>•Have developed a crop management system that produces quality that meet market requirement identified by VC reseachers</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Identify high quality plum (label, traced) New market channel</li> <li>•Increase the number of households which have regular mutual negotiation by 50%.</li> <li>•Build super chain for plums</li> <li>•Increase the price of plums by 5% compared with non project's fruits.</li> <li>•Have identified process within existing VC for MC plum s that either reduce cost or waste in the chain Identified market potential of varieties that can be produced as second crop in maize system</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•2 new successful models of maize are accepted by local people</li> <li>•2 successful treatments of temperate fruits</li> <li>•By 2015, at least 1 maize ICM trial is sucessful ly expanded (20 hhs, 10ha)</li> <li>•70% of households which participate in the project are succesful</li> <li>•Extension model developed that allows extension system to effectively introduce project research output to farrmers in NW Highlands</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•3 Master Awardees<br/>2 PhD Awardees</li> <li>•80% of project members understand and could apply participatory PM&amp;E</li> <li>•At least 5 local leaders understand and can apply PM&amp;E</li> <li>•70% of trained staffs use PM&amp;E successfully in their work</li> <li>•100% of staff who participate in the project are trained</li> </ul> |

## **II. TRAINING WORKSHOP ON PARTICIPATORY MONITORING AND EVALUATION FOR FIELD PROJECT STAFF: LEARNING TO LISTEN, LOOK AND REPORT**

### **2.1. Outline of activities**

The 2-day training workshop on participatory monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) of field activities, with a focus on temperate fruit ICM field teams, was carried out at Huong Sen Hotel, Moc Chau Town, Son La Province, on the 26<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup> of November, 2010. The detailed program is attached as Appendix 4. The objective of the workshop was to provide training on participatory monitoring and evaluation for field project staff and build skills to listen, look and report what is happening in the field. The total number of participants in this workshop was 21. Most of the participants were field and technical officers from PPRI, CASRAD, TBU and NOMAFSI.

On the first day, after the welcome and the introduction by Dr Elske about the objectives, expectations and program of the workshop, Mr Oleg Nicetic and Mr Do Thi Minh Hien gave an overview of the project's Temperate Fruit activities to date and discussed the participation of farmer researchers in the trials. An inventory was done among the participants how they perceived to improve farmer engagement in second year of trials.

In the afternoon, Mr Nguyen Huu Nhuan gave a presentation about "Participatory planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of field trials" and Mr Le Huu Huan gave an introduction about the Guidelines for the Evaluation Meeting.

On the second day of the workshop, the participants spent the whole morning in Pieng Sang village, Phieng Luong commune, practising and testing the PM&E tool for the evaluation meetings. After the evaluation of the plum ICM trial, all participants sit together in the afternoon of the second day to review the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluation process that was conducted in the morning.

### **2.2. Results of group discussion**

#### **a. Discussion on improving implementation of project activity**

| <b>What do we need (to do)?</b>  | <b>What is needed at community level?</b>   |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• More time</li><li>• Better planning</li><li>• Convincing leaders</li><li>• Good communication with farmers</li><li>• Learn/be open to local customs</li><li>• Learn methods to work with farmers</li><li>• Have good attitude/skills when working with farmers</li><li>• Involve extension officers more intensively as they are a bridge between project and farmers.</li><li>• Involve/get more support from local government/DARD</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Opportunities for farmers to learn in real situation</li><li>• Share indigenous knowledge/practices</li><li>• Support from local government (commune leaders)</li><li>• Better awareness of farmers on the purposes/opportunities of the project.</li><li>• More commitment and participation of farmers in the project</li></ul> |

## b. Evaluation of PM&E testing activity in Phieng Sang

| Strengths   | Weaknesses   |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Initial understanding of the economic analysis of the trial</li> <li>Encouragement of farmers' participation</li> <li>Suitable evaluation method</li> <li>Farmers are active to participate in the evaluation</li> <li>Being able to evaluate the result of previous crop season</li> <li>Farmers have opportunities to give idea</li> <li>Table and experimental diagram makes farmers to understand more what they are doing</li> <li>Farmers understand what they are doing</li> <li>Make agreement between farmers and project's field staff</li> <li>Evaluation is specific</li> <li>Can identify weaknesses to deal with in the next season</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questions for farmers should be short and clearer for them to answer.</li> <li>Available data should be well prepared in advance (e.g., price of inputs, productivity)</li> <li>Finding suitable ways to calculate the economic analysis for fruit tree</li> <li>Weak encouragement of farmers' participation</li> <li>Evaluators should invite also non-trial farmers to participate in trial evaluation</li> <li>Instruction to farmers is not good</li> <li>Evaluator should introduce farmers well how to carry out activity</li> <li>Evaluators are not competent in evaluation, knowing steps to evaluate</li> <li>Preparation for evaluation (paper and materials) and evaluators are not good at questioning</li> <li>Farmers should be involved more so they can be able to do themselves some activities (such as trail map) and present the results</li> <li>Weak management of time in evaluation</li> <li>Farmers are still passive in evaluation</li> <li>Evaluators speak too much while farmers speak less</li> </ul> |

## c. Other experiences and difficulties encountered by field staff during project activity implementation

- Some farmers do not know Vietnamese (Sìn Hồ, Giang Ma – Tam Đường).
- Some farmers still misunderstand the objectives of the project (Làng Mồ – Sìn Hồ).
- Understanding customs of H'Mong people will make work easier.
- Communication methods to use with farmers (Giang Ma).
- Frequent changes in participation of farmers (Tả Ngảo) and low commitment of farmers to project.
- Waiting for project's support from farmers may lead to dependence of community.
- Make clear project's objectives for farmers to understand well.
- Communication among family members is important.
- Short-term vision of farmers.
- Not to carry out activity at harvesting time (Sìn Hồ).
- It is very important to have a specific agreement on compensation for crop losses in trials and the incentives that commune leaders receive for project activities.
- Trial designers and supervisors should be the same.
- Some farmers are difficult to work with (Mường Sang).
- Make farmers trust you, avoid imposing and listen to farmers.
- Weak capacity (quantifying, recording) is an obstacle.



**Appendix 1**  
**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS OF WORKSHOP ON PM&E METHODOLOGY FOR PROJECT**  
**TEAM AND ACTIVITY LEADERS**  
*Wednesday, 24 November 2010*  
**Hanoi University of Agriculture**

| <b>No</b> | <b>Name</b>          | <b>Institution</b> |
|-----------|----------------------|--------------------|
| 1.        | Phạm Văn Hùng        | HUA                |
| 2.        | Nguyễn Hữu Nhuận     | HUA                |
| 3.        | Trần Thế Cường       | HUA                |
| 4.        | Nguyễn Thị Dương Nga | HUA                |
| 5.        | Giang Hương          | HUA                |
| 6.        | Phạm Thị Sến         | NOMAFSI            |
| 7.        | Lê Hữu Huân          | NOMAFSI            |
| 8.        | Nguyễn Thanh Thủy    | NOMAFSI            |
| 9.        | Phạm Thị Vượng       | PPRI               |
| 10.       | Đặng Thi Bình        | PPRI               |
| 11.       | Nguyễn Nam Hải       | PPRI               |
| 12.       | Nguyễn Văn Sơn       | CASRAD             |
| 13.       | Phạm Thị Hạnh Thơ    | CASRAD             |
| 14.       | Ninh Văn Nghị        | RUDEC              |
| 15.       | Bùi Văn Quang        | RUDEC              |
| 16.       | Nguyễn Công Hiệp     | RUDEC              |
| 17.       | Nguyễn Mạnh Hùng     | RUDEC              |
| 18.       | Đoàn Đức Lân         | TBU                |
| 19.       | Vũ Đức Toàn          | TBU                |
| 20.       | Đỗ Thị Minh Hiền     | AJC                |
| 21.       | Elske van de Fliert  | UQ – CfCSC         |
| 22.       | Oleg Nicetic         | UQ – CfCSC         |
| 23.       | Marlo Rankin         | UQ                 |
| 24.       | David Shearer        | ACIAR              |
| 25.       | Nguyễn Thị Thanh An  | ACIAR              |

**Appendix 2**  
**THE PROGRAM OF TRAINING WORKSHOP ON PARTICIPATORY MONITORING AND**  
**EVALUATION FOR FIELD PROJECT STAFF: LEARNING TO LISTEN, LOOK AND REPORT**  
**26-27 November 2010**  
**Huong Sen Hotel, Moc Chau, Son La**

| <b>No</b> | <b>Name</b>         | <b>Institution</b> |
|-----------|---------------------|--------------------|
| 1.        | Nguyễn Hữu Nhuận    | HUA                |
| 2.        | Trần Thế Cường      | HUA                |
| 3.        | Lê Hữu Huân         | NOMAFSI            |
| 4.        | Phạm Thị Sến        | NOMAFSI            |
| 5.        | Nguyễn Thi Thuỷ     | PPRI               |
| 6.        | Nguyễn Nam Hải      | PPRI               |
| 7.        | Nguyễn Văn Chí      | PPRI               |
| 8.        | Đỗ Xuân Đạt         | PPRI               |
| 9.        | Nguyễn Văn Sơn      | CASRAD             |
| 10.       | Đặng Thị Hải        | CASRAD             |
| 11.       | Đoàn Đức Lân        | TBU                |
| 12.       | Vũ Đức Toàn         | TBU                |
| 13.       | Đặng Văn Công       | TBU                |
| 14.       | Nguyễn Hoàng Phương | TBU                |
| 15.       | Nguyễn Duy Giang    | Sin Ho             |
| 16.       | Hà Anh Dũng         | Tam Đường          |
| 17.       | Hoàng Xuân Thảo     | NOMAFSI            |
| 18.       | Nguyễn Xuân Độ      | ASODIA             |
| 19.       | Đỗ Thị Minh Hiền    | AJC                |
| 20.       | Elske van de Fliert | UQ – CfCSC         |
| 21.       | Oleg Nicetic        | UQ – CfCSC         |

**Appendix 3:**  
**THE PROGRAM OF WORKSHOP ON PM&E METHODOLOGY FOR PROJECT TEAM AND**  
**ACTIVITY LEADERS**  
***Wednesday, 24 November 2010***  
**Hanoi University of Agriculture**

| <b>Time</b> | <b>Activity</b>  | <b>Presenter/moderator</b>              |
|-------------|--|---|
| 08:00-08:30 | Arrival and registration   | HUA                                     |
| 08:30-08:45 | Welcome and opening<br>Program and objectives of workshop  | Prof. Tran Duc Vien<br>Dr Pham Van Hung |
| 08:45-09:15 | ACIAR's Impact Assessment strategy<br>NW Vietnam project's Mid-Term Review   | David Shearer                           |
| 09:15-10:15 | Explanation of PM&E capacity building and field<br>practice events for field staff and extension<br>officers on 13-15 Sep and 26-27 Nov 2010 | Do Thi Minh Hien<br>Oleg Nicetic        |
| 10:15-10:30 | Tea break  |   |
| 10:30-11:30 | Review of PM&E activity guidelines in small<br>groups  | Nguyen Huu Nhuan                        |
| 11:30-13:30 | Lunch break  |   |
| 13:30-14:15 | Presentation of proposed PM&E framework<br>and methods   | Elske van de Fliert                     |
| 14:15-15:00 | Plenary discussion collecting input for<br>improvement of the PM&E activity guidelines   | Nguyen Huu Nhuan/<br>Do Thi Minh Hien   |
| 15:00-15:30 | Tea break  |   |
| 15:30-16:45 | Identification of indicators for success (exercise<br>and discussion)  | Nguyen Huu Nhuan<br>Do Thi Minh Hien    |
| 16:45-17:00 | Workshop evaluation and Closing  | Dr Pham Van Hung                        |



**Appendix 4**  
**THE PROGRAM OF TRAINING WORKSHOP ON PARTICIPATORY MONITORING AND**  
**EVALUATION FOR FIELD PROJECT STAFF: LEARNING TO LISTEN, LOOK AND REPORT**  
**26-27 November 2010**  
**Huong Sen Hotel, Moc Chau, Son La**

**Day 1**

| <b>Time</b> | <b>Activity</b>   | <b>Presenter/moderator</b> |
|-------------|---|----------------------------|
| 09:00-09:15 | Welcome and introduction – objectives and expectations, agreement on program                          | Huan-Elske-Hien            |
| 09:15-09:45 | Overview of TF activities to date   | Oleg and Thuy              |
| 09:45-10:30 | Discussion on participation of farmer researchers in trials: benefits and constraints in first year   | Hien                       |
| 10:30-10:45 | Tea break   |                            |
| 10:45-11:30 | Discussion on participation of farmer researchers in trials: how to improve engagement in second year | Hien                       |
| 11:30-13:30 | Lunch break   |                            |
| 13:30-14:15 | Photo report practice   | Elske and Hien             |
| 14:15-15:00 | Presentation “Participatory planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of field trials”      | Nhuan                      |
| 15:00-15:30 | Tea break   |                            |
| 15:30-16:30 | Review guidelines for Evaluation Meeting  | Huan                       |
| 16:30-17:00 | Planning of PE in Pieng Sang  | Huan-Oleg- Hien            |

**Day 2**

| <b>Time</b> | <b>Activity</b>  | <b>Presenter/moderator</b> |
|-------------|--|----------------------------|
| 08:00-9:00  | Travel to Pieng Sang   |                            |
| 09:00-11:00 | Participatory Evaluation of temperate fruit trials in Pieng Sang | Huan, Thuy, TF team        |
| 11:00-12:00 | Travel to Hotel in Moc Chau                                      |                            |
| 12:00-13:30 | Lunch break  |                            |
| 13:30-14:30 | Reflections on PE in Pieng Sang; lessons learned                 | Huan, Hien and Oleg        |
| 14:30-14:45 | Closing of workshop  | Elske                      |