



## **Exchange and Capacity Building Workshop on Farmer-Led Documentation for Sustainable Agriculture/Natural Resource Management**



**6<sup>th</sup> – 10<sup>th</sup> November 2006, Hotel Africana - Kampala, Uganda**

Facilitated by: PELUM Uganda, PROLINNOVA and Oxfam NOVIB

## Table of Contents

<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1 About this Report .....	5
1.2 Workshop Background and Rationale.....	5
1.3 Workshop Objectives .....	6
1.3.1 Overall Objective .....	6
1.3.2 Specific Objectives .....	6
1.4 Workshop Methodology.....	6
1.5 Participants.....	6
1.5.1 Market Place .....	6
1.5.2 Participants’ Expectations .....	7
1.6 Workshop Steering Group .....	8
1.7 About the Organizers .....	8
<b>2. Introduction to Farmer-led Documentation (FLD) .....</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1 Opening Remarks.....	9
2.2 Overview of FLD Aspects .....	9
2.3 Views from participants.....	10
<b>3. Case Studies - FLD in Practice .....</b>	<b>12</b>
3.1 Introduction.....	12
3.2 Case Study Presentations & Discussion.....	13
3.2.1 AGRECOL Andes - Knowledge sharing through ICTs.....	13
3.2.2 Africa 2000 Network – Community Libraries .....	15
3.2.3 ACDEP - Participatory Video.....	16
3.2.4 NAADS - Collection Exchange on Local Agriculture Content .....	18
3.2.5 Environmental Alert - Farmer Field Schools .....	19
3.2.6 ARIS - Question & Answer Voucher Service.....	20
3.2.7 PROLINNOVA (South Africa) - FLD through Digital Photos.....	22
3.3 Participatory Video – Introduction & Example .....	23
3.4 Participants’ Documentation of the Workshop.....	24
<b>4. Field Study to Mukono District.....</b>	<b>26</b>
4.1 General Description .....	26
4.2 Lessons learned .....	26
4.2.1 Group 1 .....	26
4.2.2 Group 2 .....	27
4.2.3 Plenary.....	27
<b>5. Participatory Monitoring &amp; Evaluation of FLD .....</b>	<b>28</b>
5.1 Output .....	28
5.1.1 Blue Group .....	28
5.1.2 Green Group.....	29
5.1.3 Yellow Group .....	29
5.1.4 Red Group .....	30
<b>6. FLD Synthesis .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>7. Open space .....</b>	<b>34</b>
7.1 Intellectual Property Rights .....	34
7.2 Participation and Representation .....	34
7.3 Joint Follow-up Action.....	34
<b>8. Action planning .....</b>	<b>35</b>
8.1 Individual Action Plans.....	35
8.2 Joint Follow-Up Action Plan: .....	35
8.2.1 Short Term .....	35
8.2.2 Continued Networking.....	36
8.2.3 Long term.....	37

8.2.4	Plenary discussion on the above (joint) action plans.....	38
<b>9.</b>	<b>Workshop Closure.....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>10.</b>	<b>Annex 1 - Workshop Programme.....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>11.</b>	<b>Annex 2 - Participants' Expectations.....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>12.</b>	<b>Annex 3 - Terms of Reference for the Field Study .....</b>	<b>43</b>
12.1	Introduction.....	43
12.2	Main study themes .....	43
12.3	Organization of the study .....	43
<b>13.</b>	<b>Annex 4 - Individual Action Plans.....</b>	<b>44</b>
13.1	World Neighbours.....	44
13.2	ILEIA .....	46
13.3	CEFORD .....	47
13.4	BOLIVIA AGRECOL .....	48
13.5	PELUM – ZAMBIA .....	49
13.6	ARTE NATURA .....	50
13.7	ACDEP- Northern Ghana.....	51
13.8	WOUGNET.....	53
13.9	Environmental Alert.....	54
13.10	Africa 2000 Network.....	55
13.11	ARIS / QAS-VOUCHER SYSTEM .....	56
13.12	SLUF/PROLINNOVA Ethiopia .....	57
13.13	SATNET .....	58
13.14	SACDEP – Kenya .....	59
13.15	GINKS.....	60
13.16	SAIPRO / PELUM (TZ).....	61
13.17	Priority Support Programme (CARE) .....	62
13.18	PROLINNOVA Farmer Support Group South Africa.....	63
13.19	PELUM UGANDA .....	64
13.20	PROLINNOVA International.....	65
13.21	Oxfam Novib.....	66
<b>14.</b>	<b>Annex 5 - Workshop Evaluation .....</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>15.</b>	<b>Annex 6 - List of Workshop Participants.....</b>	<b>69</b>

## List of Acronyms:

A2N	Africa 2000 Network
C.A.O	Communication and advocacy officer
CBOs	Community based organizations
E.A	Environmental Alert
FFS	Farmer Field Schools
FLD	Farmer Led Documentation
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MAAIF	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industries and Fisheries
MOs	Member organizations
NAADs	National Agricultural Advisory Services
NARO	National Agriculture Research Organization
NGOs	Non Governmental Organizations
PV	Participatory video
TORs	Terms of reference
QAS	Question Answer Service
PELUM	Participatory Ecological Land Use Management
ACDEP	Association of Church Development Projects
ARIS	Agricultural Research and Information Systems
PROLINNOVA	Promoting Local Innovations
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
CELAC	Collection Exchange on Local Agricultural Content
FSG	Farmer Support Group
WOUGNET	Women of Uganda Network

## **1. Introduction**

From 6th to 10th November 2006, PELUM Uganda, PROLINNOVA and Oxfam NOVIB organized an exchange and capacity building workshop on farmer-led documentation (FLD) in sustainable agriculture and natural resource management (NRM). During this workshop 20 participants came together to discuss what constitutes a sustainable FLD process and how they can promote and facilitate the successful implementation of such a process in their own field of work.

### **1.1 About this Report**

This report holds the results of the workshop. After a description of the workshop background, objectives and parties involved (Chapter 1) an introduction of farmer-led documentation is given in Chapter 2, as well as views of participants on the topic. Subsequent chapters contain summaries and discussion output of case studies presented at the workshop (Chapter 3), feedback from a field study to farmers in Mukono district (Chapter 4) and participants' ideas about monitoring and evaluation of FLD processes (Chapter 5). After a recap of an Open Space session where various topics were discussed (Chapter 6) the results of a plenary synthesis on farmer-led documentation is given (Chapter 7). Individual participant action plans as well as joint follow up actions are presented in Chapter 8, followed by some remarks on the workshop closure.

Annexes contain an overview of the workshop programme, participants' expectations, individual action plans, workshop evaluation results and the list of workshop participants.

### **1.2 Workshop Background and Rationale**

It is increasingly clear that successful development of sustainable agriculture and natural resource management (NRM) depends on the effective interaction between knowledge and experiences of local farmer communities with expertise of development agents. NGOs, CBOs and other development organizations therefore seek to mobilize, document and share local knowledge as an important part of the development process. In many cases, however, this is done in an extractive mode, where outsiders control the process and local knowledge and experiences are stored in their offices.

There are isolated experiences with what we call "farmer-led documentation" as an empowering process in which local communities take the lead role in the documentation process and where results are used by community members for purposes of internal learning (within the community) and exchange between communities (horizontal sharing) and communities, development agents and policy makers (vertical). These documentation and knowledge sharing processes assist in making relevant experiences and good practices at community level visible as a starting point for further farmer-led agricultural development.

Some FLD processes make effective use of traditional methods and media such as storytelling, drama or dance whereas others have introduced successfully the use of modern ICTs including digital photo and video. Though development agents show an increasing interest in farmer-led documentation, little is known of the best designs of such documentation processes, and the available and appropriate media and their use, including those making use of modern ICTs. Another set of important questions relate to the impacts of farmer-led documentation, how farmer-led documentation has led to knowledge spread, a wider development process and ultimately to livelihoods improvements. PELUM-Uganda (Participatory Ecological Land Use Management), PROLINNOVA (Promoting Local Innovation) and Oxfam NOVIB have therefore joined hands to organize a workshop to start answering these questions.

### 1.3 Workshop Objectives

#### 1.3.1 Overall Objective

To facilitate the exchange between representatives of PELUM, Oxfam NOVIB and PROLINNOVA partners (as well as other organisations) involved in FLD and NRM and reinforce their capacities for local community-led knowledge mobilisation and sharing.

#### 1.3.2 Specific Objectives

- To increase the knowledge of the participants on the role of local knowledge, its mobilisation and sharing in and between communities and between a community and policy makers, in agricultural development.
- To share and assess and analyse how different traditional and modern media can be used for FLD and develop lessons on the use of such documentation.
- To encourage PELUM, Oxfam NOVIB and PROLINNOVA partners to integrate FLD efforts/methods into their regular development programmes.
- To facilitate learning between the participants and through them, between their organisations, during the workshop as well as afterwards.

### 1.4 Workshop Methodology

During the workshop many different methods and tools for dialogue and learning were used, all with a high level of involvement of and interaction with participants. For example small breakout groups and plenary feedback and discussion, world café and open space sessions, gallery walks (with participants' individual flip chart action plans) and a market place. Volunteer participants were involved in daily workshop evaluations.

Different media for documentation were used by participants themselves to document workshop outcome throughout the week, e.g. pictures, audio recordings, video, written text and presentation slides. Breaks provided space for informal dialogue and networking.

An overview of the workshop programme can be found in Annex 1.

### 1.5 Participants

Participants came from; Bolivia, Ethiopia, Ghana, The Netherlands, Kenya, Lesotho, Mexico, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia. 16 of the participants were male, 4 female. An overview of all participants' names and contact details is provided in Annex 6.

#### 1.5.1 Market Place

A market place on day 2 of the workshop gave participants and organizers the opportunity to introduce themselves and their projects in more detail and provided space for networking.

- ACDEP (Association of church development projects in northern Ghana) showcased several publications and videos of stories about farmer groups in their meetings, from their resource library.
- Africa 2000 Network (A2N) comprises of 12 National Organizations (NOs) working together on a catalytic programme which supports local communities to develop the practice of Participatory Development Management (PDM) with a



focus on achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Innovations displayed at the this market included: mount sack growing i.e. growing of tomatoes and yams in a sack of soil; village mapping where community problems are identified; water retaining methods; monitoring team roster which is a tool used in their libraries; and different versions of their Tsunami newsletter.

- AGRECOL Andes is supporting farmers to share their knowledge through the use of ICTs. Many documentation has been produced about their method of supporting farmers in using ICTs to document their knowledge. Material in English and Spanish, text, images, CD-ROMs and DVDs were provided.
- Arte Natura - a civil society organization working in the Chiapas region in Mexico - had its best practices documented.
- Environmental Alert is involved in sustainable land use and soil management in Wakiso district. It won a global award for environment sustainability and displayed a variety of information about its activities like; farmer field schools bulletins, video tapes, environmental alert magazines and documented information.
- GINKS whose activities involved a task team to capture information on computer and video which are provided at the ICT centre.
- LEISA is a network involved in resource sharing of sustainable agricultural activities and distributes its information worldwide. It displayed information on books, DVD's, and magazines
- LRAP from Lesotho displayed information on livelihoods through sustainable agriculture programme. They basically prepare farmers training manuals.
- Oxfam Novib KIC (Knowledge Infrastructure with and between Counterparts) project. Initiative to promote learning and the sharing of knowledge and experience between and with the over 800 counterparts in the Oxfam Novib network, the counterparts in the Oxfam international network, and other alliances and networks. More information [www.oxfamkic.org](http://www.oxfamkic.org).
- PELUM Uganda is a network of 27 member organizations working in sustainable agriculture. The network builds the capacity of its members to effectively carry out their programs. Several PELUM publications were displayed including Ground Up magazines which are regionally published by PELUM Association.
- PELUM Zambia is the membership organization working towards sustainable agriculture, capacity building advocacy, information sharing, gender and HIV activities. It displayed several publications and resources.
- PROLINNOVA is an NGO-initiated programme to build a global learning and advocacy network on promoting local innovation in ecologically-oriented agriculture and NRM. Organizations from several PROLINNOVA country programmes were present at the market place, sharing their material and engaging in dialogue with the visitors. Besides this, the market stand of PROLINNOVA offered publications and posters, regarding initiatives implemented in Uganda (by PROLINNOVA Uganda) and on an international level.
- SATNET market provides sustainable alternatives for a sharing platform for all trainers, civil society organizations, government departments. All interested persons are encouraged to contribute articles geared towards farmer empowerment.
- SLUF (Sustainable Land Use Forum) from Ethiopia is involved in indigenous agro forestry practices and their implications on sustainable land use and natural resources management. It deals in integration of forests, fruits, horticulture crops and cereals. It showcased its publications and videos.
- WOUGNET is a Ugandan based women network for information and communication technologies (ICTs) as tools to share information and address challenges collectively. It displayed a variety of its publications and resources.

### **1.5.2 Participants' Expectations**

At the start of the workshop, participants expressed their individual expectations of this workshop. An overview of all expectations can be found in Annex 2.

## 1.6 Workshop Steering Group

The workshop Steering Group consisted of the following members:

- Mrs. Stella Lutalo (PELUM Uganda)
- Mrs. Emebet Wuhib-Mutungi (Africa 2000 Network / PELUM Uganda)
- Mr. Nicholas Senyonjo (UEEF / PELUM Uganda)
- Mr. Laurens van Veldhuizen (PROLINNOVA)
- Mrs. Dorine Rüter (PROLINNOVA)
- Ms. Nicole Metz (Oxfam NOVIB)

## 1.7 About the Organizers

PELUM Association (Participatory Ecological Land Use Management - [www.pelumrd.org](http://www.pelumrd.org)) is a regional network of civil society organizations in east, central and southern Africa. The PELUM Association, one of the partners of Oxfam NOVIB, was launched in 1995 and is now working in 10 countries in eastern, central and southern Africa region. PELUM Uganda aims to build the capacity of member organizations and small farmer organizations in promoting sustainable agriculture and food security for better community livelihoods through networking, research, advocacy, gender and participatory approaches. Through its involvement with member organizations, which are directly supporting farmers, as well as involvement with the ESAFF-Uganda, PELUM Uganda strives to promote farmer-to-farmer interaction and exchange. An exchange and capacity building workshop on FLD will support this aim.

PROLINNOVA (an NGO-facilitated international programme in 9 countries - [www.prolinnova.org](http://www.prolinnova.org)) aims to promote local innovation in ecologically oriented agriculture and natural resource management (NRM). Its focus is on recognizing the dynamics of indigenous knowledge and learning how development agents can strengthen the capacities of farmers to adjust to changing conditions. As part of these efforts, PROLINNOVA partners (in each country including government, research, education, and extension organizations) aim to explore FLD and support the implementation of good documentation practices. First experiences being very promising (a/o using ICT such as digital video) a need was identified to take stock of innovative experiences elsewhere and assess their potential in strengthening PROLINNOVA's efforts. A workshop was therefore proposed to review those experiences and build the capacities of participants to use them in their programmes.

Oxfam NOVIB's goal is to promote a global society in which the social-economic contradictions between poor and rich are overcome, in which the world's prosperity is divided justly and in which people and population groups can get to know and respect each other's cultures, and co-operate on the basis of shared responsibility and mutual solidarity to benefit their development. Oxfam NOVIB is affiliated to Oxfam International, a growing number of now twelve development organizations working in partnerships and supporting around 4000 counterparts and alliances in around 100 countries. In 2005 Oxfam NOVIB worked with 854 counterparts, and supported 1,061 projects, always focusing on the rights-based approach.

In 2005, Oxfam NOVIB initiated the project Knowledge Infrastructure with and between Counterparts (KIC). Involvement in the FLD workshop is part of Oxfam NOVIB's activities in the context of that project. Further information: [www.oxfamnovib.nl](http://www.oxfamnovib.nl) or [www.oxfamkic.org](http://www.oxfamkic.org).

## 2. Introduction to Farmer-led Documentation (FLD)

### 2.1 Opening Remarks

Participants were welcomed to the workshop by Ms. Mary Jo Kakinda (Chair person PELUM Uganda) and Mr. Kalule Sewaali, Commissioner of Farm Development., Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industries and Fisheries. Both stressed that FLD is an important approach to documentation used to promote sustainable development in farming activities. In his opening speech Mr. Sewaali highlighted a few issues of importance to (the context of) the workshop.

- To promote the search for local innovations as an exchange of ideas between different farmer groups should be promoted and facilitated. Groups and clusters of farmer innovators are to be built and strengthened.
- On a more institutional level, we need to work with government systems to implement innovations and policies with partners. To achieve this, NGO work should be monitored for resource practices and different organizations should work together, look for support and share experiences. Supporting this, a policy needs to be created for the system for financial support, sharing benefits and innovations and documentation of the process.

### 2.2 Overview of FLD Aspects

To come to a common understanding of FLD, a brief introduction on different aspects (why, what, whom, how) was given by Mrs. Dorine Rüter (PROLINNOVA). Below you find a summary, starting with a draft definition.

*FLD can be seen as an empowering process in which local communities take the lead role in the documentation process and where the results are used by the community members for purposes of internal learning and exchange between communities, and between a community and development workers / policy makers.*

Farmers develop the knowledge required for their work through their own experience with agricultural practices and management of natural resources. To share this knowledge with others, e.g. for educating a future generation of farmers, there is a need to externalize the knowledge that is locked inside the farmer's head. This requires the farmer to make this implicit knowledge (in his/her head) explicit and then pass it on to others, for example by demonstrating a practice.

Documentation of this knowledge-made-explicit helps to capture the information and bring it across to other people. It provides opportunities for several people to learn from the experience of one farmer. Proper documentation maintains its value in the future, so that it can be reused, making learning and education more efficient.

Reasons for farmers to document their own knowledge are that:

- Presence of traditional knowledge of sustainable agriculture and NRM has decreased, but gaining importance, due to environmental and health related circumstances;
- In an increasingly complex environment with multiple stakeholders, farmers are interested in communicating their needs to external stakeholders in an effective way;
- Farmers are looking for ways to spread their innovations.

There is an increased interest among development workers to leave the lead of documentation processes in the hands of farmers themselves. FLD amplifies the voice of farmers to express knowledge in their own words and their own vision. This in turn results in more effective development interventions. Another reason for looking at documentation from a farmer-led

perspective is the opportunities provided by new digital media, such as digital camera, video and other ICTs.

There are several types of knowledge that can be documented, some maybe better than others. It can be actual practices (yam cultivation, pig rearing) but also less practical knowledge, such as insight into a situation, concerns and point of view. Finally, one can share more abstract knowledge such as underlying values and cultures.

Several roles can be identified in a FLD process. Those taking the initiative (coming up with the approach, providing support) and those implementing the actual documentation (writing, drawing, and filming) are not always farmers. However, in order for a documentation process to be truly farmer-led, the decisions regarding if, when and how to document should be made by the farmers themselves. Leaving the lead at the farmer level while aiming for full involvement of all groups, including marginalized, can be a challenge for development workers.

The question of how to approach the documentation process is a complex one and was discussed during the workshop. Much depends on the objectives (why), the content (what), the people involved (who) and the target groups (for whom), but also on available resources, currently used communication methods and tools and the language. What is Important is to stay open minded towards documentation methods - both processes and tools, traditional and modern (e.g. song, play, text, video, pictures) - that are most appropriate for the context within which farmers live and work.

### 2.3 Views from participants



The FLD introduction was followed by a plenary discussion. Issues (e.g. questions, concerns) brought up during this discussion reflect participants' perception and interest regarding FLD and the context within which they are dealing with FLD processes.

**Process** - FLD can be a transformative process to bring about change in community empowerment. The process is implemented parallel to ongoing work and should be integrated in existing initiatives. It is a participatory methodology, which requires the involvement of farmers from inception. Clear definition or distinction between

the role of farmers and that of development workers is essential.

**Practice of FLD** - There are various roles: initiation of the documentation process, decision-making in content, managing the process and responsibility for the results. Identify appropriate tools to capture different types of information – statistics or cultural knowledge. Guard against creating artificial boundaries that restrict sharing of information. Degree of involvement of farmers – source of information and practical involvement in documenting farmer experiences; what are the stages of support until sole implementation of FLD is achieved?

Success can depend on the type of information – cultural information is sensitive and community members may not be willing to share. Farmers may be willing to share information about their problems and how they perceive solutions. Farmers' willingness to share information on their practice, skills requires an element of trust. Ownership of knowledge – need to clarify that the knowledge belongs to someone and will be attributed to the source; protection of farmer knowledge (intellectual property rights).

Ensure the environment is appropriate for participation of all, especially marginalized groups. Identification of needs of the different categories or groups within the community can be relevant. Interest of the group doesn't have to be equal to individual interest. Cultural context requires attention (e.g. being cautious of hindering factors such as status, gender issues). What level of intervention from NGOs is accepted?

**Sustainability** - There needs to be a purpose and clear motivation to document by the farmers (e.g. marketing, promotion of their products). Safeguarding continuity beyond the support of development workers has its implications regarding the point at which farmers are involved in the process. Collective action needs to be encouraged to sustain a FLD process.

**Challenges** are lack of resources and low education levels.

### 3. Case Studies - FLD in Practice

#### 3.1 Introduction

To acquire insight into the practice of FLD, case studies were presented and discussed and participants were provided with the opportunity to experiment with documentation techniques themselves.

Before starting with the presentation and discussion of case studies, a brain storm exercise was held during which several methods and approaches of FLD were brought up. Participants, especially those that would not be presenting their case during the workshop, were invited to contribute ideas from their own experience with farmer-led (or participatory) documentation. Some results:

- It was observed that farmers can easily use the digital camera if taught. However it was not easy for farmers to make slideshow presentations (e.g. PowerPoint). They could be educated on how to use these.
- The added value of the work of NGOs should not be overlooked. There is a need to strike a balance between the role of NGOs and farmers.
- There should be a way of determining whether the methods of documentation are feasible or not for local communities.

Since it was not possible for everybody to share their case studies the previous day, members were requested to highlight the different methods of farmer-led documentation they use which would be discussed later. The following are some examples from the experience of participants:

- In one NGO, development workers go to farmers and record their experiences on video tapes; farmers also give answers to community radios and send recorded tapes to farmer groups. It was noted that the NGO preferred community radios because it was a two way communication between the farmers and their organizations.
- Radio cassette players were seen as good tools for FLD since it was possible for farmers to have a player/recorder at their disposal. The organization's target was to teach farmers how to use the radio and do the recordings themselves for resource sharing.
- One experience mentioned a pioneer group in the late 80s which used drama to perform in local communities and villages. When it proved to be expensive to move this group around the work of the drama group was captured on video and taken to other communities instead. A question raised was how such communities would be empowered to use the videos and carry out community activities themselves.
- Another experience involved an NGO entering a village and using PRA tools to identify farmers' needs and prioritize needs accordingly. After the above process, a farmer extension facilitator is identified for further training on specific skills required by farmers, and later demonstrates those skills to farmers. If the process works they document it and knowledge is passed to the rest of the farmer groups.
- Another approach used by one NGO in Kenya is by holding farmer field days where a demonstration of the local farm field varieties are identified and they directly talk in to farmers to understand what they have processed. They also identify the best framers from those demonstrations and document their work.
- Another experience came from Kenya (still in the process of formulation), whereby farmers access information from the Internet developed by Pan-Germany online information on chemical control. Pan-Germany's rationale was to check the relevance and applicability of this information to farmers. If the information is applicable, it is sent back to the organization and there is a feedback process which later leads to process implementation. They are trying to set up a

community centre where farmers can share experiences, and learn by using flip charts, consultations and inquiry whether there is a solution to problems in using the above documentation process.

### **3.2 Case Study Presentations & Discussion**

During the workshop six participants had the opportunity to present a case. Participants were invited to discuss with the presenter as well as with each other, making contributions from their own experience, keeping in mind that sharing ideas is the key to learn from each other.

Cases presented were;

- AGRECOL Andes (Bolivia) - Knowledge sharing through ICTs
- Africa 2000 Network (Uganda) - Community libraries
- ACDEP (Ghana) - Participatory video
- NAADS (Uganda) - Collection Exchange on Local Agriculture Content
- Environmental Alert (Uganda) - Farmer Field Schools
- ARIS (Uganda) - Question & Answer Voucher Service
- PROLINNOVA (South Africa) - Digital cameras

#### **3.2.1 AGRECOL Andes - Knowledge sharing through ICTs**

Mr. Luis Carlos Aguilar (project leader) of AGRECOL Andes shared the experience of his organization with facilitating farmers' knowledge sharing through the use of ICTs.

AGRECOL Andes is a regional information centre based in Cochabamba, Bolivia. Focusing on agro-ecology and the sustainable use of natural resources, it aims to share information and to develop the capabilities of different actors. This includes supporting the analysis and documentation of field experiences, especially local initiatives. AGRECOL Andes gives priority to the recovery and documentation of local knowledge, without overlooking the importance of outside knowledge (Piepenstock et al, LEISA Magazine, March 2006).

ICTs such as video, sound tapes and slide show presentations are used to facilitate documentation of knowledge. Use of digital cameras has been found to be the most effective means. Images are important to keep the collective memory of a community alive, and photography is increasingly contributing to this.

Four initial components of farmer-led documentation using digital technologies are:

Identification of local facilitators (i.e. digital camera and computer operators).

- Ensuring the digital/computer operators are suitably equipped to operate. Agreement on methods employed for collecting, editing and spreading information, such as drawings, leaflets, slide show presentation.
- Providing value of the media and presentation by including the community in a critical analysis of the information and presentation.
- Spreading the information further to other communities and investigating negative or positive reactions.

Some challenges and lessons:

- Local organizations were provided with a computer if they were willing to buy a digital camera themselves. The organizations also provided housing facilities for the equipment.
- Important condition: people's understanding of systems of information gathering, collation and dissemination and their own place in these systems.
- Involvement of local authorities stimulated wider interest and adds importance to the undertaking.

#### **Notes from the discussion**

### *Advantages*

- User-friendly
  - This case was considered a true example of Farmer Led Documentation
  - The method is visual, practical, and simple (easy to learn, understand and interpret). It is farmer-friendly and offers a very good practical learning experience by involving farmers in capturing and documenting their experiences
  - The outputs can easily be replicated and stored for use by farmers and other development workers.
  - It is participatory - involving women and men, children and adults and educated and uneducated people.
- Asset accumulation and ownership
  - Farmers own and are responsible for the equipment
  - Farmer involvement in the documentation process creates a sense of ownership
  - Makes information (participatory videos) on farmer experiences readily available for use by researchers and other development actors involved in advocacy on pro-farmer agricultural policies.
  - NGO work with farmer organizations to document experiences and the process enhances partnership, trust and collective responsibility
- Knowledge and skills development
  - Through this method farmers are exposed to new information technology and acquire knowledge and skills in ICT
  - It offers an opportunity for farmers to reinforce their knowledge by explaining the digital illustrations and photographs
  - It may be used to trigger sharing of tacit (indigenous knowledge and culture) information which can then be captured and documented
  - Promotes posterity
  - Farmers learn to use equipment for other events outside farming – to capture social events
- Storage, retrieval and use of information
  - Durable information (soft and hard copy)
  - Documentation outputs can be used for income generation (multipurpose)
  - Reference purposes (information can easily be retrieved and stored)

### *Disadvantages*

- The technology is expensive (digital camera, computer, printer) and difficult to upscale
- All equipment requires energy (to transfer photo images to computers, print, or disseminate on the Internet)
- Some important information may not be captured using camera e.g. market information
- Most rural areas have limited information infrastructure and also do not have electricity which makes it difficult scale up
- Equipment is delicate may require maintenance and repair (and additional costs)
- Requires skills training to learn how to use the ICT equipment
- Control on appropriate use of ICT equipment (for learning rather than entertainment)

### *Lessons learnt*

- Farmers can effectively learn and use ICTs
- Farmers were anxious, motivated and excited

#### *Issues of clarification*

- How do farmers use the documented material?
- What is the role of the NGO staff? Often NGOs do most of the background work on documentation but there is need to strike a balance between the role of the farmers and NGOs
- To what extent do the farmers contribute to the sustainability the project?
- To what extent is editing of documents realistically done by the farmers themselves?
- How are the groups organized?
- What happens to the equipment after the project phase?
- How is the replication of the documentation taken on board?
- Usefulness of the documented information versus experience sharing with other non project direct beneficiaries
- Why provide free equipment for farmers – cost sharing of equipment with farmers?

Need to determine whether this method is feasible for the typical African local community. Some participants did not think this was feasible due to lack of power and expenses.

### **3.2.2 Africa 2000 Network – Community Libraries**

Ms. Ritah Lumala (Programme Assistant) presented the experience of Africa 2000 Network (A2N) with community libraries.

Using the participatory development management approach (PDM), A2N supports small-scale farmers with their agricultural activities, from planning to implementation. Part of the activities concerns the facilitation of farmers in documenting their activities. For example, farmers document number of seedlings and harvested products, but also the cultivation methods used. This helps them to link their input in terms of products and farm activities with specific result and thus learn from their own experience. The latter is done within community farmer groups, where farmers come and share ideas in community gatherings.

Documented material is stored in the community library. Farmer innovators are challenged to document their knowledge and submit to the library. Furthermore, the library holds action plans and proposals of previous activities. Libraries are hosted in free spaces in existing buildings. There is no focus on use of ICTs due to lack of power in rural areas.

#### **Notes from the discussion**

##### *Library*

- What is the impact of the library? Are these libraries in demand by the farmers? What other methods of motivations are in place i.e. what motivates the farmers to use the libraries?

##### *Involvement of Farmers*

- Are farmers doing all the documentation? How often is information updated?
- Capacity building of farmer – librarian, is he self-elected?
- Are farmers in control of the content, and do they determine what is to be put on the shelf?
- Where is the farmer participant in the library issues and the farmer documentation?
- Is it better to have farmer discussions than the library?

##### *Language*

- In which language is this information, and how do farmers know there is information?

##### *Use of Documented Material*

- If farmers are recording information how do they learn from these records? Are farmers re-using this knowledge before starting a new process e.g. before seedlings.
- Combine written information with visual documents, pictures, and video.

#### *Sustainability*

- What is the sustainability of the above approach?
- Are there conflicts with local supervisors?
- Is it all voluntary work? Is the librarian's work combined with farming? If so this could be constraining as regards time allocation.
- How is the sharing of experiences on the library functions? Identify areas of improvement.
- Link of these libraries to government and local government sectors in relation to local planning. Link libraries with local schools and teachers for sustainability. Use of existing groups and their plans. And what are the contributions of research centers to the library?
- What provisions are in place to network the library with USAF?

### **3.2.3 ACDEP - Participatory Video**

Mr. Norbert Apentibadek (Programme Officer) of ACDEP presented the experience of the Association of Church Development Projects (ACDEP) with the use of participatory video (PV) in an FLD context.

ACDEP is a development agency working in rural areas in northern Ghana. Part of their activities concerns the use of participatory technology development (PTD) tools. To sustain the lessons learned and end-products of the PTD process and other development experiences of farmers, ACDEP began the implementation of a PV project.

An example is the documentation on *siella*, a local mineral lick in northern Ghana. The following steps formed the basis of the PV project:

- Introduction of team members and essence of documentation.
- Demonstration and learning; farmers in a group were trained on how to handle and manipulate a camera.
- Practising the video exercise by filming colleagues performing various activities.
- Participants grouped together to watch their first product (the footage).
- Team-facilitated planning sessions for farmers to decide on what to film, where, how and by whom.
- Participants grouped together to preview the product.
- Team and community groups discussed and mapped out when to play back edited film to the entire community.

Some challenges were the illiteracy and difficulty to learn camera manipulation, editing limitations by farmers (as result of high illiteracy) and seasonality of farming and other activities (causing problems in terms of timing). Some benefits were the capacity building and adoption of PV for documenting success stories and an increased learning and sharing among farmers.

#### **Notes from the discussion**

##### *PV Approach*

- Who initiated documentation using PV? Which group selected PV as the best means of documenting farm experiences? Is it ACDEP or the farmers group? How do you rank the community's communication method preferred?
- How about the sustainability, ownership and finance issue of this approach?

##### *Content*

- What makes the approach different from other types of documentation? Is there no imposition on farmers as regards what kind of documentation and who is to interview? Do farmers determine what will be included?
- How do farmers determine the relevant information to be captured (filmed)? They may choose non-useful information. Do you discuss edit final editing work with them to remove irrelevant information? If communities wanted to continue with videos, do they want all the innovations to be captured?

#### *Making the Video*

- It was noted that video documentation was time consuming, and therefore needed much documentation before the end of the program.
- ACDEP mentioned editing limitations. Do limitations come from instrumental or conceptual problems?
- After showing the final video and the community comes up with questions and identified gaps, what is the procedure to identify those gaps at earlier stages?
- Gaps were covered with audio commentary, who did the commentary? Where farmers leading the identification of gaps and writing comments?
- The repackaging of information is very important because the level of literacy in the villages is very high. People cannot read the English language and they should think of ways of repackaging that information.
- It was observed that the capacity building of participants at the village level should be continued.
- Farmers don't own the equipment they only own the video tapes. Methods of ownership of the video equipment should be developed further.

#### *Language*

- The translation issue was raised and members were wondering why farmers don't talk in their own language. Is English the right language to translate to for re-use of material in other communities? If used in local communities, then why translate? And can PV break the illiteracy barrier? It was observed that one doesn't need to know English to toggle a button.

#### *Use of Video End-Product*

- How do you use the videos? Are they used for extension purposes only and later taken back to the centre? Is the service given to partners only, what about farmers?
- How are videos showed to other communities? How the frequency of the shows and what is determines this? It was suggested that video exchanges between communities could be developed.
- Do you think videos will be the best method to disseminate/document information? If its one centre, it's okay but it becomes problematic if it's to be shown to many communities. Other NGOs might need to upgrade their centers. If facilities for showing videos are not fully available or optimally used; they should use existing commercial movie theatres in the villages. The problem of movie theatres i.e. by commercial videos where farmers pay 200/= for accessing the video. This is something to think about in future. How is the film industry in Ghana and its possible lines of development?
- What is the purpose of a village community documentation centre? Does it store video tapes only or even other materials? Who will manage the centre?
- What strategy do you have to ensure that other farmers - that are not members - benefit? It was established that presently there is no strategy. However there is an information centre at the secretariat.
- The video is linked to PTD process, how do you expect to improve the PTD process by videos?

### 3.2.4 NAADS - Collection Exchange on Local Agriculture Content

Mr. Yusuf Kiwala (Information Specialist) presented the experience of National Agricultural Advisory Services Secretariat (NAADS) with collection exchange on local agriculture content (CELAC).

The general aim of NAADS is to increase farmer access to information, knowledge and technology for profitable agricultural production. NAADS is utilizing ICTs, such as radio and mobile phone to ease the process of knowledge sharing. Work is done at national, district, sub-county, parish and village level. The CELAC approach for knowledge sharing consists of various components: the knowledge forum, relevant ICTs (such as mobile phones and radios), local knowledge brokers and local knowledge. Community based facilitators / knowledge brokers work between village and parish level and connect farmer groups with others. Knowledge forums are interactive local meetings where farmer groups convene. CELAC members document meeting outputs but do not interfere. Relevant local knowledge coming from these meetings is stored in a central database and distributed via mobile phone text messages, in audio format via community radios and through periodic newsletter distributed among community libraries. Newsletters are written every 2 months and cover information from different forums. Newsletters contain detailed messages, whereas mobile messages are for brief communications.

#### Notes from the discussion

##### *NAADS approach*

- Are poverty levels declining in NAADS areas? Aren't farmers constrained by being given few enterprises e.g. ground nuts growing for 3 years? The answer lies in zoning Uganda and having comparative production linked to markets.
- It was noted that farmer challenges dictated the terms of reference for service providers. A question was raised whether the service provider/farmer facilitator was paid only after farmers were satisfied with his/her work?

##### *Farmer involvement*

- Who writes the newsletter and in what language is it published? The issue of information distortion was raised. It was noted that scientific/technical jargon might creep in.
- What is the contribution to CELAC by farmers? Do they contribute because they expect bigger money?
- It was noted that farmers get to know their challenges through the forums. Documentation of knowledge forums is done by CELAC members. Why not farmer-led? Farmers should be empowered to document. Participants wondered whether NAADS could embrace farmers in the documentation processes just as they embraced them in information dissemination.
- It was observed that knowledge is good but emphasis should be put on the relevance of the content to farmers. Information is gathered on demand of farmers in the sense that the starting point is farmers' problems, expressed at the knowledge forums.
- Documentation begins at the knowledge forum. How is the documentation during knowledge forums?

##### *Knowledge brokers*

- It was noted that women played a bigger role in knowledge brokerage than men.
- Are the knowledge brokers paid?

##### *Access to Information / Media*

- CELAC makes use of existing structures e.g. community library. The infrastructure was not the best as regards to the existing libraries. Suggestion was to use mobile information kits to package information and then pass on to different farmer groups for utilization.
- Who owns the community radios? Is it the private sector? Are farmers using the media tools for other purposes?

#### Sustainability

- How is sustainability ensured for this approach? Sustainability may be started by a contribution of 2% by farmers.
- NAADS was encouraged to network and partner with other development organizations which could provide content as well.

### 3.2.5 Environmental Alert - Farmer Field Schools

Mr. Joshua Zake Program Officer - Environment and Natural Resources shared the experience of Environmental Alert (EA) with Farmer Field Schools.

Land degradation is a major problem in Uganda, contributing to stagnant or declining agricultural productivity. Together with various partners, EA implemented a pilot project in Wakiso district using the Farmer Field School (FFS) approach. This increased the capacity and involvement of farmers in farming systems analysis (learning and observation) and technology development.

To include and enable farmers to document their findings, documentation activities were introduced, possible roles discussed, documentation tools developed (in a participatory way) and demonstrations held. Both farmers and facilitators of the FFS performed documentation activities and discussed results. Products such as fact sheets, policy briefs and fliers were developed on the bases of the information collected and distributed among the farmers to support them training others.

During the FFS, farmers were directly involved and participated in the following activities:

- Data collection and entry through season long observations, monitoring, analyses, plenary presentation and evaluation
- Documenting proceedings of FFS sessions and community workshops
- Respondents during baseline survey and impact studies
- Video shooting for documentaries
- Taking photographs
- Facilitating specific events (e.g. radio activities during World Environment Day)

#### Notes from the discussion

##### *FFS approach*

- Periodical reviews are carried out in the FFS process. Their role is to facilitate the process and come up with issues, and also involve the farmers to come up with an agenda where each one comes up with their own ideas.
- When one compares the two systems (the regular extension system and FFS), there is much deviation. To what extent are could principles of these systems be integrated? There is dialogue between the researchers and the National Research Organization (NARO) that piloted this approach in its projects. They are trying to establish whether this dialogue will work.

##### *Documentation process*

- Farmers had their priorities in food security and generating income and therefore they didn't take documentation as one of their priorities.
- How do you document role-plays, and songs? How do you document the whole process of farmers asking physical questions i.e. the case of pests? On the documentation processes, farmers use both drawings and data sheets. By using drawings for example, they establish what

the crop looked like during the activity and identify the problem i.e. whether it was infected or not.

- Where do you store the information? Is it stored at the local level, by researchers or EA? Is there a library in the school or any person keeping documentation? Is this person able to know the materials documented and their subject content? A secretary keeps the documentation and farmers can access it any time. Secretaries are sensitized to keep such information.

#### *Farmer participation*

- Are tailored datasheets developed for participatory approaches? Is that possible? If he is talking of tailored data sheets, which means there is no participatory involvement.
- During monitoring and evaluation, is there an opportunity for farmers to determine what tools they want for documentation or are they restricted to tabular forms?
- Can farmers determine monitoring and evaluation and the documentation methods?
- Do you document the work processes in the farmer field schools? Are they farmer-led too?
- In terms of documentation Environmental Alert was taking the leading role and fewer opportunities were given to farmers although they involved them to some extent.
- On tailored datasheets, it was established that data sheets are simplified to suit farmer needs/requirements.
- During the monitoring process, they establish the exact needs of farmers and incorporate them according to their monitoring tools. By doing so, it becomes a participatory process.

#### **3.2.6 ARIS - Question & Answer Voucher Service**

Mr. Eria Bwana Simba (Information Officer) ARIS presented the experience of the recently launched Question and Answer Service Voucher System.

The Question Answer Service (QAS) voucher system for farmers is a demand driven, open, decentralized, and web-based communication and information system. Vouchers are used to turn farmers' information needs into demand for information. The vouchers are handed out to farmers to entitle them to ask questions of their choice and to get an answer from an expert.

A number of persons are involved to ensure that the service is provided to farmers. These have specific tasks that are geared towards delivering answers to the farmers. A web-based information and communication system is used to document the questions and answers and to facilitate communication between farmers and experts.

Steps in the QAS process:

- Donors (financing agency) define the type of service, the target group, the thematic scope and the scale of the operation. Project Managers and service providers work out QAS guidelines that define actors, tasks, cost, scope and procedures of the service. The Rural Universe Network (RUN) System Administrator defines the projects on the RUN platform according to the QAS guidelines.
- Donors put the money in the bank. Vouchers are handed out to the client (farmer).
- The farmer will choose a field agent who will help him to formulate his question, fill the request form and to take pictures. The field agent carries the information request to the telecentre. The telecentre (Rural Information Broker - RIB) publishes the request on the web in his RUN e-journal.
- The answer service checks the RUN web site for information requests. The answer service identifies a national expert. The expert provides elements of response according to the QAS guidelines. The answer service puts the information in appropriate format and publishes the answer (receipt) in his RUN e-journal. Other people from the information society will read the information. They might add information comments.
- The telecentre (RIB) downloads and prints the answer. The telecentre (RIB) will hand the information to the field agent. The field agent will bring the answer to the farmer.

- The field agent will help the farmer to evaluate and rate the quality of the answer according to the QAS guidelines. The telecentre (RIB) will fill the evaluation form on the RUN platform. It will also drop a printed copy at the local archive. The controlling agent checks the participating RUN e-journals to verify if services were provided according to the guidelines. He will use the RUN accounting backend to keep a record of provided services and payments.

Farmer involvement includes the following:

- Farmers own the vouchers
- They identify the Field Agent (should be a fellow farmer) to assist them publish their requests
- They evaluate the response as to its usefulness and relevance
- They keep a local archive of the questions and answers at the community centre.

### **Notes from the discussion**

#### *QAS process*

- What is the project area coverage? How many target families?
- How much is the value of one voucher? How do you select farmers to be given a voucher?
- How are the questions selected? Who interprets questions for farmers? Is the quality of interpretation verified to have the correct information from farmers? The model is based on farmers taking as many photographs as possible while the researcher takes physical samples and all the information on the ground. The field agent takes on an expert role here, to gather questions and bring them forward, and also take soil samples and measure their suitability for agricultural purposes. The organization prepares field agents for regional development, purposes of coping, and knowledge of researchers.
- What is the relationship between technical issues and other issues like marketing, considering the farmers' interests?
- What is the maximum time given to the whole process until the answer is given and how long does it usually take, in practice?
- Are there any systems to verify the solutions given to farmers? Which ones are they?
- The project has a strong donor support, will it be sustainable?

#### *Sustainability / Links with other initiatives*

- Participating members requested the researchers to summarize what they think will be a way forward and to take capacity building seriously. It was noted that the questions being raised would lead to a new precedent for the research agenda in Uganda.
- What is the role of the extension service providers and researchers? Do you bypass them? How do you avoid duplication from the extension service providers?
- Agromisa has a similar project. Has ARIS consulted them? And is the project linked to other stakeholders like NAADS, NARO and MOA? There should be a way to discover how the various cases discussed at the workshop (such as QAS and the CELAC model) can compliment each other.

#### *Farmer involvement*

- ARIS is one of the research institutes in Uganda. It was established after realization that farmers had not been integrated into the research process. In the previous years, farmers were contributing minimally to this process. The project wants to go beyond the research system to a broader entity. The presentation of QAS seemed a good practical example because it showed a shift away from compiling programs in order to answer farmers' problems without the farmers being consulted.
- Who are the experts providing the answers/solutions? Are they researchers? If so, why are farmers not involved in finding a solution that will lead to their better understanding?

### 3.2.7 PROLINNOVA (South Africa) - FLD through Digital Photos

Mr. Thabani Nicholas Madondo (Farmer from Okhahlamba, Uthukela, KwaZulu Natal in South Africa and member of a Farmer Support Group) presented the experience of farmers of his Farmer Support Group (FSG) with the use of digital photography.

Mr. Madondo is currently involved in a project called Smallholder System Innovations in watershed management (SSI). Farmers involved in SSI are trained to document project activities in different ways. They use data books, digital camera and video. Data is recorded on rainfall, planting date and yield. Photo cameras are used in all farming activities such as trainings, farmers' days, farmer-to-farmer extension, as well as cultural events. Video is used for special events, but only by experts and not by farmers.

Farmers use their data books and the camera to monitor and evaluate their activities, from land preparation to planting, different growth stages and harvesting dates. Affordability of the cameras (e.g. obtaining multiple memory cards) is a challenge the farmers' experience.

All farmer groups in the region meet every three months to discuss, share ideas and experiences, and find solutions to their problems. Extension officers or group facilitators are sometimes asked for advice.

In the opinion of the farmers, documentation through pictures is good to maintain memories of the past and as encouragement to continue good practices. It helps uneducated, illiterate people, since it is easy to make and watch pictures. Through the photographs, farmers can easily recognize if a plant has a problem and how they should act upon that. The pictures can be used as a learning tool in farmer-to-farmer extension.

#### Notes from the discussion

##### *Data collection and processing*

- The rain gauge is used to measure rainfall. There are interpreters for the rainfall data. Questions regarding the data collection and processing were: Do farmers buy the weather equipment? Where do you store the information and how do you make use of these records (on rain fall, temperatures etc.)? Do researchers give advice on the use of this information? Are there improvements in production because of this used information?
- How do you integrate traditional ways of rainfall predictions to your recordings/data? Traditionally long ago there were rituals done to bring out the rains. But today much as they are performed rains still don't come.
- If only two languages are used for documentation, how do researchers understand? The report summary in English should also be translated in Zulu.
- How will this process be sustained after student research assistants withdraw? How will the program survive since most of the farmers were not educated? Is the facilitator currently being paid?
- It was stated that sustainability exists and when students go away, the institution remains. Records are also kept safely much as students leave. It was recommended that farmers should be trained to document using cameras and videos.
- It was observed that one camera for all the groups become problematic. Farmers appreciate the photographs however they don't have enough cameras. Therefore if farmers had cameras they



would do it themselves because it is the easiest way to document. Currently, farmers are using several memory cards in order to keep an individual photo collection of their farming activities, but keep costs of additional cameras low. However, there are still too little cards. What other alternatives are there for farmers to document their activities since cameras and cards are expensive?

#### *Farmer involvement*

- Where is the farmer's involvement in the project, e.g. in terms of ownership?
- How do you ensure that all farmers participate in recording and utilization of records? Some of the farmers who are affected by the rains participate and it is also a very small village.
- Recordings appeared technical and purposed for researchers. Researchers compile and write reports that are taken at the institute.

### **3.3 Participatory Video – Introduction & Example**

Participants viewed an introduction video about participatory video (PV) as a tool for empowerment of local communities. This video was an annex to the PV handbook developed by Insight (2006). Subsequently, an example of a PV end product was shown, i.e. a short video about pig rearing in Ghana, developed by COMPAS (2004) in the context of a PV training by Insight. Breakout group discussions followed, during which participants shared their (first) impressions of PV, as well as their observations about relevance and feasibility of the advocated methodology (games, storyboards, interviews, tools for participatory rural appraisal) and technology.

#### **Notes from the discussion**

##### *Impression of the pig rearing video*

- Most of the shoots were interesting, varying from long shoots, through medium shoots to close up shoots. There were also areas for improvement for example an interviewer should endeavor to be audible.
- It was observed that the quality of the pig video was good after little training. It also had great inspiration and was very clear.
- It was a practical demonstration that could be used to communicate effectively with local farmers through illustrations.
- The pig video if produced by farmers is very encouraging. The video was precise and to the point and participants should emulate such practices. However it seemed to have been produced professionally.
- Participants wondered whether the pig farmer made research on the animal feeds and passed the information to other farmers or it was his own initiative which he decided to apply.

##### *Impact*

- Images had a good impact and they called for attention. They showed testimonies and synthesized local experiences.
- Videos motivate and seem to make children happy. (This in response to a fragment with children.)

##### *Process of filming, editing*

- Prior preparations are very important before the filming process.
- Home video cameras seem easier to manage.
- Making a story board seem useful for any documentation process.

- An inspiring training exercise was when people from one community interviewed each other.
- It was noted that filming should have specific subjects with steady and unshakable techniques during filming, and the background/site selection should be clear and visible.
- Success stories should be documented in a farmer's own language and environment. Use subtitles to enable viewers who don't understand the local language to follow the process.

#### *Farmer involvement*

- It was essential for local people to participate in the development of the film. The videos were commended for their participatory nature. It was a good experience to see enthusiastic farmers participate in the process. The farmer's involvement in the documentation process was a critical issue because it ensures ownership of the documented product.
- It was noted that the community / group screenings were very important. Videos should be shown in communities (e.g. in an open forum) to decide on what to include and exclude. Sharing feedback on documented products also improves farmers' motivation. If such videos are first shown to farmers, it gives them enough confidence to open up and share their comments about the video. Farmers look at their participatory video footage, study them, and if they notice errors they come up with solutions for improvement.
- Farmers with information should train others because they understand each other better.
- If video filming is left to the farmers, it would be more interesting. Documentation is more inspiring to a farmer if carried out by a fellow farmer. Illiterate people can learn best and with interest when you allow them to learn as they practice.

### **3.4 Participants' Documentation of the Workshop**

During the week, participants created their own documentation of the workshop. Four groups each documented (part of) a workshop day and presented their results at the end of the week.

- One group used an audio device with recording function to briefly interview case presenters and participants. Pictures illustrated the day. Pictures and audio clips were combined into one product via a slide show presentation.
- Two groups joined forces and used a video camera to document case presentations and discussions as well as the field study to Mukono district. A cameraman supported the groups in managing the camera and microphone. Editing of the footage was also done by the cameraman, based on the input of the teams.
- The last group used written text and digital pictures to document workshop sessions. Text and pictures were brought together in one slide show presentation and supported by an oral elaboration.

Participants discussed their findings after this documentation exercise.

#### *Impact*

- Video easily captures non-verbal messages. However it was stated that this also depends on how one uses the equipment. Pictures if well packaged could be better than video.
- Sometimes documentation enables one to capture more than what you originally anticipated.

#### *Handling the tools*

- Equipment may determine the quality of documentation outcome.
- In absence of videos, one can use slides with sound accompanying.
- The combination of audio recording and pictures in a slide show presentation is an easy to use methodology. However it can only be done if the proper equipment (camera, audio recorder, computer with slide show software) is available.
- Videos should have contingency plans especially for the equipment.

## Process

- The different techniques were considered to be fully participatory.
- There is a need to plan for the document process, e.g. use story boards. Storyboard for planning will tell the cameraman what he/she needs to capture.
- Choose the criteria to select the questions.
- Be sensitive and considerate when working with people you visit. Some people are very shy and cannot respond easily.
- The editing is very important after capturing the film. Elaborate the steps of what you are going to do and then present the video later.
- Messages should have a specific focus.
- Teamwork spirit is the cream of success!
- It was a good and important exercise, which was good for their perception of documentation. However, time pressure should be looked at truly. If you want participants seriously involved in the documentation of a workshop, the programme should offer better and more possibilities to do it well

## 4. Field Study to Mukono District

Participants went on a field study to farmers in Mukono district to learn from them and get a practical view of what they had been discussing in the previous days; find out farmer's perception of farmer-led documentation; and what forms of communication farmers use to capture and share information. The participants were guided by Mr. Yusuf Kiwala of NAADS. Terms of reference for the field study are included in Annex 3.

### 4.1 General Description

Mukono trading centre holds 78 farmer groups. Key enterprises included: piggery, promotion of local chicken rearing, mushroom farming, vegetables, banana, vanilla and diary farming.

Service providers (SPs) are contracted by NAADS to teach farmers. The service providers train the lead farmer of the group. The key skills learnt are then passed on from the lead farmer to the rest. Farmers have improved on vegetable growing, water and sanitation technology. Farmers have also gained knowledge from other agencies besides NAADS i.e. knowledge on poverty alleviation, food security.

The service providers are asked to write lessons learnt and lecture notes for other farmers to use. Farmers decide when and how to schedule the lessons. Each farmer carries a notebook. Some farmers are trying to transcribe materials and lessons into audio-video for easy dissemination. A technical consultant will be hired to do the activity. They don't have a library but plan to have one set up by NAADS, however they wanted theirs to be independent from NAADS.

The groups' chairperson sources for information materials i.e. on prices and markets. Local technology for local chicken rearing was shown through records kept – they lacked serious documentation though.

One farmer group (Nezikokolima) started in 1997 had 20 women and 3 men. It engages in piggery and outside catering, an enterprises started as a self-help group effort. For their catering activities they have intentions of making flyers and business cards for connections.

Assisted by NAADS, work is allocated on rosters. Capacity building activities on constitution and proposal development are implemented. Records kept have helped to compare and monitor progress. The farmer group documents pictures of their activities and events in their library. The group is making use of songs to convey drama to elaborate on HIV/AIDS and modern farming.



### 4.2 Lessons learned

#### 4.2.1 Group 1

- There was no clear evidence of farmer-led documentation in all the groups visited. Record keeping is the only evident aspect of documentation. Most of the records are for business tracking.
- Farmers are absolute receivers of all information from the service providers. There should be a suggestion on redirecting the training process.

- More effort should be on documenting the processes for information sharing purposes. Notes taken during trainings are kept although there is little evidence that knowledge is transferred. It was noted that knowledge was only transferred from one person to another through sharing of experiences. Not much meaning and sharing of information takes place without physical contact. Practical experience on FLD needs to be in touch with farmers.
- Farmers had not been documenting from the onset due to lack of consolidated groups. Traditional documentation methods presently originate from schools and parents expand on them, as opposed to how this used to be.
- Poor reading and writing culture in Uganda makes it hard for libraries to thrive. Use of libraries can be encouraged, e.g. by organizing mobile libraries and information kits to stimulate learning. Other materials that use for example music is good for accessibility.
- What is our ultimate objective of FLD? Do we want farmers to learn?

#### **4.2.2 Group 2**

- Farmers keep their records in books and photographs. They keep minimal records of their activities, and do not do this consistently. They only record data, but not meaningful information. They do not know what the data books are used for. There should be mobilization for FLD i.e. data experiences, what and why and how? Some formats are top down and difficult to grasp by farmers given that most of them lack formal education. If farmers are motivated they can carry out documentation.
- There is need to let farmers document by themselves. Farmers visited were not true representatives of the typical rural smallholder farmers. If these farmers have problems with documentation, how about the smallholder farmers?
- The farmers are well organized, they share information in meetings and also they have mobilizers who spread information. Trust among farmers needs to be maintained. There is no continued passage of information to the young ones / children.
- They have the interest of using other methods such as video, but cannot afford those. Farmers have the opportunities for setting up a library. However the use of library will be questionable.
- Farmers need to be linked to other institutions for support for example in terms of accessing other resources and tools such as video and digital cameras.

#### **4.2.3 Plenary**

How do NGOs identify and establish what farmers want without depending on NGO ideas. Participatory video was one of the tools used followed by digital cameras. If farmers are encouraged to use the documentation tools they have in place they can be able to select what they prefer best.

## 5. Participatory Monitoring & Evaluation of FLD

In four breakout groups, participants discussed various aspects of monitoring and evaluation of FLD processes. All were asked to formulate criteria for successful implementation of FLD and build on that to come up with key indicators to measure output, outcome and impact of projects. Two points of attention were how to measure the sustainability of the FLD process and how to approach the M&E itself through a participatory methodology.

### 5.1 Output

#### 5.1.1 Blue Group

*Criteria for success:*

*Outputs:*

Documents

People involved

Geographical coverage

Objectives achieved

Skills acquired

Farmer identity clarified

*Outcome:*

*Impact:*

Improved level of skills

Finance for project

Increased replication rate

Improved knowledge transfer

*General:*

No of districts/regions covered

% of success

No of innovations

Participatory

Drama

Capacity building

Training

Of or PRA tools

*Sustainability:*

Farmer participation

Level of ownership

Economic improvement

*Key:*

No of facilitators/extension staff

No of experiences recorded

No of participants

*Farmers involved:*

TOTs

Group approach  
Self-evaluation

### 5.1.2 Green Group

*Outputs:*

People involved i.e. Groups or individual Indicators i.e. number of people like gender, types of groups.

- Joint discussions like; session meetings trainings, forums and visits. Also include number of sessions, frequency and people involved.
- Products i.e. video, audio book, posters drama report pictures, Also include type of product and quality

*Impacts:*

Higher education, empowerment

*Outcomes:*

Enhanced capacity of farmers for FLD like the diversity in documentation and quality

There is ownership for example the process and tools. Also look at the decision making; contribution of own resources and interest

Analysis i.e. the selection of tools; comparison like before, between cases and rankings

Learning – number of farmers adopting

Sharing – replication and scaling up

*Methodology:*

Documentation of the documentation

Framework/planning

Selection of tools approaches and frequencies, include capacity training

Analysis /reflection and feedback

### 5.1.3 Yellow Group

*Criteria for success:*

Farmer being on the forefront

Involvement of farmer in determining the content

Involvement of women farmers

Output understood from the beginning

Farmers should be able to demand services

Farmers should be contributors of knowledge

Empowerment of farmers and have confidence in their knowledge

Farmers should try and interact more between themselves and others

Farmers should independently own FLD processes

Farmers to link with others service providers

*Indicators:*

Increased number of women documenting their experiences

More tangible documentation

A well functioning group as a result of FLD

Knowledge from the farmers being used by other stakeholders

*Methodology:*

Use of participatory approach

The use of functional farmer groups  
Use of existing meetings  
Establish linkages with existing institutions e.g. schools  
Regular monitoring and evaluation  
Use of questionnaire  
Exchange visits  
One to interview

#### **5.1.4 Red Group**

*Criteria:*

*Outcome:*

Physical availability of different documentation e.g. visitor's books, photographs, DVDS, PVS, song scripts, drama

Presence of FLD tools at farmer centers e.g. Camera, video camera, note books and pens

Presence of organizational structure at community levels

Increased capacity of the farmers to document

*Impact (internal qualities):*

Increased knowledge sharing and transfer of skills

Increased income through improved practices and improved livelihoods

Increased civic expression of farmers

Increased capacity for optimal utilization of resources

Increased capacity for farmer initiatives and innovations

*Indicator (outcome)*

No of documents for own use

Number of documentations suitable for others

Number of people involved in the documentation process

Number of people involved in learning from experiences

Number of farming practices learnt from FLD

Extent to which productivity was increased (number of pigs, bags of beans)

Extent to which income was improved (monthly net income)

*Methodology:*

N/A

Include farmers in planning, objectives, outcomes and indicators.

## 6. FLD Synthesis

During the introductory sessions of the workshop (section 2.2), various aspects of FLD were discussed (why, what, by whom, for whom and how). At the end of the workshop, participants collaboratively identified key lessons for these and a number of additional perspectives (assumptions, key principles and sustainability). The output of this session provides an overview of their basic thinking on farmer-led documentation and can be used to further investigate opportunities, challenges and solutions of FLD.



### Assumptions behind FLD

- Farmers consider information a valuable resource
- Farmers and development workers are convinced that farmers can take a complete lead
- Farmers are as intelligent people as the best researchers
- Farmers can improve how they work
- Farmers are interested in FLD
- Farmers are documenting
- Readily available tools for FLD
- Development partners assist the farmers
- Contributes to the betterment of farmers situations
- Resources are available
- Farmers know the benefit of FLD
- Great demand/needs to move away from poverty trap
- Better outcome economically
- Policy support and for institutionalization of FLD

### Key principles of FLD

- Farmers decide if and when and how they document
- Clear purpose of FLD
- Develop principle of monitoring and evaluation for quality assurance
- Farmers groups functioning is a process to which FLD contributes - as a method and not as end in itself
- Participatory and gender equality
- Should accrue to some benefit to the farmer
- Full involvement of farmers in FLD, from the beginning
- FLD should be farmer centered and farmer driven
- Farmers decide language and tool (drawing, text)
- Learning while doing
- Willingness to share information to all

### Why (farmer-led) documentation

- So that they can use the FLD and improve/increase their knowledge
- To preserve local knowledge
- Assist them to share knowledge

- To pass down knowledge to their children
- Reference materials when training other farmers/groups
- Empowerment (especially women) is key objective and should guide methods
- Create farmers' confidence as they speak about their issues/concerns
- To attract external attention for their cause i.e. policy issues
- To identify problems
- FLD helps solve their problems like marketing, funds etc
- Support farmers' marketing
- Would increase farmer income and GNP
- Because it's fun

### **What can be documented**

- Great variety
  - minutes of meetings
  - problems, questions and answers
  - economic data
  - best practices, experiences
- Farmer's thoughts from experience
- Knowledge
- Sustainable local practices and innovations
- Market information
- Knowledge that is useful to others (demanded)
- The FLD itself

### **By whom**

- Critical role of a farmer
- Information broker
- NGOs, institutes, government department, private sector support / facilitation
- Village community, including children, not only the popular or affluent farmers
- Farmers / researchers
- Technical people and farmers
- Should be agreed / decided by the farmers

### **For whom**

- Policy makers
- Farmers / future farmers (e.g. youth)
- Own consumption
- Development workers in sustainable agriculture and natural resource management
- Regional research networks, government organizations, NGOs
- Farmer unions / associations
- Support services
- Extension agents

### **How (generation, processing, editing, packaging, use and storage)**

- Importance of feedback cycles to learn and improve FLD
- Participatory monitoring and evaluation
- Incorporated throughout projects / activities
- Combination of:
  - Problem driven

- Show opportunities and possibilities
- By the farmers' time and interest
- Encourage farmers to learn FLD in groups
- Involvement of farmers
- Applying their own methodology for FLD
- Start with simple tools / methods before moving to complex methods
- Village knowledge centres in some form
- Need for linkages and complementary between models and approaches!
- Establish existing information systems, infrastructure and learning culture before FLD intervention
- Prevent the white elephant (or mouse) effect - Technology as a gadget that everyone likes but that does not have a sustainable project
- Maximum use of existing infrastructures (e.g. mobile phones, village radio)
- Planning action
- Baseline survey before FLD
- Capacity building
  - Training
  - Ownership of equipment
- Capacities building among farmers on documentation to kick start FLD
- Encourage farmers to begin with the process using existing available tools
- Start with what farmers are already doing

### **Sustainability**

- Link FLD with existing structures for documentation / learning e.g. schools
- Integrate FLD into commercial income earning activities
- Need attitude change at different levels (farmers, extension workers in regard to FLD?)
- Tools like cameras should also generate income i.e. from weddings
- Integrate FLD within existing farmer's enterprises
- Identify / search institutions to continue documenting
- Instill a sense of process ownership
- Work with established partner
- Accompany farmers during FLD processes until they are successful
- Policy support and budget
- Be creative on financial sustainability
- Farmers should see FLD as an addition rather than option for knowledge management
- Adult literacy of / financial contribution by community is essential
- Partnership with other farmer's communities
- Integration of FLD in development programs of research and development institutions
- Seed money for NGOs is crucial

### **Others/miscellaneous**

- Extension workers have many difficulties themselves for documentation
- Documentation by NGOs that are facilitating FLD is important too!
- Need attitude change at different levels (farmers, extension workers) in regard to FLD
- Not necessary expensive (but requires time)

## 7. Open space

Before tending to individual action planning, participants organized themselves in small groups during an Open Space session and addressed some final topics of their interest. Three issues discussed are briefly described in the following paragraphs.

### 7.1 Intellectual Property Rights

Learning points from the dialogue on intellectual property rights (IPR):

- Patenting is costly and usually a tedious process.
- If farmers do not want to disclose information they consider being highly sensitive or of monetary value then they should not be forced to do so.
- Once a practice has been documented and the source acknowledged, it prevents any further claim of ownership by other parties.

### 7.2 Participation and Representation

Learning point from participation and representation discussion:

- Let the representatives be selected by the farmers
- We can provide a criteria for selection, may be a profile
- Assumptions i.e.: People are not homogeneous; there is an evident talented and also a potential talented.
- The selection of representative is not easy

#### Evident

- Writing
- Managing documentation

#### Not evident

- Political skills
- Generosity
- Teaching and learning

### 7.3 Joint Follow-up Action

Participants from this session drafted a joint follow-up action plan that was later used as input in a plenary session on joint follow up action.

Activities	Responsibility	Timeframe	Resources
- Briefing organizations and staff about FLD workshop	- Participants	1 week upon return	
- Networking and information exchange - Formation of discussion groups - Skype	- Participants - Steering Group	December	
- FLD workshop report - Dissemination	- PELUM Uganda	End November	
- Integrating FLD into organization workshop	- Organizations - PELUM - PROLINNOVA - Oxfam Novib	Start immediately	
- Monitoring and evaluation	- Organizations - PELUM - PROLINNOVA - Oxfam Novib	Ongoing	
- Follow up workshops	- Organizations of FLD	2007	Provide

## 8. Action planning

### 8.1 Individual Action Plans

Workshop participants and organizing NGOs developed realistic individual action plans. Individual plans of workshop participants mainly included activities on local and regional levels and less on national and international. The latter mainly to be covered by joint follow-up action. All individual action plans are included in Annex 4.

Some organizations planned to do resource activities for FLD. Others had their own ongoing plans, which they will integrate. Some proposed to implement pilot activities and later share the results. Participants were commended for cooperating and sharing ideas. General suggestions and ideas after reviewing the individual action plans:

- Do your actions need thinking through or will they face any resistance?
- Incorporating FLD into farmers' practice: Not only advocacy but helping farmers to document.
- Think of the aspect of sustainability, since FLD is a new idea to farmers.
- Networking, i.e. PELUM Uganda learning from Kenya and South Africa.
- Polish the action plan after going back to your organization. Push it forward for policy implementations.

### 8.2 Joint Follow-Up Action Plan:

The overview below presents the follow-up actions that were agreed upon during the workshop. For some tasks, responsibilities have already been assigned to specific organizations or persons. For all other tasks, the steering group will have to plan timeframe and responsibilities in more detail.



#### 8.2.1 Short Term

1. Develop materials on basis of the workshop's contents and results:
  - Finalize proceedings. The report will be a good dissemination tool on farmer-led documentation. It would be good to have a summary of activities proposed by members.
  - Put audiovisuals together, e.g. in a CD-ROM or other tool
  - Produce a summary of the workshop and translate it in Spanish.
2. Plan and implement dissemination of the workshop output:
  - Make a planning for dissemination (jointly and per country)
  - Present at Innovation Africa Symposium in Uganda, November 2006
  - Upload workshop reports and other resources on the network and membership organizations' websites for national and international sharing
  - Present on KIC portal
3. Manage FLD pilot grants.

#### Agreed tasks and responsibilities

Task	Responsible Org.	Implementation	Remarks
Finalize proceedings	PELUM Uganda	Stella Lutalo (PELUM Uganda), Justine	Draft report to be sent to all participants

		Ssempebwa	between 15 and 22 November for comments
Produce CD-ROM with digital material	PELUM Uganda	Stella Lutalo with Dorine Ruter (PROLINNOVA)	
Summary of workshop results	PELUM Uganda		
Summary translation (Spanish version)	PELUM Uganda	Máximo García (Arte Natura)	
Present at Innovation Africa Symposium	PELUM Uganda	Stella Lutalo, Emebet Wuhib (A2N) and Richard Nguma (CEFORD)	
Dissemination plan	Steering Group	Dorine Ruter	
Make a dissemination plan per country	All participants	-	To be included in action plan
Present on KIC portal	Oxfam NOVIB	Nicole Metz (Oxfam NOVIB)	
Upload workshop related material on websites	PELUM Uganda, PROLINNOVA, Oxfam NOVIB	-	
Manage FLD pilot grants	PELUM Uganda	Stella Lutalo, with Emebet Wuhib, Nicholas Senyonjo (and Dorine Ruter)	ToR to be developed and distributed among participants.

### 8.2.2 Continued Networking

A continued (facilitated) exchange and collaboration among participants is suggested. This includes peer-to-peer support in the implementation of the action plans formulated by the participants at the end of the FLD workshop, exchange of experiences on methods of FLD and further analysis of these FLD practices.

The following activities are proposed:

1. Share all e-mail, Skype and other contact details.
2. An electronic discussion group will be formed, through which participants to the FLD workshop
  - Share the results of their activities (e.g. FLD pilots)
  - Participate in focused electronic discussion, e.g. on: concepts (e.g. FLD integration into sustainable development), the joint venturing on FLD theory to support individual initiatives and promote FLD further.
  - Receive quarterly summarized overviews of FLD experiences.
  - Share agendas to find opportunities to participate in other meetings i.e. international regional meetings.
3. Biannual invitation to share recent experiences with FLD. Development of an easy to use reporting format to support and encourage participants to share their experiences (FLD pilot results and other).
4. For PELUM, PROLINNOVA and Oxfam members: Participatory monitoring and evaluation of the implementation process of participants' action plans takes place during member organization meetings (PELUM, PROLINNOVA, Oxfam).
5. According to need and relevance: ad-hoc formulation of thematic (working) groups and region representatives for different activities.

### Agreed tasks and responsibilities

<i>Task</i>	<i>Responsible Org.</i>	<i>Implementation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>
Share contact information of all participants	PELUM Uganda	Stella Lutalo	In proceedings
Set-up and facilitate electronic discussion group		Prince Deh (GINKS) Apolinary Kahabi (SAIPRO) Dorine Ruter Nicole Metz	Use e-mail list of participants. Moderated list, to which new participants are welcome.
Presentation format		Jorge Chavez	
Collecting and compiling participants' biannual reports		Jorge Chavez with support of Máximo García	
PM&E of implementation action plans	PELUM Uganda, PROLINNOVA		Possible role for the whole group? Joint responsibility?

### 8.2.3 Long term

Besides follow-up of agreed actions in the coming year, consolidation of experiences is aimed for on a longer term, through/after further learning and sharing among workshop participants and a wider group of people involved in FLD.

1. Systematic follow-up to the FLD workshop
2. Develop products to support understanding and implementation of FLD
  - Prepare a focused publication
  - Policy brief on FLD: the outcomes of the workshop can be used as a guideline for implementing policies
  - Produce a toolkit (report, audiovisual, presentations etc) that other NGOs/organizations can use to introduce FLD in their programmes
  - Publicize the topic of FLD to wider audiences through the media
3. Further investigate issues related to FLD
  - Search and share further information, materials and case studies on FLD.
  - Analyze results from FLD pilots.
  - Organize and encourage focused exchange with ESAFF and other partner alliances.
4. Organize follow-up learning events:
  - Follow-up events to be planned in the context of capacity building planning on FLD with responsibilities and timeframe i.e. who, what, how etc.
  - Plan specific country FLD workshops.

### Agreed tasks and responsibilities

<i>Task</i>	<i>Responsible Org.</i>	<i>Implementation</i>	<i>Remarks</i>
Follow-up to the FLD workshop, integrated into regular work of networks		PELUM regional network, PROLINNOVA network	

Follow-up to the FLD workshop, to manage dissemination and short-term follow-up	Steering group	PELUM Uganda, PROLINNOVA, Oxfam NOVIB	
Plan specific country FLD workshops	Participants to the workshop from specific countries	Several organizations. (could be supported by Oxfam NOVIB, PROLINNOVA, government organizations if appropriate)	See individual follow-up plans

#### 8.2.4 Plenary discussion on the above (joint) action plans

- All action plans should incorporate FLD component in their structures. Participants oversaw a need for international support for the action plans.
- It was agreed that it is the participants' concern to fit a sharing component in his/her work plan. Information should be shared within the regional offices and there after shared to membership organizations. Member organizations are encouraged to network with each other for national action plans and resource sharing.
- Organize research as a network gateway on what others do. It was agreed that all participants should carry out the research work and share the information with others i.e. do active searches on FLD. It is the responsibility of each member to share information with the rest of the group.
- An electronic discussion group will be set-up, open to anyone who is interested. Moderation needs to be there to prevent advertisements or any other form of misuse.
- Coordination and facilitation. It was suggested that committees could be set up to oversee the progress of group projects. However, committees create space between the committee members and others. It is therefore appropriate to make it an organic process; the network will not have specific groups beforehand but will form ad hoc groups if that is considered useful. Members opted for small groups to encourage participation.
- It was reported that a workshop Steering Group is currently in place (PELUM Uganda, PROLINNOVA, Oxfam NOVIB). However there was no proper governance agreed for ongoing FLD networking and this should be set up. It was observed that the remarks were important though at that point it was very difficult to implement them due to limited capacity. Participants agreed to organize themselves with meetings and later establish the responsibility. Responsible persons to push group projects should be identified.

## 9. Workshop Closure

Ms. Emily Nakagiri was thanked and commended for translating the workshop (English-Spanish).

Mr. Prince Deh was nominated to give a final word on behalf of the participant's. He thanked the steering group and facilitators for organizing the workshop and the hospitality shown. The steering group was commended for making the workshop useful and Mrs. Emebet Wuhib-Mutungu was thanked for the great work done in her capacity as the steering group chair.

Ms. Nicole Metz of Oxfam NOVIB closed the workshop. She expressed her enthusiasm about the interesting workshop and exposed reasons why farmers should improve as they were categorized as farm groups and therefore should try to develop methods to make life better. She also asserted that participants should use such opportunities to think about the objectives of contributing to eradicating poverty and improving the livelihoods of people.

The notion of FLD was broader than the activities they had undertaken and it had very interesting methods and the written documents were useful too. Different methods of documentation were identified including Cameras, videos and computers. The Action plan was also a very interesting session for them to see commitments and put ideas together and discuss further to see what should be taken into consideration

It was also agreed that farmers should take the lead to improve their lives. And therefore will also put all they talked about into practice and be in touch with MAAIF, NARO, and NAADS.

The Steering Group (besides Ms. Nicole Metz) comprised of Ms. Stella Lutalo, Ms. Emily Drani, Ms. Emebet Wuhib-Mutungu, Mr. Nicholas Senyonjo, Mr. Laurens van Veldhuizen and Mrs. Dorine Rüter. The group was thanked for its excellent collaboration and facilitation.

For those interested a guided tour through Uganda's capital city Kampala was organized, during which the African Village and the Uganda Museum were visited. To end the week, participants and facilitators enjoyed a show, cultural competition and dinner at Ndere cultural center in Ntinda.

## 10. Annex 1 - Workshop Programme

Day One: FLD – Why and what is it?

- Registration
- Introduction of participants
- Welcome/opening remarks
- Brief profile of each of the 3 partner organizations
- Expectations: workshop and FLD
- Workshops objectives, programme
- Introduction to FLD and wrap up – Q&A
- Rational of FLD: Case study AGRECOL Andes (Bolivia)
- Documenting this workshop
- Cocktail

Day Two: FLD in practice

- Recap of day 1
- Brief on evaluation
- Recap case study
- Identification of some methods of FLD
- Case Study presentations (3)
- Sharing key learning's from the 3 case study presentations
- Market place
- Case study: FLD videos
- Discussion and reflection

Day 3: FLD in practice

- Recap of day 2
- Case study presentations (3)
- Sharing key learning's from the 3 case study presentations
- Preparations for field study
- Field study: interaction with NAADS groups, Mukono

Day 4: Reflecting and action planning

- Recap of day 3
- Key learning points from the field study/feedback
- Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) of FLD
- Sharing experiences in PM&E of FLD
- Wrap up and synthesis
- Open space
- Action planning

Day 5: Moving forward with FLD

- Recap of day 4
- Presentation of documentation of the week's news
- Presentations of action plans
- Joint follow-up action plan
- Back stopping support and dissemination of workshop outputs
- Reflection and evaluation of the workshop
- Awarding certificates
- Official closure of the workshop
- Touring Kampala city

- Barbeque & Cultural night

## 11. Annex 2 - Participants' Expectations

Expectations as expressed by participants were:

- Learn and share experiences on farmer-led documentation
- Learn tools and methods for farmer-led documentation (sharing from others)
- Learn about the different views on how to use farmer-led documentation, its opportunities and challenges.
- Learn the different approaches to FLD
- Build capacity in new innovative practices relevant to FLD
- Knowledge of the key success factors in FLD
- To know the forms and approaches of FLD
- Learn possibilities and limitations of farmers doing the whole documentation process
- Learn how to motivate farmers to sustain the process of FLD
- Knowledge of how FLD can directly be utilized by farmers
- Acquire knowledge in the available tools for FLD and under what circumstances they would be used
- Check out effective methods employed by farmers to document their practices
- Exchange experiences, concepts and plans
- Learn about good practice in FLD that can be replicated in wider networks
- Improve the farmer-led documentation practices and help each other.
- Build a group that could keep the learning processes from each other in future.
- Develop links to promote farmer-led documentation in the region and organization
- Create and make strategy networks i.e. African, Latin Americans and European experiences
- Analyze possibilities to generate field based knowledge
- Acquire and learn new skills
- Share experiences, learn and improve job skills
- Find out exactly what FLD means
- To learn new alternatives for increasing one's wellbeing
- Acquire skills on how best to document farmer expectations
- Hear what has been documented by various organizations
- Share and learn how best to empower rural farmers to become more friendly to literature

## **12. Annex 3 - Terms of Reference for the Field Study**

### **12.1 Introduction**

The field study is done in two groups. Both groups will interact with villagers and farmer groups in the Mukono district. In the context of the FLD workshop the study has two closely related objectives:

1. Generally, understand the agricultural development efforts undertaken with the villagers and farmer groups and how they perceive these, with a special attention of the role of information spreading and use.
2. Understand from farmers how they perceive the relevance of the ideas and principles of FLD (see themes below).

### **12.2 Main study themes**

Five study themes are given that mostly link to objective 2 above as this directly relates to the topic of the workshop. These are:

- How do farmers, villagers, traditionally share and spread information and experiences (related to agriculture or natural resources management)? In what form? Is this different for men or women? How?
- In what form are experiences, ideas, and information “captured” or documented traditionally, if at all?
- In present sharing of information and ideas, to what extent does this include experiences, ideas, and innovations from villagers themselves as compared to those from external support organizations? How do they look at this balance?
- How useful and user friendly is information provided to the villagers?
- In this context, what role do they see for farmer-led documentation, its relevance? What would they recommend?

### **12.3 Organization of the study**

Pay attention to the following:

- Agree in the study group on the process of interaction with the villagers. Should one or two volunteer to facilitate the interaction or start at least with the questioning?
- Ask your guide whether there are any specific Do’s and Don’ts in interaction with villagers in this district.
- Agree in the group how and by whom the feedback to the workshop plenary will be prepared. Include in that feedback report at least all key issues and insight generated related to the 5 study themes above.

## 13. Annex 4 - Individual Action Plans

### 13.1 World Neighbours

Objective: Mainstream and institutionalize FLD in current programmes of world neighbors and its partners

Specific objectives	Activities	Level	Collaborators	Responsibility	Time frame
Enhance awareness on FLD (importance, current efforts etc.	- Develop report (trip) on FLD workshop and share with WN staff - Give talk to WN East Africa office	World neighbors international level, East Africa		Qureish	
Integrate FLD into existing programme plans	- Discussion with farmers on FLD (audio cassettes/photos) - incorporation of start up FLD activities in budgets for July 07/June 08	Local level -Nyando (Kenya) - Busia (Kenya) - Singida (TZ) -Tarime (TZ)	Foko, VAF, VDC, REFSO, WEGCC, TARDTF, NAGAD, Vi, MoH	Qureish Ruth	December 15 <sup>th</sup> 2006
	- Proposal for development of FLD	Local International	Local CBOs, Pelum (K), PROLINNOVA, Pelum (TZ), Oxfam Novib, Klimo Trust	Qureish	March 2007
Build capacity of farmers and partners in FLD	- Assessments of FLD (needs, opportunities - Training on identified method/tool	Local	FOKO, Vi, Gov't dept's, CBOs, Farmer groups, PELUM, PROLINNOVA, (Kenya, TZ)	Qureish Ruth	August 2007
Build capacity of civil society and farmer groups in FLD	Training/workshop on fld in different countries. -Implementation across different zones/farmer groups - proposal development for national region	National	PELUM (U) PELUM (K) PROLINNOVA, FFS Network, CosoFAP, SACDEP VC Resource Centre		After consultations with PELUM K, TZ and other partners
	Concept/proposal development for cross country FLD -implementation of activities - community resource centre (libraries)	International level	WN (all programs) IIRR PROLINNOVA Oxfam Novib PELUM (K) PELUM (TZ)	Qureish Scott Killough Steve Sherwood	Proposal for Andes ready  Dec. 2007 Proposal for Africa/Asia

		AZN		
--	--	-----	--	--

## **13.2 ILEIA**

### **Objectives:**

Analyze the advantages/difficulties of FLD as part of a broad documentation effort.  
Promote its use for the generation of knowledge on LEISA

### **Activities:**

- Open discussion on concepts/options/ideas.
- "Try outs" in different contexts and at different levels
- Monitoring
- Compare results
- Analyze the roles and responsibilities of farmers, extension workers and organizations.

### **Collaboration and responsibilities:**

ILEIA, partners, and interested organizations

### **Time frame:**

2007-2008

### 13.3 CEFORD

Objective: Integrate farmer led documentation to organizations objective to enhance farmer's participation in agriculture to realize increased income and food security at household levels.

Activities	Responsible person	Collaborators	Needed resources	Time frame
1. De-briefing of CEFORD staff on workshop proceedings (FLD)	Richard		Workshop handouts and work plans	12 <sup>th</sup> – 20 <sup>th</sup> Nov. 2006
2. Sensitization of farmers and partners on FLD (meetings, workshops etc)	Richard Programme Officer (CEFORD)	NAADS secretariat		25 <sup>th</sup> Nov. – 6 <sup>TH</sup> Dec. 2006
3. Acquire materials and equipment for implementation of FLD (cameras, writing materials)	Richard Executive Director CEFORD	PELUM	Funds	Dec. 6 <sup>th</sup> 2006 - 7 <sup>th</sup> Jan. 2007
4. Select 2 communities or community groups to pilot the process of FLD and identify what tools to use	Richard Project Officers CEFORD Secretariat leaders	Secretariat leaders NAADS	Transport, books, pens and funds	Jan. – Feb 2007
5. Start implementation of the whole process	Richard CEFORD staff	All NGOs involved in agriculture Secretariat NAADS	Funds	Feb. 2007
6. Linkage of selected groups to partners	Richard CEFORD staff	All NGOs involved in agriculture Secretariat NAADS	Funds	Feb – May 2007
7. Capacity building trainings for the 2 groups	Richard CEFORD staff	All NGOs involved in agriculture Secretariat NAADS	Transport, books, pens and funds	Feb. – March 2007
8. Monitoring, reporting, evaluation and way forward	Richard CEFORD staff	All NGOs involved in agriculture Secretariat NAADS	Funds	Jan. – May 2007 (monitoring) May 2007 (Evaluation)

### 13.4 BOLIVIA AGRECOL

Objective	Activities	Collaboration	Responsibilities	Operational levels
<p>1. Organization of farmer's document and exchange experiences in agro ecology and management of natural resources through using ICTs, getting more empowerment in their organization and improve their systems of production</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meetings</li> <li>- Projects in capacitating and management of ICT documentation experiences.</li> <li>- Projects validation and experiences documented.</li> <li>- Exchange of experiences</li> </ul>	<p>NGOs facilitators</p>	<p>Facilitators local groups</p>	<p><b>Local:</b> Farmers, selected school, school of adult education, health ministry, committee of soil conservation</p> <p><b>Regional:</b> Sub counties, NGO, private universities</p> <p><b>National:</b> ICT Bolivia, ministry of Agriculture</p> <p><b>International:</b> IICD, COJUDE</p>
<p>2. Organization of producers, NGOs, government bodies, schools, universities, and utilization of different media, audio, video, photos to get experiences and produce information.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Elaboration of material, printing posters, newsletters, magazines, articles.</li> <li>- Elaboration of material audiovisual and multi media.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Institutions</li> <li>- Facilitators</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Projects responsible</li> <li>- Facilitators in the fields</li> <li>- Technical people elaborate the material through audiovisual and media</li> </ul>	<p><b>Local:</b> Farmers production organizations, Rural stations</p> <p><b>National:</b> Counties, NGOs, television</p> <p><b>International:</b> IICD, COSUDE, PELUM (U), PROLINNOVA, Oxfam Novib</p>

### 13.5 PELUM – ZAMBIA

Objective: To strengthen the way farmers access, share and manage knowledge experiences

Activities	Partners	Responsibilities	Who	Timeframe
- Train MOs and farmer groups in participatory methods and tools.	- MS – Zambia - Agromisa	PELUM Zambia	- CAWS - Extension staff - Agriculture Officers	Nov. 2006
- Organize farmer’s exchange visits	- Harvest help UK - FOSUP	PELUM Zambia FOSUP	Farmer groups representatives	April 2007
- Publish documented cases.	- Agromisa	PELUM Zambia	Consultant	Dec. 2007
- Sensitization on FLD.	- HH UK - ESAFF	PELUM Zambia	MOs	Jan – March 2007
- Introduce PV documentation	- ZNFU - Agromisa	PELUM Zambia ZNFU	Farmers	April – Aug. 2007

### 13.6 ARTE NATURA

Objectives	Activities	Collaboration	Responsibility
Identify a working strategy to:  - Promote FLDs in the area.  - Participate in discussions about concepts, methodologies, techniques and experiences related to FLDs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Generate a participative discussion to obtain and work definition of sensitization of Latin America.</li> <li>- Develop experiences of “true” FLDs in Mexico and document them</li> <li>- Define more strategic activities for communicate local innovations to South Mexico and Guatemala Boarder.</li> <li>- Identify institutions and academic groups with interest in the subject of FLDs</li> <li>- Capacity building on FLD, local knowledge and opportunities of natural resources.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- AGRECOL Bolivia</li> <li>- LEISA</li> </ul>	Arte Natura team

### 13.7 ACDEP- Northern Ghana

Objective: To enhance farmer networking and participation in research and extension for improved livelihoods in Northern Ghana

Activities	Collaborators	Level	Responsibility	Timeframe
1. Share FLD workshop experiences with staff	- Colleague PO s - PROLINNOVA	- Local - Local	- Norbert & PROLINNOVA	Week 4 Nov 2006
2. Mainstream FLD into programme activities/ plans	- POs - PROLINNOVA - Oxfam Novib - NGLWG	- Local - International - International - Regional	- Norbert & PROLINNOVA Northern Ghana programme	Jan-Dec 2007
3. Facilitate the process of FLD as available means of documenting farmers' innovations/ experiences in 3 communities	- Member NGOs - Existing FGs - NGLWG - PROLINNOVA - Oxfam Novib - POs - MoFA	- Regional/local - Regional/local - Regional/local - International - International - Local - Local	Norbert	2007 - 2008
4. Facilitate exchange of knowledge gained among the 3 communities	- FG leaders - MOs - PROLINNOVA - Oxfam Novib - NGLWG - MoFA	- Local - Local - International - International - Regional - Local	Norbert & Member NGOs Farmer Group Leaders	Nov 2007
5. Replicate FLD process in other communities.	- Existing FGs - Member Groups - PROLINNOVA - Oxfam Novib - NGLWG - MoFA	- Local - Local - International - International - Regional/Local - Local	Norbert, NGOs & Farmer Groups	
6. Establish forum/resource centre for learning, sharing and feedback.	- Member NGOs - Farmer Groups - PROLINNOVA	- Local - Local - International	Norbert, NGOs & Farmer Groups	

	- Oxfam Novib	- International		
7. Feedback	- All stakeholders			

### 13.8 WOUGNET

<b>Objective</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Collaborators</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>
1. Incorporating the FLD into existing work plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Briefing organization/staff about FLD</li> <li>- Writing workshop report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Organization staff</li> <li>- Other local NGOs dealing with farmers</li> </ul>	Lucy	25 <sup>th</sup> Nov. 2006 (two weeks' time)
2. Introducing the concept of FLD and its benefits to the farmers groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sharing with farmers</li> <li>- Capacity building</li> <li>- Dissemination meetings</li> <li>- Listening clubs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Farmer groups</li> <li>- Colleagues</li> <li>- Other staff from partner organizations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Implementing staff</li> <li>- Lucy</li> <li>- Group executives</li> </ul>	Dec. – Feb 2007
3. Fund raising for tools to be used in FLD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reports about farmers activities</li> <li>- Proposals to donors of interest.</li> <li>- Creation of partnership and linkages.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- WOUGNET staff</li> <li>- PELUM (U)</li> <li>- Explore opportunities given by workshop</li> </ul>	<p>Lucy</p> <p>Staff in fundraising committee</p>	Ongoing

### 13.9 Environmental Alert

Objectives	Activities	Collaborators	Responsibility	Timeframe
1. To integrate FLD approaches/principles in overall documentation activities of Environmental Alert (EA) program/projects	- Briefing EA staff about FLD approaches/principles; why the FLD; and benefits of FLD	- PROLINNOVA - PELUM Members	Joshua Zake E A staff	End Nov 2006
	- Disseminating FLD workshop report to EA staff and partners Present to PROLINNOVA (U)	- Novib Oxfam - Other EA partners	PELUM (U) Joshua Zake	Last Week Nov 2006
2. Promoting FLD approaches/principles among relevant Environmental Alert partners/stakeholders	- Participate in follow up workshops by other partners to share EA lessons/experiences in regard to FLD.		Joshua Zake	Jan 2007 – Ongoing
	- Source for more information and/or experience experiences on FLD		Joshua Zake	Jan 2007 - Ongoing

### 13.10 Africa 2000 Network

Overall objective: Transforming community libraries into dynamic community resource centres and introducing the concept of FLD in other communities.

Objective	Activities	Collaborators	Responsibility	Timeframe
<p>Have farmers document widely their best practices and experiences and share them amongst other farmers and the neighboring communities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Farmer associations meetings. Discuss and decide on what, why, who, and how to document using ICTs</li> <li>- Train farmers on the importance and use of the new technologies on ICTs e.g. Internet facilities, video/digital cameras, tape recorders, village phones etc</li> <li>- Conduct exposure visits for farmers to areas/countries where the chosen ICTs are best used by farmers.</li> <li>- Mobilize extra resources for the framers to access the chosen ICT methods/tools</li> <li>- set up demonstration sites in 3 pilot districts where community libraries are already established.</li> <li>- Hold 3 write-shops on FLD for member countries</li> <li>- work with farmers to generate income from the centres e.g. set up video shows</li> <li>- Partner with the local government, higher institutions of learning and CBOs to redirect research fees to the centres.</li> </ul>	<p>NGOs (WOUGNET, ARIS); NARO; Department of Agriculture, MUK; Private sector (MTN); Local Government (NAADS); Current and new development Partners - (Oxfam Novib, PROLINNOVA)</p>	<p>Farmer's own initiative - implement and evaluate the project</p> <p>Consultants and extension workers (to work towards farmer's interests)</p> <p>Africa 2000 Network (facilitator)</p>	<p>Over 2 years (2007 - 2008)</p>

### 13.11 ARIS / QAS-VOUCHER SYSTEM

Objectives	Activities	Responsibility	Collaborators	Timeframe
1. To empower farmers with information for their development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identify and train field agents</li> <li>- Capture farmer's questions</li> </ul>	<p>NARO – ARIS</p> <p>Tele-centres: RUN, ZADI, CTA</p>	<p>Tele-centres Farmers Networks PELUM PROLINNOVA</p>	Jan. –March 2007
2. Build partnership and networks for the QAS voucher system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identify an profile capable actors</li> <li>- Finalize movements with partners</li> </ul>	<p>NARO – ARIS RUN, ZADI, CTA</p> <p>NAADS, PELUM, A2N etc.</p>	<p>NARO NAADS PELUM ZADI</p>	April – June 2007
3. Up-scale the system to involve more farmers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identify farmer groups</li> <li>- Define new actors</li> </ul>	<p>NARO – ARIS</p> <p>RUN, ZADI</p>	<p>Farmer groups Partners</p>	July – Aug. 2007

### 13.12 SLUF/PROLINNOVA Ethiopia

Objectives:

- Introduce the concepts and practices of FLD to governments, NGOs, and research directors.
- Initiate pilot-scale studies to verify feasibility of FLD
- Integrate FLD approaches into research and development systems and programmes

Activities	Responsibility	Resource/inputs	Collaborators	Timeframe
- Debriefing of EIAR/SLUF PROFIEET/ASE	Habtemariam Habtamu		- EIAR - MARC - SLUR/Ethiopia - WVI,CCF,CRS, M	Week 3 – Nov. 2006
- Planning for familiarization/sensitization workshop	Participants; PROFIEET/ASE	Human, financial, FLD workshop report etc.	- BoARD-MoARD - ALI - PROLINNOVA - Oxfam Novib	Mid March 2007
- Conduct FLD sensitization workshop with potential partners	Participants; PROFIEET/ASE; PROLINNOVA.			June 2007
- Develop joint action plans - Prepare project proposals - Submit and get feed back	FRG-At Melkasa; PROFIEET/ASE; Participants.			July 2007
- Plan implementation at selected pilot projects sites				

### 13.13 SATNET

<b>Objectives</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Collaborators</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>
-Share/sensitize and campaign about FLD	- Write an share report of FLD workshop with SATNET staff	FLD – Workshops steering committees	Martin C.A.O	Organizational	Workshop reports	13-20 Nov 2007 (1 <sup>st</sup> week after workshop)
- Establishment of FLD strategy for SATNET	- Redesign mobile information kits into FLD	SATNET staff	Martin - C.A.O A.D.O	Organizational	Financial; Technical Support	Dec. 2006
- To pilot FLD among 2 member organizations	- Select 2 MOs, to distribute mobile information kits	Selected member organizations FLD promoting agencies	Martin H.O.P - SATNET	Regional		2007
- Networking with FLD promoting agencies	- Participate in FLD Email - communicate FLD progress at SATNET	PELUM (U) Oxfam Novib PROLINNOVA	SATNET Oxfam Novib PELUM(U) PROLINNOVA	International	Communication; funds	2007

### 13.14 SACDEP – Kenya

Objectives:

- To introduce the concept of FLD into existing SACDEP community projects.
- Design the approach of integrating the FLD to the farmer groups
- To have at least 6 farmer groups documenting in one years' time from now.

Activities	Responsibility/ Collaborators	Timeframe
- Formal discussion with community agriculture programs on FLD	SACDEP	Nov. – Dec. 2006
- Development of approaches to FLD in community groups	SACDEP	Nov. – Dec 2006
- Develop a variety FLD forms to be choice of varieties for farmers groups	SACDEP	Nov. – Dec 2006
- Define the roles of SACDEP and farmers in FLD	SACDEP	Jan. – March 2007
- Bring together other stakeholders for harmonization of FLD approach.	SACDEP	March – June 2007
- Develop capacity building training to farmers on FLD	SACDEP/Collaborators	March – June 2007
- Mobilization of resources for FLD	Farmers groups	June – Aug. 2007
- Develop at least two documentaries for group in one year's time.	Farmers groups	Aug. – Dec. 2007
- Evaluate the utilization and impacts of these twelve documentaries	Farmers groups SACDEP	Aug. 2007 – Jan. 2008
	Collaborators: PELUM (K),(TZ) Network members Government service providers.	

### 13.15 GINKS

Objectives	Activities	Collaboration	Responsibility	Timeframe
- Achieve high level FLD in Ghana	- Integrate FLD into existing organization plan	Ginks/IDRC	Prince - Ginks	End Dec 2006
- Encourage information/knowledge sharing on FLD and promote discussion on selected themes	- Form advocacy groups	Ginks PROLINNOVA IICD	Prince - Ginks	End Dec 2006
- Monitor progress of FLD use in Ginks/IDRC project	- Develop M&E strategy	Ginks IDRC PROLINNOVA	Ginks	End Dec 2006
- Form closer relations with participating organizations	- Communicate to participatory members through Email	Various participating groups	Prince	End of Workshop
- Develop links with future partners	- Proposals to future partners	Ginks Oxfam Novib PROLINNOVA	Ginks	End Feb 2007

### 13.16 SAIPRO / PELUM (TZ)

Objective: To contribute to men, women, boys, and girl's rights to access food, empowerment of small holder farmers and sustainable livelihoods

Objectives	Activities	Level	Collaborator/ Responsibility	Resources	Timeframe
- Enhance knowledge sharing on FLD	- Involve and brief SAIPRO staff and PELUM (TZ) member organizations about the essence of FLD	Local: SAIPRO  National: PELUM (TZ) MOs	PELUM (TZ) country office/ Kahabi	Networks (Emails) Stationary Photocopy	15-18 Nov 2006
- Strong coordination initiated among PELUM (TZ) – MOs towards promotion and facilitation of FLD	- Present the FLD agenda at PTZ-AGM or initiating and sharing experiences among PTZ-MOs on FLD	National: PELUM (TZ)	PELUM (TZ) country office/ Kahabi	Stationary Networks Photocopy	Dec 2006
- Implementable and comprehensive FLD incorporated in 2007 PLANOP	- Present plan to management for authorization and review to be integrated & incorporated in 2007-PLANOP to precede FLD - Assess roles & responsibilities for activities identified in FLD - Coordinate the execution of FLD plan with existing organizational plan - Monitor effective performance of FLD - Capture lessons learned on the effectiveness of FLD	Local: SAIPRO management          Local: SAIPRO management	Board member and Executive team. Programme officers/ CEO & Management      Board member and Executive team. Programme officers/ CEO & Management	Allocate resources for FLD (2007-PLANOP)         Allocate resources for FLD (2007-PLANOP)	Dec 2006         Jan - Dec 2007
- Full adoption of FLD and shared among small-holder farmers and partner CBOs	- Up scaling and institutionalizing FLD on successful PID experiences - Capacity building and training - Develop a participatory &	Local : CBOs & Farmer groups	CBOs; Farmers; Extension workers; Programme officer/ SAIPRO management, Executive staff	- Tools and equipment - Methodology - Indigenous knowledge	Jan - Dec 2007

	effective FLD-PLANOP			
--	----------------------	--	--	--

### 13.17 Priority Support Programme (CARE)

Objectives	Activities	Collaborators	Timeframe/Responsibility
- To provide feedback on FLD workshop	- Hold briefing meeting with all PELUM members in Lesotho	All NGOs that are PELUM members	End Nov. 2006/Makojang
	- Facilitate a session for PSP Management, DFS, & DROs on FLD	PSP employees, consortium members MOAFS	End Nov. 2006/Makojang
	- Meeting with the department of extension in LAC on FLD	Faculty staff	End Dec. 2006
- To mainstream FLD into our plans	- Present to members of LCN	LCN members	Next meeting
	- Facilitate a process of incorporating FLD into next year's plans	PSP MOAFS	Dec. 2006/Makojang/PSP Management
	- Share the workshop report with NFSTF	Government ministries, NGOs; INGOs & PS	When available Makojang
	- Initiate a field trip to facilitate FLD	PSP/MOAFS	Dec. 2006/Makojang

### 13.18 PROLINNOVA Farmer Support Group South Africa

Objectives	Activities	Collaborators/responsibility	Timeframe
- To ensure farmers understand the importance of FLD	- Briefing all stakeholders and farmers associations	All stakeholders in Okhalamba district / Thabane	14 Nov. 2006
- Working with stakeholders	"Plan, act & reflect"	Farmer leaders; Community facilitators; Project facilitators; Extension workers / Thabane	End Nov. 2006
- Keeping local knowledge	- Monitoring and evaluation FLD	Farmer leaders; Community facilitators; Project facilitators; Extension workers / Thabane; FSG; DFA	

### 13.19 PELUM UGANDA

Objectives	Activities	Partners / Stakeholders	Responsibility	Timeframe
Enhance information generation, sharing and dissemination among member organizations across other networks	- Dissemination of workshop report	PELUM(U); PELUM ASSO'N; PROLINNOVA; Oxfam Novib; KIC (all partner Websites)	PELUM (U) Secretariat	Nov. 2006
	- Production of information sheets on FLD for the Innovation Africa Symposium Market Place	PELUM (U); Oxfam Novib, PROLINNOVA	PELUM (U)	Nov. 2006
	- Participation in the innovation Africa symposium market place	2 participants from FLD workshop, PELUM Uganda, PROLINNOVA, CIAT, IIRR	PELUM (U) Participants from FLD workshop	Nov. 2006
	- Sharing event on FLD	PELUM member organizations, PROLINNOVA partners; Oxfam Novib partners	PELUM (U) Secretariat	2007
	- FLD workshop outcomes in organization newsletters and links to websites and "ground up magazine article"	PELUM Uganda, PELUM Association	PELUM Uganda	2006-2007
	- FLD pilot project	PELUM member organizations	PELUM MOs	2007
2. Build the capacity of ESAFF Uganda to implement their plans	- Hold a discussion forum on FLD with ESAFF Uganda members.	PELUM, ESAFF	PELUM (U)	2007

### 13.20 PROLINNOVA International

		When	Who
1.	<b>Feedback</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PROLINNOVA team meetings</li> <li>- Back to office report</li> <li>- Informal briefings COMPAS and EASE teams</li> </ul>	January 2007 Early Dec 2006 Dec 2006	LVE LVE / DRU LVE / DRU
2.	<b>Dissemination FLD workshop</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Posting to e-mail groups, PROLINNOVA YAHOO; PTD-forum, KM4DEV; INARS</li> <li>- PROLINNOVA website for news postings; create FLD sub-site</li> </ul>	End Nov 2006  Early 2007	DRU  DRU / LVE / IIRR Dayrit
3.	<b>Towards developing FLD theory and examples</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Explore opportunities/interest co-funding: CTA / IDRC</li> </ul>	Dec 2006	DRU, Prince →IDRC
4.	<b>Encouraging FLD among partners</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- FLD discussion session during next annual partners meeting</li> </ul>	March 2007, Senegal	LVE

### **13.21 Oxfam Novib**

#### **Objectives:**

- Share FLD workshop findings with Oxfam
- Motivate other NGOs and international networks to use this methodology
- Create linkages with interested stakeholders

#### **Actions: (output)**

- Present FLD findings to Oxfam Novib and KIC portal.
- Present FLD case studies on KIC portal

#### **Networking:**

- Actively inform and involve Oxfam International, Agromisa, WUR, and PROLINNOVA.
- Create linkages with media stakeholders for collaboration and technical support.
- Involve Southern livelihoods partner organizations to the process and liaise with participants of FLD workshops in the same region.

#### **Facilitation:**

- KIC portal (platform for exchange)
- Funding opportunities from partners

## 14. Annex 5 - Workshop Evaluation

After each day, the facilitators and one volunteer participant evaluated the day. This resulted in feedback to participants and facilitators such as:

- To keep presentations focused on FLD and less on background;
- To keep the number of presentation slides limited and if needed, skip a few;
- To try to be clear, slow and audible.

### Evaluation results

Results from an overall evaluation at the end of the workshop were as follows:

(Rating: *very poor, poor, fair, good, and excellent*)

1	Pre-workshop information dissemination	Excellent
2	Workshop venue location	Good
3	Workshop facilities room and equipment	Good
4	Hospitality - meals and accommodation	Excellent
5	Facilitation of the workshop	Good
6	Appropriateness of the content	Good
7	Extent of meeting participants' expectations	Good
8	Extent of meeting the workshop objectives	Good
9	Applicability of workshop learning to your work	Good
10	Overall organization of the workshop	Excellent
11	Would you recommend this workshop to others?	Yes

### General comments

1. Should have involved in more farmers.
2. It would be better if each organization had come with one farmer per country.
3. Need for Follow up activities of the resolutions made.
4. Every person should have had an opportunity to make a presentation on their case study.
5. It is a good initiative to help participants learn how FLD works and also not sure whether farmers benefit from the FLD exercise that is undertaken.
6. It was a great workshop however, there was a need for more theory on FLD
7. Next time participants to be given their money for dinner
8. It took a long period.
9. Would have liked to read the case studies in advance.
10. Should emphasize up scaling the concept and the practicality of the FLD.
11. Distribution of programs and time for presentations to be considered.
12. It was well organized and accompanied with good ideas.
13. Follow up workshops are important
14. Good to share experiences with others, but since documentation is taken as a cold topic, we have to articulate other topics to discuss.
15. More space for conceptual discussion, more space on organization's integration, clear strategic for follow ups
16. Advance documents to let people get informed of the subject and the contents.
17. Very good however, some facilitators didn't appreciate some comments that were made.
18. A great opportunity for participants to share and learn, hope to utilize the information gained back in the country.
19. Seed money held should be used for developing proposals and soliciting for funds for more activities.

20. Participatory way and integration of the workshop was excellent.

## 15. Annex 6 - List of Workshop Participants

To prevent SPAM, email addresses were changed in this list. To contact a person per e-mail, replace the ' AT ' by an @ sign.

	<b>Participants/organisation</b>	<b>Designation</b>	<b>Postal, Fax, Email Address</b>
1.	<b>Thabane Nicholas Madondo</b> <i>Farmer Support Group/ PROLINNOVA</i> SOUTH AFRICA	Farmer	P.O. Box 566 Benguille 3350 south Africa  madondont AT yahoo.com
2.	<b>Yusuf Kiwala</b>  NAADS  UGANDA	Information Specialist	Ykiwala AT naads.or.ug
3.	<b>Máximo A. García-Millán</b>  ARTE NATURA  MEXICO	Coordinator of Market on solidarity	artenaturamx AT yahoo.com.mx artenaturaATprodigy.net.mx
4.	<b>Lucy Orech</b>  WOUGNET  UGANDA	Information Officer	lorech AT wougn.net.org
5.	<b>Qureish Noordin</b>  <i>World Neighbors</i>  KENYA	Programme Coordinator Sustainable Agriculture	qnoordin AT wneastafrica.org
6.	<b>Luis Carlos Aguilar Apaza</b>  <i>Agrecol Andes</i>  BOLIVIA	Responsible Projecto	luiscarlos AT agrecolandes.org  4452200 www.agrecolandes.org info AT agrecolandes.org
7.	<b>Norbert Apentibadek</b>  ACDEP  GHANA	Programme Officer	Norbert AT acdep-the.org
8.	<b>Aselly Mwanza</b>  <i>PELUM Zambia</i>  ZAMBIA	NAKS Coordinator/ Information Officer	P.O. Box 30443 Lusaka Fax: + 260-1-295392  pelum AT coppernet.zm

9.	<b>Ritah Lumala</b> <i>Africa 2000 Network</i> UGANDA	Programme Assistant	rlumala AT a2n.org.ug ritahlumala AT yahoo.co.uk
10.	<b>Martin Watsisi</b> SATNET UGANDA	Communication and Advocacy Officer	watsism AT yahoo.com satnet AT utlonline.co.ug
11.	<b>Prince Deh</b> GINKS GHANA	Assistant Network coordinator	papalenzd AT yahoo.co.uk
12.	<b>Habtamu Admassu Ayana</b> ASARECA ETHIOPIA	Agricultural Researcher	P.O. Box 659 Nazareth, Ethiopia h_admassu2004 AT yahoo.com
13.	<b>Makojang Mahao</b> <i>PELUM Lesotho</i> LESOTHO	Programme Manager Care Lesotho	Tel: (09266)588611205 mmahao AT care.org.ls
14.	<b>Joshua Zake</b> <i>Enviromental Alert/ PELUM Uganda</i> UGANDA	Programme Officer Environment & Natural Resource	P.O. Box 11259 Kampala Tel: +256-712-862050 jzake AT envalert.org envalert AT envalert.org
15.	<b>Meshack Shikuku</b> <i>SACDEP/ PELUM Kenya</i> KENYA	Project Coordinator	P.O. Box 1134 Thika Kenya aramismeshak AT yahoo.com
16.	<b>Jorge Chavez</b> ILEIA NETHERLANDS	Editor LEISA magazine	j.chavez-tafur AT ileia.nl
17.	<b>Apolinary Medard Kahabi</b> <i>SAIPRO/ PELUM Tanzania</i> TANZANIA	Programme coordinator	P.O. Box 1, Hedaru Kirimanjaro saipro AT habari.co.tz khabitz AT yahoo.co.uk
18.	<b>Richard Nguma</b> CEFORD UGANDA	Programme Officer	P.O. Box 303 Arua ngumarich AT yahoo.com ceford_ug AT yahoo.com
19.	<b>Eria Bwana Simba</b> ARIS	Information Officer	qas AT kari.go.ug www.runetwork.de

	UGANDA		
20.	<b>Habtemariam Abate</b> <i>SLUF/PROLINNOVA Ethiopia</i> ETHIOPIA	Executive Director	habate2001 AT yahoo.com slu AT ethionet.et
21.	<b>Laurens Van Veldhuizen</b> <i>PROLINNOVA</i> NETHERLANDS	Member of PROLINNOVA International Support Team (IST)	l.van.veldhuizen AT etcnl.nl
22.	<b>Dorine Ruter</b> <i>PROLINNOVA</i> NETHERLANDS	Consultant - Learning & knowledge sharing	d.ruter AT etcnl.nl
23.	<b>Nicole Metz</b> <i>Oxfam Novib</i> Netherlands	KIC Officer Knowledge and Infrastructure	nicole.metz AT oxfamnovib.nl
24.	<b>Nicholas Senyonjo</b> <i>UEEF/ PELUM Uganda</i> UGANDA	Executive director	P.O.Box 5658 Kampala Tel: + 256-41-290740 senyonjonicholas AT yahoo.co.uk ugandaenvironmental AT yahoo.com
25.	<b>Emebet Wuhib-Mutungi</b> <i>A2NI/ PELUM Uganda</i> UGANDA	Communications Officer	ewuhib AT a2n.org.ug
26.	<b>Stella Grace Lutalo</b> PELUM Uganda Country Desk UGANDA	Country Desk Coordinator	pelumuganda AT utlonline.co.ug
27.	<b>Emily Drani</b> <i>Consultant</i> UGANDA	Consultant	emily_drانيا AT yahoo.co.uk
28.	<b>Mary Jo Kakinda</b> <i>A2NI/ PELUM Uganda</i> UGANDA	Chair person PELUM- Uganda	mjkakinda AT a2n.org.ug
29.	<b>Justine Juliet Ssempebwa</b> Uganda	Workshop Rapporteur	jssempebwa AT yahoo.com justine.ssempebwa AT finance.go.ug

