

Recommendations of the report

“Assessment of Capacity Development for Participatory Research and Gender Analysis among ICARDA and Partner Institutions”

(Report by Ann Braun)

(Extracted by Aden Aw-Hassan)

Current capacity-building approaches could be improved by the following:

1. **Mobilize core innovators as trainers:** Bring together innovators identified from the different projects and countries to brainstorm ways to move participatory approaches forward and to build capacity for them. These could be the core group of trainers. They could play a key role in designing capacity development, training trainers, accessing external skills as needed, and in monitoring and evaluation of capacity development processes.
2. **Organize experience sharing workshop across projects:** Integrating experience from the diversity of projects that ICARDA and partners are involved in as raw material for training. A benefit of this would be that more people would gain a “broader” picture of the diversity of participatory approaches, the skills, tools and processes and principles common to all of them, and how different approaches suit different contexts. More people would gain familiarity with PR & GA experiences from the region.

Strategies for future capacity development

Three complimentary strategies emerge from the context, demand, needs, lessons learned and views on how capacity building can be improved.

3. **Integrate capacity building into the project cycle:** Each project undertaking PR & GA integrates capacity-development into its project cycle and strengthens follow-up, mentoring and reflection processes building in order to make the learning process iterative and practice oriented.
4. **Form PR&GA network across projects:** Projects and programs undertaking PR & GA form a resource group or network to support capacity development across the board. The resource group is composed of methodological innovators and facilitators identified by each project. These innovators and facilitators could become a core group of trainers for the ICARDA network of projects.

5. **Assign a PR&GA network coordinator:** The projects undertaking PR & GA could contribute core funds or collaborate in resource mobilization to engage a resource person who could coordinate the network of innovators/facilitators/core trainers, help raise the visibility of the PR & GA work undertaken by the ICARDA network and facilitate linkages to other networks and resources. In addition this person could conduct research related to methodology development for PR & GA and/or to monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment. He or she could help stimulate and support discourse in ICARDA and regionally on key issues related to PR & GA approaches such as multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary models of integration and the relationship between the functional and empowerment objectives or functions of participatory approaches.

Assessment of Capacity Development for Participatory Research and Gender Analysis among ICARDA and Partner Institutions

15 April, 2005



Prepared by:
Ann Braun, Consultant, PhD
P.O. Box 462
Nelson, New Zealand
Tel: +64-544-2597
Fax: +64-544-2503
a.braun@xtra.co.nz

Table of Contents

ACRONYMS	3
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	5
1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
The contex for participatory and gender approaches.....	6
Demand and specific needs for capacity development.....	7
Lessons learned from capacity development experience	8
Strategies for future capacity development.....	9
2. OBJECTIVES.....	10
3. MOETHODOLOGY.....	10
4. THE CONTEXT FOR PARTICIPATORY AND GENDER APPROACHES	11
4.1 Summary.....	11
4.2. The value of PR & GA approaches:.....	13
4.2.1. ICARDA Views	13
4.2.2. National Program Views.....	14
4.3. Expectations and potentials of PR & GA methods.....	15
4.3.1 ICARDA Views	15
4.3.2. National Program Views.....	16
4.4. What is (or is not) participatory research?	17
4.4.1. ICARDA Views	17
4.4.2. National Program Views.....	19
4.5. What is (or is not) Gender equitable/sensitive research?	20
4.5.1. ICARDA and National Program Views	20
4.6. Concerns about PR & GA and how they can be addressed	21
4.6.1. ICARDA Views	21
4.6.2. National Program Views.....	30
5. DEMAND AND SPECIFIC NEEDS FOR CAPACITY BUILDING.	31
5.1. Summary.....	31
5.2. Detailed summary of data from the inventory	32
6. LESSONS LEARNED FROM CAPACITY BUILDING EXPERIENCE	39
6.1. Summary.....	39
6.2. Lessons learned from recent ICARDA experiences.....	40
6.2.1. Observations and insights by trainer consultants.....	43
6.2.2. Detailed feedback on capacity-building experiences from trainer consultants....	44
6.2.3. Innovators in PR & GA approaches	46
6.2.4. Synthesis of formal capacity building events	46
6.3. Has capacity-building been internalised?.....	49
6.3.1. Views of ICARDA researchers	49
6.3.2. Views of trainer consultants	50
7. STRATEGIES FOR FUTURE CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT	51
7.1. Summary	51
7.2. Details	52
REFERENCES	56
APPENDIX 1. Terms of Reference	57
APPENDIX 2. Schedule of interviews	60
APPENDIX 3 Considerations for proposal development and review	62

ACRONYMS

ARC	Agricultural Research Center, Egypt
CABI	Commonwealth Agricultural Bureau International
CWANA	Central and West Asia and North Africa
EPMR	External Program and Management Review
FFS	Farmer Field School
FPR	Farmer Participatory Research
GCSAR	General Commission for Syrian Agricultural Research
HQ	Headquarters
ICARDA	International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
INRAT	National Agricultural Research Institute of Tunisia
IPM	Integrated Pest Management
M&M	Mashreq and Maghreb Project
NARES	National Agricultural Research and Extension System
NARS	National Agricultural Research System
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
NRM	Natural Resource Management
NRMP	Natural Resource Management Program
NVRSRP	Nile Valley Red Sea Regional Program
PADEL	Agro-pastoral Development and Local Initiatives Promotion Program in the South-East
PPB	Participatory Plant Breeding
PR & GA	Participatory Research and Gender Analysis
PRGA	CGIAR Systemwide Program on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis
PRODESUD	Project de developpement agropastoral et de promotion des initiatives locales dans le sud est
PTE	Participatory Technology Evaluation
PVS	Participatory Varietal Selection
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Aden Aw-Hassan, Richard Thomas, Salvatore Cecarelli, Stefania Grando, Hanadi Dessougi, Kasem Al-Ahmad, Mr. Afif, Amor Yahyaoui, Marica Boyagi, Majd Jamal, Mohamad El-Mourid, Ali Nefzaoui, and Ismail Moneim for the time and effort they put into logistical arrangements and especially for their warm hospitality which made my visits to Aleppo, Damascus, Cairo and Tunis memorable and happy occasions.

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The context for participatory and gender approaches

Two main views of PR & GA approaches were apparent among ICARDA researchers and in the national programs visited. The first is a functional view, which perceives the main value of these approaches as related to improved efficiency, effectiveness and impact of research. Within this functional view a prominent perception in ICARDA and among some national researchers and programs is that participatory approaches are a tool for promoting researcher-generated technologies. The second view, which values PR & GA as a means of empowerment, is less prominent. This view sees gender-sensitive and equitable participatory approaches as a means to bring about positive social change and democratisation through sharing of knowledge, decision-making and power. Researchers holding this view tend to see technology development as a component in the wider process of developing sustainable livelihoods, and view themselves as contributing one form of knowledge to the process, while playing a role in facilitating the integration of other sources of knowledge. Among national researchers the functional view was more associated with programs that have less experience and expertise with participatory approaches.

Among ICARDA researchers two main views exist about researcher roles in within teams involved in PR & GA. Some researchers prefer a multidisciplinary mode in which research is handled from a variety of disciplinary perspectives. In practice this translates into assigning responsibility for participatory research to the social scientists in a team. Others prefer an interdisciplinary mode in which teams purposefully integrate concepts and methodologies from different disciplines and perspectives into a common framework. In practice this translates into shared responsibility for PR & GA.

There was a strong recognition among ICARDA and national program researchers that the incorporation of gender perspectives is important in current commodity-oriented and natural resource management work and that this is a weak area.

Concerns about PR & GA approaches were mainly focused on how these can be better supported and developed. Key issues included the following:

Institutional: Many researchers would like to see more support from ICARDA management to “raise the flag” of PR & GA at ICARDA. This would allow the centre to respond to emerging opportunities around the CWANA region to link with and help empower other organisations (including an emerging NGO presence) applying participatory approaches in order to improve the livelihoods of farmers and agropastoralists, conserve biodiversity and address other key natural resource management issues.

Methodological: Despite of the development and use of community approach, the INRM approach in several projects, some researchers voiced concern about a perceived lack of clear methodologies particularly for participatory research related to complex NRM issues. Approaches for data collection and analysis within participatory research frameworks and better documentation in general were identified as needs. There is also some concern about how to move from the use of participatory approaches to promote the supply of existing technologies to a more demand-driven mode of participatory technology development.

Integration: Many researchers would like to see more integration occurring across disciplines, projects and with other actors including national programs, NGOs and the private sector. PR & GA approaches and joint proposal and project development are seen as going “hand in hand” with integration.

Capacity: Many researchers feel that ICARDA does not have enough in-house expertise in participatory research, that more gender expertise is also needed, and that more women researchers are needed in order to reach women farmers and agropastoralists. A number of scientists have developed their own expertise in participatory research and are recognised as innovators by colleagues. A common perception is that the innovators do not have the time to help others develop capacity in participatory research. There is recognition by some researchers that some NARS have very significant expertise and experience in participatory research and gender analysis -- especially in Africa (e.g. Ethiopia, Kenya, Morocco, Tunisia).

Capacity development: Researchers in projects applying participatory approaches recognise a need for capacity building and articulated a number of strategies for going about this including: 1) raising the visibility of participatory research at ICARDA as a way to attract resources for capacity-building; 2) increasing exposure to PR & GA experiences elsewhere; 3) combining formal and informal mechanisms of capacity-building and using innovative approaches; 4) addressing gender staffing issues; 5) making sure capacity building is well targeted; 6) using pilot projects with positive results to demonstrate the value of participatory research.

Demand and specific needs for capacity development

About half of the projects identified the need for capacity development through stakeholder consultation processes. The other projects based their decisions on technology adoption rates and on perceptions that knowledge of participatory approaches needed to be increased.

Most of the effort in capacity building is being directed at NARS researchers and research assistants. Farmers and extension workers are also included in some of the capacity development plans.

Although the inventory asked specifically about capacity building related to PR & GA, some of the objectives of the planned capacity building relate to more conventional research skills such as capacity to conduct household and community surveys, assessing the impact of technologies, improving disease diagnosis and control and decreasing the gap between yield potential and production in wheat fields. Some of the objectives are very general such as getting farmers involved in pest management, improving technology adoption, reducing poverty -- while others are much more specific, such as formulating plans and strategies for implementing PPB in crops with strategic importance for drought-prone areas. The very general objectives do not provide a strong basis for formulating well-designed capacity development interventions.

The formats and approaches for capacity building are diverse and in most cases there are plans to combine workshops with fieldwork, on the job training and other modalities such as cross visits, individual mentoring and action research.

The content of training, which specifically mentioned participatory research, included

- Theory and principles of participatory research
- Livelihoods approaches
- Tools for participatory research
- Design of participatory field trials and analysis of data
- Organization of meetings with farmers, sharing data with farmers
- Need based technology design

- Participatory learning processes
- Encouraging farmers' experimentation,
- Communication/listening skills
- Skills for integrating local/outsider knowledge
- Facilitation skills
- Gender
- The action research cycle
- Joint planning and partnerships with rural communities

Most of the planned capacity building will be designed and facilitated by small teams usually with some support from external consultants.

At least 320 people will be trained and at least 70 days of formal training is planned in 2005 (not counting season -long farmer field schools).

In addition most projects have identified additional capacity-building needs, which are not yet included in proposals or work plans.

Lessons learned from capacity development experience

The current capacity building strategy involves significant reliance on external consultants as trainers, combined with on-the-job training and informal mentoring in project settings. There are also a number of self-motivated individuals in ICARDA and among partner organizations who gained competence in participatory approaches through independent study and learning from practical experiences. A few of these individuals have gained prominence in ICARDA and beyond as pioneers and methodological innovators and have developed the capacity of others (individuals and teams) through a combination of hands-on experience, mentoring and formal training. Whether done by training consultants or internal innovators, formal capacity-building has been organized mainly on a project basis with insufficient cross-project collaboration or communication.

Since 2002 ICARDA's Natural Resource Management Program (NRMP) has played a role in organizing seven formal workshops on participatory approaches. The Socioeconomics of Production Systems Project has facilitated in the organization of most of these workshops. Other significant capacity building has been conducted by the barley PPB project, by the IPM project on sunn pest, by the PRODESUD project led by INRAT in Tunisia and by the Agrobiodiversity project in West Asia, IRDEN Project, WANA Benchmark Project, CP in Karkheh River Basin in Iran, and Mountain and Tillage projects in Morocco.

Main lessons learned from these capacity building experiences include the following:

- Follow-up to formal capacity building is perceived as a weak point in many projects. Without follow up it will be difficult for participants to translate what they have learned into good quality gender sensitive/equitable, participatory research processes. Unless the need for follow-up is acknowledged from the beginning, adequate funding for it may not be factored into budgets.
- Capacity-building needs to be more practice-oriented. Both training consultants and participatory research innovators in the ICARDA network recommend a programmed and iterative local approach where training and mentoring is built into projects and opportunities to discuss and reflect on experiences are a frequent and regular element of the process.

Although significant progress has been made, there is still a great deal of work done to internalize participatory approaches in ICARDA and among partners. In addition to inadequate follow-up, main constraints include 1) the top-down culture in the region; 2) limited knowledge about participatory approaches among managers, researchers and extension staff; 3) disinterest or resistance among researchers and research assistants; 4) a transfer-of-technology culture; 5) compartmentalized organizational structures. It would be also be helpful if more researchers realized that improving the efficiency and effectiveness of research through by increasing stakeholder participation is compatible with more development and empowerment-oriented views of participatory approaches.

Current capacity-building approaches could be improved by:

- Bringing together innovators identified from the different projects and countries to brainstorm ways to move participatory approaches forward and to build capacity for them. These could be the core group of trainers. They could play a key role in designing capacity development, training trainers, accessing external skills as needed, and in monitoring and evaluation of capacity development processes.
- Integrating experience from the diversity of projects that ICARDA and partners are involved in as raw material for training. A benefit of this would be that more people would gain a “broader” picture of the diversity of participatory approaches, the skills, tools and processes and principles common to all of them, and how different approaches suit different contexts. More people would gain familiarity with PR & GA experiences from the region.

Strategies for future capacity development

Three complimentary strategies emerge from the context, demand, needs, lessons learned and views on how capacity building can be improved.

1. Each project undertaking PR & GA integrates capacity-development into its project cycle and strengthens follow-up, mentoring and reflection processes building in order to make the learning process iterative and practice oriented.
2. Projects and programs undertaking PR & GA form a resource group or network to support capacity development across the board. The resource group is composed of methodological innovators and facilitators identified by each project. These innovators and facilitators could become a core group of trainers for the ICARDA network of projects.
3. The projects undertaking PR & GA could contribute core funds or collaborate in resource mobilization to engage a resource person who could coordinate the network of innovators/facilitators/core trainers, help raise the visibility of the PR & GA work undertaken by the ICARDA network and facilitate linkages to other networks and resources. In addition this person could conduct research related to methodology development for PR & GA and/or to monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment. He or she could help stimulate and support discourse in ICARDA and regionally on key issues related to PR & GA approaches such as multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary models of integration and the relationship between the functional and empowerment objectives or functions of participatory approaches.

Some strengths, weaknesses and risks of these strategies are summarized.

2. OBJECTIVES

This study has three objectives:

- To assess demand and specific needs for capacity development in PR & GA in ICARDA and among partner institutions
- To develop a strategy and plan of action for capacity development
- To identify mechanisms for sustaining networks of national trainers associated with ICARDA.

3. METHODOLOGY

This assessment of the development of capacity to conduct participatory research and gender analysis in ICARDA and among partner institutions was carried out in the context of an ICARDA project entitled “Socioeconomics of Production Systems (Project 4.2)” under the Natural Resources Management Program¹. Aden Aw-Hassan, the project leader, developed the Terms of Reference, planned the implementation and supported the process of carrying it out. The study was financed by the CGIAR Systemwide Program on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis (PRGA) under Letter of Agreement C-039-04. The Terms of Reference are available in Appendix 1.

Four main approaches were used to meet the objectives of this study. The first of these is **an analysis of the context of PR & GA in ICARDA and among partners**. To develop this, interviews were conducted with ICARDA staff at headquarters and in two of the regions (Cairo and Tunis). Most of these meetings were held on an individual basis. The list of people interviewed is given in Appendix 2. All other regional offices were contacted by email; however no inputs were received.

The Terms of Reference also called for an analysis of proposal documents as a way of providing reference point for actual PR & GA activities and related capacity building. Unfortunately it was not possible to access proposal documents from the projects office.

Four field visits were planned involving 1) the Barley Participatory Plant Breeding work and the Khanasser Valley project in Syria, 2) activities related to the Nile Valley Red Sea Regional Program (NVRSRP) in Egypt and 3) Mashreq and Maghreb III in Tunisia. The latter visit could not be carried out². It was also not possible to visit the Khanasser Valley³ however I spent an afternoon interviewing the Community Facilitator associated with this project.

The contextual analysis involved exploring four main lines of inquiry with each individual interviewed:

- General perceptions on the value of PR & GA
- Views on what is or is not participatory and gender sensitive/equitable research
- Expectations and potentials of PR & GA methods
- Concerns about PR & GA approaches and how these can be addressed

The views of ICARDA and national program researchers on each of these issues have been collated from recordings and notes based on the interviews and organized thematically. The

¹ Under ICARDA’s new structure, this is now part of Poverty and Livelihood Analysis (Project 5).

² The planned visit to Tataoine was affected by rearrangements in the travel schedule to adjust for a mistake in the issuing of the airticket for travel to Tunis and Cairo.

³ The visit to Khanasser Valley was also affected by the same airticket problem.

comments have been paraphrased and edited to increase clarity and to make them more concise, however every attempt was made to reflect the original sense of the comments. The full diversity of comments for each thematic area is presented.

The second approach was to **develop an assessment of demand and specific needs for capacity building**. These issues were raised during interviews, however the main source of information for this was an inventory sent to each person interviewed and all the regional offices.

The third approach was **to identify current approaches and strategies in capacity building and to explore ideas for improving these** with those interviewed. To complement the interview findings I attempted to assess to what degree past capacity building in PR & GA approaches has been internalized. This was accomplished by examining the process documentation developed through formal capacity building events, interviewing (by email or in person) trainers and then analyzing the interviews with ICARDA and national program staff in light of the main messages developed during the capacity-building events. The reports submitted by the trainers were also reviewed. The process documentation and reports are listed in the reference list. This approach was constrained by two factors: the process documentation was not available before the start of the assignment, and the program of meetings included very few people who had participated in the training. Nevertheless, a synthesis of main points from some of the formal capacity building developed through this process may be useful in the future as a reference point for self-assessment of the internalization of capacity-building in PR & GA.

The final approach was to **synthesize information from these first three approaches into a several possible strategies for on-going capacity development in PR & GA approaches**. The terms of reference also call for the development of a plan of action for capacity development; however, I suggest that the actual planning be conducted in a participatory fashion by ICARDA and partners, and hope that the strategies will be a useful input for developing this plan.

While I have acted in an independent capacity during the conduct of this study, it should be noted that I served as the facilitator of a PRGA working group on Participatory Natural Resource Management from 2000 – 2004, and have provided recent support to ICARDA and national partners in building capacity for Participatory Research and Gender Analysis (PR & GA) in Central Asia.

4. THE CONTEXT FOR PARTICIPATORY AND GENDER APPROACHES

4.1 Summary

Two main views of PR & GA approaches were apparent among ICARDA researchers and in the national programs visited. The first is a functional view, which perceives the main value of these approaches as related to improved efficiency, effectiveness and impact of research. Within this functional view a prominent perception in ICARDA and among some national researchers is that participatory approaches are a tool for promoting researcher-generated technologies. The second view, which values PR & GA as a means of empowerment, is less prominent. This view sees gender-sensitive and equitable participatory approaches as a means to bring about positive social change through sharing of knowledge, decision-making and power. Researchers holding this view tend to see technology development as a component in a wider process of developing sustainable livelihoods, and themselves as contributing one form of knowledge to the process, while playing a role in facilitating the integration of other sources of knowledge. Among national researchers the functional view

was more associated with programs that have less experience and expertise with participatory approaches.

Among ICARDA researchers two main views exist about researcher roles in within teams involved in PR & GA. Some researchers prefer a multidisciplinary mode in which research is handled from a variety of disciplinary perspectives. In practice this translates into assigning responsibility for participatory research to the social scientists in a team. Others prefer an interdisciplinary mode in which teams purposefully integrate concepts and methodologies from different disciplines and perspectives into a common framework. In practice this translates into shared responsibility for PR & GA.

There was a strong recognition among ICARDA and national program researchers that the incorporation of gender perspectives is important in current commodity-oriented and natural resource management work and that this is a weak area.

Concerns about PR & GA approaches were mainly focused on how these can be better supported and developed. Key issues included the following:

Institutional: Many researchers would like to see more support from ICARDA management to “raise the flag” of PR & GA at ICARDA. This would allow the centre to respond to emerging opportunities around the CWANA region to link with and help empower other organisations (including an emerging NGO presence) applying participatory approaches in order to improve the livelihoods of farmers and agropastoralists, conserve biodiversity and address other key natural resource management issues.

Methodological: Some researchers voiced concern about a perceived lack of clear methodologies particularly for participatory research related to complex NRM issues. Approaches for data collection and analysis within participatory research frameworks and better documentation in general were identified as needs. There is also some concern about how to move from the use of participatory approaches to promote the supply of existing technologies to a more demand-driven mode of participatory technology development.

Integration: Many researchers would like to see more integration occurring across disciplines, projects and with other actors including national programs, NGOs and the private sector. PR & GA approaches and joint proposal and project development are seen as going “hand in hand” with integration.

Capacity: Many researchers feel that ICARDA does not have enough in-house expertise in participatory research; that more gender expertise is also needed, and that women researchers in teams are needed in order to reach women farmers and agropastoralists. A number of scientists have developed their own expertise in participatory research and are recognised as innovators by colleagues. A common perception is that the innovators do not have the time to help others develop capacity in participatory research. There is recognition that some NARS have very significant experience and expertise in participatory research and gender analysis than ICARDA -- especially in Africa (e.g. Ethiopia, Kenya, Morocco, and Tunisia).

Capacity development: Researchers in projects applying participatory approaches recognise a need for capacity building and articulated a number of strategies for going about this including: 1) raising the visibility of participatory research at ICARDA as a way to attract resources for capacity-building; 2) increasing exposure to PR & GA experiences elsewhere; 3) combining formal and informal mechanisms of capacity-building and use innovative approaches; 4) addressing gender staffing issues; 5) making sure capacity development is well targeted; 6) using pilot projects with positive results to demonstrate the value of participatory research.

4.2. The value of PR & GA approaches:

4.2.1. ICARDA Views

ICARDA staff at headquarters (HQ) and in regional offices identified several main areas of value related to PR & GA approaches. The most commonly expressed view was related to improved efficiency, effectiveness and impact of research.

Improved efficiency, effectiveness and impact of research
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participatory approaches are very important because many technologies developed by researchers alone, have not been adopted by farmers. Researchers may think they understand farmers' criteria, but low adoption rates indicate otherwise. • Participatory research is a way to make research more effective and more efficient; results reach the targeted people and can be produced more quickly and with least cost • PR & GA can improve research relevance and make results more useful, which means research can have more impact. It also allows more understanding of different users of research results and hence impact can be differentiated. • Participatory approaches make research more targeted. • Adoption and fast dissemination of improved technologies/products can be observed. • Participatory approaches provide a way of convincing farmers about improved technology and to get these applied by a majority of communities. • Participatory research is a necessary component for reaching farmers to get our technologies adopted. I am somehow not satisfied with publications on the shelves of scientists if the technologies are not used by farmers. • Faster farmer to farmer diffusion of varieties is one of the advantages of participatory varietal selection (PVS); the informal seed sector predominates for crops where government services do not produce seed -- PVS is a key factor in supporting this sector and speeding up seed multiplication. • PVS results in speeding up the process of varietal release and dissemination of improved varieties.

PR & GA approaches were also frequently cited as catalysts or enhancers of integration and collaboration among researchers and between researchers and other actors in Natural Resource Management (NRM).

Improved integration and collaboration
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The participatory approach can help to stimulate more research integration and better NRM by farmers. • The participatory approach stimulates the integration of breeding work into a more holistic systems approach; breeding should be a component of animal and cropping systems and part of wider NRM work. • Participatory approaches enhance collaboration across projects and disciplines. • Participatory approaches fit well with the perspective of solving land management issues. Participatory work is important when working with communities living on commonly held and used land where complicated social issues must be solved. • NRM work demands participatory approaches and in turn these approaches demand that we develop stronger linkages with non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and development projects

Some ICARDA researchers also perceived PR & GA approaches as catalysts of individual and institutional change and as a mechanism for improving relationships.

Catalysts for change and improved relationships
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ICARDA has worked for a long time in a way that was supply driven; Farmers were given incentives to try technologies and the apparently high adoption was a reflection of this. Changing this culture has been very painful, but definitely worthwhile. • Participatory research is of value in this region as a way of encouraging people to have a greater level of contact with farmers and to listen more to them. Because of the top down style prevailing in this region, there tends to be a mentality of "we know what works". • Participatory research frameworks provide a new way of conceptualizing agricultural research.

Several staff members felt that despite the growing in interest in participatory approaches at ICARDA that their value was not sufficiently understood or appreciated.

Participatory Approaches are Undervalued
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ICARDA staff are not adequately aware of the value of Participatory approaches. Exposure to outside experiences could help to change people's views - There is little knowledge of the history or theory of participatory approaches among staff. • The attitude at ICARDA towards participatory approaches is positive at this stage, but these are new approaches for ICARDA and they have not been institutionalised.

4.2.2. National Program Views

Some national program researchers share the view of many ICARDA researchers that the value of PR & GA approaches lies in improving the efficiency, effectiveness and impact of research. These national program staff tend to value PR & GA approaches as functional tools that are useful specifically for promoting technologies generated by researchers. Other national program researcher's view and value participatory approaches as catalysts or contributors to change, which may occur among farmers, communities and the governmental and non-governmental agencies serving them. For these researchers participatory approaches are associated with the processes of empowerment and democratisation.

PR & GA approaches are valuable as tools for promoting technology
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participatory research is a very powerful tool for letting farmers decide which research outputs they prefer and value • Participatory diagnosis (PRA) is complementary to the system of on station trials, trials in farmers fields and demonstration trials. It provides more detailed information, labour issues can emerge and farmers gain a greater appreciation of how a technology is produced. • The participatory and community approach is effective and valuable because farmers are not educated enough to be convinced of researchers recommendations • Working with farmers promotes the adoption of new technologies • Participatory research helps to promote technology and to increase adoption

PR & GA approaches build knowledge and catalyse change and empowerment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working with farmers and their wives conserves biodiversity and helps to improve the knowledge of scientists • Local knowledge is disappearing due to immigration and development – participatory work can help to document and preserve local knowledge • Participatory approaches are schools of democracy • By the end of the second phase of the M&M Project we were just beginning to touch participation. By learning from this experience and integrating many other experiences from the region we are moving forward towards empowerment of local populations of agropastoralists

These differences in views may reflect differences in experience and expertise with participatory approaches. The more functional view was associated with the Egyptian national program, which is just beginning to try participatory approaches and has relatively limited expertise. The more empowering view is associated with the Tunisian and Moroccan national programs, which have built experience in over a significant period of time and have made significant investments in building expertise.

4.3. Expectations and potentials of PR & GA methods

4.3.1 ICARDA Views

The strongest area of expectations for PR & GA methods among ICARDA staff related to effectiveness, efficiency and impact of research and two main areas of emphasis emerged. ICARDA researchers expect PR & GA methods to lead to more relevant research with increased impact and to speed the research and development process.

More relevant research with increased impact
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better understanding of problems and development of more relevant results • Increase impact of research by improving relevance of technology for users • The objective of farmers' participation in research is to reflect their preferences and to understand what they expect from the research • Participatory research should be applied systematically by impact-oriented centres like ICARDA and national programs and should be combined with gender analysis • The aim is not to create a farmers' group, but to move the best technologies out to the greatest number of farmers • Participatory research provides a way of understanding gender-related differences in farmers' criteria; for example market issues, quality characteristics and issues related to labour, which have different importance to men and women in different settings • Gender aspects of agricultural technology can be addressed • The participatory community approach allows us to better focus research on the problems in managing common rangeland, identify areas of research priority, and determine how to modify grazing systems research to fit community situations

Speed the research and development process
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participatory research reduces the research lag • Participatory research shortens the adoption lag by stimulating early adoption and increasing adoption speed • Participatory research improves adoption and leads to faster dissemination

After expectations related to effectiveness, efficiency and impact the next strongest area of expectation related to stimulating learning, broadening knowledge and the merging knowledge from different sources or epistemological systems.

Stimulate learning, broaden knowledge and merge knowledge from different sources
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participatory research offers a way to merge the technical knowledge of research with farmers' ideas on why technology components are acceptable • Application of participatory approaches results in the gaining of broader skills and knowledge; practitioners become less confined to a single discipline • Participatory research feels more "reasonable" --and makes it possible to take a broader view, to see linkages, to be more practical than would be the case if we were only doing conventional research • Participatory projects can serve as capacity-building "laboratories" for young researchers • Participatory processes encourage learning in national programs

Expectations and potentials related to improved collaboration and integration to empowerment also emerged.

Improved collaboration and integration
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participatory research is a mechanism for strengthening collaboration among different research disciplines at ICARDA and with partners • Learning about participatory processes can help to make the system less compartmentalized

Empowerment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participatory approaches increase farmer knowledge and empower farmers • Participatory approaches empower local people

4.3.2. National Program Views

National program expectations of participatory approaches fell into three main areas: Empowerment, including empowerment of women, increased adoption of technologies and improved collaboration between national and international research partners.

Empowerment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women have less information than men in all technical areas; gender approaches and participatory work can help improve the situation of women • Participatory development of selection of technologies is important, but it is only a first step. The real purpose of participation is to change things in our societies, to be trained in democracy. • The objective of participation is to increase democracy in the community • Participatory research gives farmers the opportunities to become decision-makers rather than the mere recipients of technologies developed by researchers

Increased adoption of technologies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participatory approaches can increase adoption – especially of water technologies which have rarely been adopted by farmers.

Collaboration between national and international research partners
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The attitude of international scientists towards national scientists tends to be somewhat like the attitude of scientists towards farmers. Before participatory approaches were

introduced researchers didn't pay enough attention to partnerships with farmers. Likewise, the quality of partnerships between national and international research centers also needs more attention and hopefully participatory approaches can shed some light on how to improve these.

4.4. What is (or is not) participatory research?

4.4.1. ICARDA Views

ICARDA researchers recognize that participatory research is not a single approach, and that methodologies have evolved over time.

Participatory research is not a single approach

- Distinguishing what is and what is not participatory is not so straightforward; participatory research requires communication methods and takes time because it requires capacity building on both sides (farmers/researchers)
- There is a spectrum of participation based on the role of farmers in design, implementation and evaluation. There is no yardstick to say what is participatory research and what is not, but for each type the level and role of farmer participation in the research cycle should be well justified with a purpose.
- Participatory research is not a strict sequence of methodological steps but rather a way of doing research, which has to vary from situation to situation and from community to community.
- The researcher is faced with determining the most effective way of doing research - who should participate and when - on a case by case basis. The same participatory research process can not be applied everywhere

Participatory research approaches evolve

- Early concepts of participatory research related to agricultural development date from farming systems research and have evolved over time
- Farming systems research involved participation of farmers and communities -- but the participation was not spelled out
- Participatory research is a new stage in ways of working with farmers
- We've been doing participatory work from time immemorial, but in different forms. The term is used differently in different contexts

Several enabling conditions for participatory research were mentioned repeatedly:

Enabling conditions for participatory research

- Sustained contact with farmers
- Two-way communication with farmers
- Mutual trust and respect

When asked how they define or characterize participatory research, two main views emerged among ICARDA researchers – these have already been described (in the section on national researcher views on the value of PR & GA approaches) as functional and empowerment views.

A main concern among those holding functional views of participation was the cost versus the benefit of participatory approaches to research.

Cost vs benefit of participatory research	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting farmers' experimentation is considered as an advanced level of participatory research, but the issues of cost and wider applicability of such research can be questioned When the participation itself becomes the objective, participatory research becomes costly and might divert you from the real objective. My concern is the high financial cost of integrated participatory research, but it is worth it if it reaches the end users. Rural communities are the ones with the lowest levels of benefits from public investments, thus they deserve full involvement in R&D design, planning, implementation and evaluation.

The functional views characterize participatory research in a number of ways: for some participatory research is any form of contact with farmers during the research process, for others the defining characteristic of participatory research is consultation and dialogue with farmers. Some view participatory research as a tool or instrument for bringing about technology transfer. Still others associated participatory research with participatory evaluation of technologies.

Functional views of participatory research	
Working with farmers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At ICARDA participatory research used to mean any form of "working with farmers". Everyone said they were doing participatory research - this is changing slowly as awareness grows. Most of our work is done on farmers' fields. When you do with work with communities it is necessarily participatory
Consultation and dialogue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participatory research means taking into consideration farmers views and having dialogue with farmers
A tool for technology transfer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participatory research is work that leads to adoption and impact; work that makes the probability higher for technology to be transferred
Participatory technology evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The aim of participatory technology evaluation is to find better uses for tested technologies; to encourage their adoption and improvement by farmers and to increasingly enhance farmer's ownership of research Participatory technology evaluation is an essential part of farmer participatory research. In PTE farmers observe and evaluate different technologies under local conditions. Participatory research involves getting farmers' feedback on elite lines which already have key resistances/tolerances incorporated. Appropriate farmer involvement consists of providing inputs to evaluations of quality and agronomic traits

Those with empowerment views of participation mentioned several key characteristics of participatory research – these are 1) sharing of knowledge and power and 2) mutual learning.

Empowerment views	
Sharing power and knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Doing participatory work means sharing power and acknowledging that other's knowledge is important In a participatory project things change in the way the project operates as a result of feedback from farmers; when farmers see their suggestions having an impact on the project they are empowered. Empowerment is not just participation in decision-making, but wielding the power to change processes and outcomes

Mutual learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The difference in participatory work is that we do not give farmers directives; nothing is imposed; it's a learning approach on both sides • Participatory research involves learning and taking of action together to build relationships, trust and credibility
-----------------	--

The conversations indicated that ICARDA researchers hold diverse views about when farmers should be involved in research processes.

When should farmers be involved in research?	
At particular stages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participatory research involves getting farmers' feedback on elite lines which already have key resistances/tolerances incorporated. Appropriate farmer involvement consists of providing inputs to evaluations of quality and agronomic traits • Believing in participatory research is not incompatible with seeing that stakeholders can be involved at certain stages. Some say farmers need to be involved at all stages, but this is not necessarily the case.
Throughout the project cycle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Farmers should participate from the beginning of our activities up to the harvest of materials -- full participation • Participatory research means at the very least doing evaluation of technology components with farmers and ideally involving them in the whole research cycle
It depends on the situation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are extreme views at ICARDA ranging from the belief that work needs to be totally participatory with farmers involved at all stages to be of value or to develop something useful - to the belief that farmer participation is not useful or at best useful on an occasional or opportunistic basis • There are two main approaches - involving farmers in day to day conduct of research and doing research with the knowledge of the farmer on what you are doing • The researcher is faced with determining the most effective way of doing research - who should participate and when - on a case by case basis. • There is a spectrum of participation based on the role of farmers in design, implementation and evaluation. For each type the level and role of farmer participation in the research cycle should be well justified with a purpose.

4.4.2. National Program Views

Responses to the question of what is (or is not) participatory research came from Tunisian and Moroccan national program staff. More researchers from Egypt were interviewed and they were quite oriented towards describing the Egyptian programs and institutions during the interviews and field visit, and tended not to respond to this question directly. This could also be a reflection of the relative novelty of their efforts to learn about and apply participatory approaches. For the researchers interviewed from the Tunisian and Moroccan national programs participatory research is associated with empowerment and democratization, with an emphasis on people rather than technology and with processes focused on learning and change. Participatory technology development is seen as an element within this wider development-oriented framework.

Participatory research is about social change, empowerment and democracy

- The most important output of a participatory process is that everybody involved sits in a basic school of democracy
- Participatory development of selection of technologies is important but it is only a step. The real purpose of participation is to try to change things in our societies
- Consulting or collaborating with farmers is taken by many as participatory, but to my understanding real participation is something that goes much further. Real participation is about social change; it's about empowerment.

Characteristics of participatory processes

- Participatory work is vision-based -- start by reviewing the past, then look at the situation today, then ask explore what people would like to see happening in the future -- what they want to leave for future generations. If you ask for problems all you will get is an endless shopping list. When researchers do diagnosis they fall into the trap of fixating on problems. It is unavoidable that problems will come up in discussions, but this is not what you focus on -- you focus on people's vision for the future
- Farmers are involved from the start and their opinions and suggestions are fundamental to the development of the project
- Participatory research is not about technologies, it's about people
- Participatory research is working with people rather than working for people
- Participatory research is a way of respecting farmer experience rather than imposing researcher's ideas

4.5. *What is (or is not) Gender equitable/sensitive research?*

4.5.1. ICARDA and National Program Views

Many researchers at ICARDA and from the national programs visited stressed that incorporation of gender perspectives in research is an weak area within their participatory research and one that needs more attention. When researchers were asked what is (or is not) gender equitable or sensitive research, many replied with comments that gender has not adequately been addressed in their projects.

Gender equitable/sensitive research has not been adequately addressed

- Gender related research is nascent
- We have not done any gender related research
- We have limited experience with gender analysis
- Gender analysis is not adequately used
- Gender has not been adequately addressed in our projects
- More work on women's roles in conserving biodiversity is one of our exit strategies
- Gender concerns are being incorporated more and more, but no training on this has been done
- Even though ICARDA has a gender expert, access to advice/support on gender issues is not adequate
- Gender issues are important in wheat breeding. This is not on the research agenda but it should be. Research teams need people with gender sensitivity. Current work on gender is ad hoc
- Researchers need to be able to survey women, to access them to see what they need in terms of technology. In the context of this region, women researchers are needed for this work

What is (or is not) gender equitable/sensitive research?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genuine interaction with farmers (men and women) in understanding their problems and constraints, which can then be incorporated into the research process. • Men and women's evaluation of research results is participatory research, but this is not sufficient if it is done on an individual basis. A methodology for systematizing it is essential for transferring it to others. • Working with farmers requires clarity about whom to work with – in some cases it is with women, but we must also consider age groups and different interest groups • We involve women in cooking quality testing and make selections based on this information • Gender analysis is done through survey work and is important because gender determines in the community what tasks are and are not done as related to livestock and rangeland. • If gender analysis is done for the sake of publications, I do not see this as the right approach. Gender analysis should be directed to the best possible dissemination of technologies to end-users. Women should be part of formal and informal surveys and part of the exploration of possible technology and policy options that best fit a community as a whole.

4.6. Concerns about PR & GA and how they can be addressed

4.6.1. ICARDA Views

As pointed out by national program researchers, if you ask about concerns and problems when doing an assessment you will get “an endless list”. Not surprisingly, the concerns of ICARDA researchers in relation to participatory research and gender analysis proved to be extensive. There is some concern about “whether PR & GA is “a means or an end” and its relationship to conventional research. These concerns seem rooted in differences in perspectives and attitudes related to prevailing functional and empowerment views. There is also some concern about the time and financial costs of PR & GA, researcher roles and methodological issues, however the concerns expressed were overwhelmingly oriented towards how ICARDA's participatory work can be better supported and developed.

Is PR & GA a means or an end?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participatory research should not be an end in itself - people should not be too fanatical about participatory research. • Participatory research should be a tool rather than an aim • Participatory approaches shouldn't become an end rather than a method complementary to other methods. This can be avoided by training and exposing practitioners to the ways other projects have maintained focus • Participatory research is a means not an end; there should be "different horses for different courses". For example there is no need for participatory research in wheat because adoption of improved varieties is high

What's the relationship of PR & GA to conventional research?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is also a place for controlled trials • Some work still needs to be done on stations. • How do we handle the need for a balance between controlled experiments and farmers' experiments? • Participatory research doesn't mean giving up on conventional research, but recognising that conventional research alone is not helping farmers.

- For certain problems not much participation of farmers is needed, but for complex NRM issues, more participation is needed
- Postgraduate students face the need to balance the different expectations of universities (focused on basic research) and ICARDA (focused on impact). Finding ways to combine conventional and participatory research is necessary but can be very challenging, especially because of the time pressure. Planning meetings involving the university and ICARDA are helpful to clarify expectations
- Concerns of postgraduate students trying to conduct participatory research include rigour and generation of data that can be statistically analysed

Methodological issues

- There is no clear methodology for participatory work in NRM as there is in participatory breeding - there are guidelines but these are debated - there is no "proven" methodology.
- The scientific method is clear to researchers (hypothesis formulation and testing, impartiality, objectivity) and it is not always easy to see how farmers can be brought into this process.
- No clear methodology is available for participatory research and better documentation is required
- Data collection and analysis tools are required
- Some parts of the research cycle are challenging in terms of farmer involvement, for example - data analysis
- Better clarity of roles of farmers and researchers in analysis of results is important.
- When technologies are simple (e.g. seeds), then participatory research is easier because the methodology is very clear - but with more complex technologies the process is not so clear - and lack of clarity by the researchers can lead to a loss of confidence on the part of farmers
- The approach of taking available technologies to farmers as an entry point for participatory is a constraint and in the future ways should be sought to move away from this supply driven mode
- When asked what the method is I have a hard time giving examples of the specifics of the procedures, and approaches that have been used in the past.

Time and financial costs

- If overdone participatory research can become a burden - to avoid this - the type of participation needs to be designed based on the type of problem and type of stakeholder - there is no recipe
- Participatory research has to be carefully structured in order to avoid getting lost in trivialities
- Participatory research can be very time-consuming
- Work schedules are already overloaded
- Participatory research is more time-consuming, but at the same time more effective; and results can be produced more quickly because farmers want to work with you
- Participatory projects and processes as formulated today are too short -- 3-4 years is not long enough – we need longer-term perspectives
- At ICARDA scientists don't have the time to do capacity-building required by participatory approaches
- Continuity of participation by the farmers and women involved can be an issue. Sometimes farmers tell us that they have other business to do.
- The effort that goes into training farmers in participatory approaches is not considered enough in project formulation.

Two different perspectives emerged about researcher roles in teams undertaking participatory research. Some ICARDA researchers prefer a multidisciplinary framework in which participatory research is conducted by social scientists who take this responsibility within a team. Others prefer an interdisciplinary arrangement where researchers with complementary expertise plan, decide and act jointly, and combine their conceptual schemes to create original frameworks.

Researcher roles: Multidisciplinary perspective
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participatory research should be left to professionals -- to social scientists. For many biological scientists the preferred model is working on a team that includes social scientists to make sure that farmer's perspectives are included. At the same time social scientists should also develop their own areas of research -- this can be methodology development • Before any breeding is done, we have to know the needs and concerns of the ultimate user. One way to get this information is by working with socioeconomists. Some breeders prefer to leave participatory work for social scientists so that they can concentrate on the breeding. • Wheat breeding work with poorer farmers is being done by national program scientists and their teams include social scientists • Earlier involvement of economists in research is positive

Researcher Roles: Interdisciplinary perspective
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participatory research should be done by project teams in an integrated way • Biophysical researchers should be involved in participatory research and not see it as an exclusive responsibility of social scientists • We need to have whole teams trained in PR & GA right from the beginning. Otherwise it is not possible to deal with the myriad of issues that arise in working with communities (for example how to handle farmers' expectations for incentives and handouts).

Some concerns were voiced about integrity – or the inclusion of participatory rhetoric in proposals without commitment to the approaches involved during the actual execution of the projects.

Integrity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many people use PR rhetoric, without using PR • Some use participatory rhetoric in proposal-writing but lack skills and commitment to carry out the participatory research proposed • In some cases there is poor correspondence between what project documents say and what is going on in the field; participation rhetoric is used to obtain funding, but the work is not participatory; this is risky because poor results associated with such projects could undermine confidence participatory research approaches • Some ICARDA researchers are using participatory research approaches because it is the new thing and not because they believe in it. This will result in poor results and could give participatory research a bad name • The quality of participatory approaches at ICARDA still needs improvement; the term "participatory" is used rather indiscriminately as a label for a wide range of types of interactions with farmers; there is a tendency to label any form of contact with farmers as being participatory.

The issue of resistance to PR & GA approaches within ICARDA was mentioned.

Resistance to PR & GA approaches
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A common view is that trying participatory approaches is too risky; people have invested years of effort to become a researcher, which puts them in a position of power where they "know more than others." Doing participatory work means sharing power and acknowledging that other's knowledge is important. People are afraid that being participatory will undermine their power. • There is resistance to participatory approaches on the part of the national staff; some of the resistance is due to insecurity. • In Egypt older researchers have benefited from their positions of power and are reluctant to pass on their knowledge to younger ones • There is resistance to gender approaches especially at the senior researcher level. If gender is given importance, it is because donors are pushing for it.

Limited knowledge regarding participatory research approaches and insufficient attention to gender analysis were frequently mentioned.

Limited knowledge of participatory research and insufficient attention to gender
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At ICARDA there is a lot of emphasis on participatory approaches and a lot of discussion of this, but there is little discussion and little focus on gender. • If gender is considered in a project the work is delegated to someone -- usually to a woman • Gender analysis has been introduced as a component in some workshops and training courses, but there has been little follow up to look at what people are doing with what they have learned. • Learning from the more participatory projects (e.g. M&M) has not been mainstreamed in ICARDA • There is a lot of misunderstanding about participatory approaches at ICARDA - passive forms of stakeholder participation are labelled as participatory • Some people in ICARDA don't know what they don't know with respect to participatory approaches • Natural resource scientists in the region do not have a good understanding of participatory research -- social scientists are somewhat better but there are relatively few social scientists and most of these are economists

The concern at ICARDA about PR & GA approaches was related to how these can be better supported and developed. Factors related to institutional context within ICARDA, within partner organisations and in the CWANA region in general was the principal area of emphasis. The top down culture in the region was mentioned repeatedly as a general constraint.

Systemic constraints
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Even though we are committed to participatory research, changing the NARES and ICARDA is not easy • The region is behind; there are few outside projects; few development projects; government systems are top down; there is little push from inside to change; this is comfortable for scientists - they can do what they've always been doing. • Local participation in research (and development in general) is underdeveloped in the CWANA region and few other agencies are engaging in this; ICARDA is missing an opportunity for ICARDA to be a leader in this area • The system is constraining, bureaucratic, people are educated to memorise; people attending training courses are not used to being asked for ideas, but rather to be told what to do. To do participatory research means working on the whole system

- The ICARDA culture is not participatory, nor is the national or regional context, but this is changing as a result of pressure from the EPMR, from donors and the energy of some people
- With the context so difficult higher level support is important
- The methods are not well understood by the donors, they do not appear to have much published from ICARDA.

The institutional issues related to the internal ICARDA environment included support from management, collaboration and interdisciplinarity, and capacity development and communication.

Support from management

- There is not much pressure from the senior management level to deliver on participatory research
- Quite a lot of ICARDA work is participatory but this is not well projected by the center. ICARDA does not actively attempt to create an image as a center of excellence for participatory approaches
- Participatory research is perceived by ICARDA management and some ICARDA scientists as being suitable for marginal areas and resource poor farmers, but in many cases, the potential of participatory research is not being assessed from a position of familiarity. People don't know what they don't know.

Collaboration and interdisciplinary

- There is not enough work across projects and disciplines; this can be addressed by exposing staff to the work of integrated projects, through joint proposal development; integration and participatory approaches; go hand in hand; the new flatter organizational structure should also help interaction.
- Interaction between the different participatory projects within ICARDA is low - increasing this requires time and leadership; the Participatory Interest Group was formed but the group was left to create its own TOR; with people strapped for time this is not happening. Specific time-bound objectives would help. It would help if there were a person whose job it was to lead this, but this requires resources
- Even though ICARDA has a gender expert, access to advice/support on gender issues is not adequate
- Relationships between ICARDA and other kinds of institutions are sometimes competitive – this needs to be overcome so that better research/development partnerships can be established. There is much more opportunity for this now in Syria.

Capacity

- ICARDA doesn't have enough in house expertise in participatory approaches - there is knowledge but the scientists are mostly biophysical - the social scientists are very busy and don't have time to conduct training - so the people who have the expertise do not have the time.
- ICARDA does not have strong socioeconomic capacity -- some NARS are much stronger. Some NARS are much stronger in participatory research and gender analysis than ICARDA -- especially in Africa (for example in Ethiopia, Morocco and Kenya); The problem in ICARDA has been the disciplinarity and lack of integration
- There is a huge need for capacity building in projects that want to use participatory approaches - in many cases the training is done after the researchers have already been pushed to work with communities. Whole project teams need to be trained and from the beginning.
- Teams need to learn how to do research with farmers, but there are lots of obstacles

- because there are so many differences with the way researchers are used to working.
- A lot of projects are implemented with National Programs -- there is a need for follow-up as well as training, but this is not happening enough
 - There has not been an evaluation of the impacts of training in participatory research - training has created islands of capacity

- Communication and documentation**
- Research on gender issues and methods at ICARDA is not being disseminated adequately to others who could benefit
 - Most of the scientists at ICARDA do not speak Arabic, so they need a translator when working with farmers. - This makes it difficult to conduct participatory research since translators are often not able to transmit the nuances of what is being said.
 - Every project manages its own training on participatory approaches and not much information is shared about training opportunities. It's common to hear about the training when it is over - to allow scope for sharing the benefits with other projects and bringing in expertise from other projects
 - There is a need for a lot more work to document the community approach. Systematizing the approach is important so that it can be spread and upscaled.

Several strategies were suggested for developing greater capacity for PR & GA at ICARDA

- Strategies for developing greater capacity for PR & GA:**
Raise the visibility of participatory work at ICARDA
- ICARDA needs to do more to raise the flag of participation -- and integration. Engaging a full time resource person on participatory research would be a way of showing commitment; but this needs to be done in such a way that the person doesn't end up becoming the servant of projects as a trainer in participatory methods. The participatory research has to be an integral part of projects
 - The recognition that ICARDA would gain by "raising the flag" of participation would help to bring in the resources to increase capacity and build on strengths; Even if you raise the flag this doesn't mean that everything ICARDA does has to be participatory
 - There are no specialists on participatory research at ICARDA - bringing in external consultants seems to be cost effective at the project level, but if there were enough demand at the center level, it would make sense to hire someone
 - ICARDA needs a full time researcher who can support other scientists in the development of their participatory/community work, and through this process conduct his/her own research. The research could be on monitoring and evaluation or methodology development
 - We need a facilitator at ICARDA to help raise the visibility of participatory research; someone who could coordinate across projects and be a driving force behind things that people want to do together but which no one has the time to coordinate. Presently, no one has this responsibility. Perhaps projects could "buy in" to support such a person from core budget.
 - ICARDA needs a resource person dedicated to guiding participatory approaches, advising on issues arising and developing clearer frameworks for participatory research. This person could also help to raise the flags of participation and integration at the institutional level. This person's research could be related to monitoring and evaluation of participatory components, or on methodology. There is also a gap on impact assessment of participatory research. Having his/her own research agenda would help to avoid that the person becoming a "slave" to other projects
 - ICARDA's actions should be complimentary to those of NARS; this is compatible with a role for ICARDA in empowering others to do participatory research

Strategies for developing greater capacity for PR & GA: Increase exposure to participatory work done elsewhere
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visits from outside practitioners/experts to increase knowledge about participatory research in general could make the process of participatory research work better at ICARDA • The top down culture in the region makes participatory research difficult. This can be addressed by modelling other ways of working and bringing in people from outside the CGIAR system to expose ICARDA and NARS to other ways of thinking; breaking the barriers between different kinds of organizations (with most located in Damascus) by organizing events where a wide cross section of people are invited (e.g. seminars)

Strategies for developing greater capacity for PR & GA: Combine formal and informal mechanisms and use innovative approaches
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training is needed at the senior scientist level due to lack of understanding and lack of familiarity with tools • New people need systematic exposure to past ICARDA experience and more formal orientation to participatory research in addition to informal mentoring • Direct mentoring, combined with hands-on training, experiencing together; going to the field together are keys to change - also "switching people's minds" by exposing them to new concepts - like farmers innovation • More innovation in training is needed at CARDA; for example to complement traditional courses and workshops we need to incorporate non-formal training modalities and to build up communities of practice among people involved in learning new things, like participatory approaches • To complement, formal training, self-study and informal mentoring and on-the-job learning processes it would be helpful to have exposure to many kinds of participatory methods and approaches -- to have more mechanisms for learning about what others are doing. • More creative forms of capacity-building need to be explored -- these can include giving seminars at venues outside ICARDA, introducing participatory approaches into university curricula, introducing MSc/PhD degrees associated with participatory approaches; investing in future professionals may be a more promising strategy than trying to change the thinking of current institutions. • Capacity building strategies need to consider individuals and networks – courses and seminars are not enough – mentoring and networking are very important. ICARDA is weak on mentoring. • There is not enough capitalization on people's experiences in participatory research – including those of ICARDA research assistants, NARS and NGO staff – this is perhaps more important than formal capacity building in participatory approaches • When training oneself in participatory approaches, problems and mistakes are inevitable -- having mentors to interact with is very important • Exposure to participatory and gender concepts is needed much earlier – during the formation of researchers

Strategies for developing greater capacity for PR & GA:

Address gender staffing issues

- Women researchers needed on teams to look at the gender aspects
- More women researchers and extension people are needed to work with women farmers in the region
- There are obvious roles in the communities that are gender-related and sensitive as many of the livestock responsibilities are male decision makers but much of the activity as milking, food gathering, some herding, forage gathering, medicinal plant collection, all very important activities in the community are done by women. All the people conducting the surveys we are doing are male though the lead scientist is female. Apparently, the reason for this is cultural.

Strategies for developing greater capacity for PR & GA:

Make sure capacity building is well targeted

- Capacity building aimed at building skills in participatory research needs to focus mainly on younger people
- Some people have the capacity for listening to farmers "in the blood"; others cannot develop this even with training
- Anyone involved in participatory research needs training; but to be involved you have to like this kind of work -- if you don't like it training courses can't help
- Not every researcher can work with farmers
- We should not make the mistake of thinking that enthusiasm and aptitude for participatory work is only among younger people. Some older researchers and research assistants have been among those who learned the most from training.
- Aptitude for participatory work is more a function of sensitivity than of age
- Capacity building should occur within the context of a project.
- New people need to "get what is meant by participatory". They need to understand what it requires and how participatory research relates to conventional.
- Often in training courses the level of expertise is mixed - which is not so helpful for people with more background and experience - training plans should be based on better information on people's backgrounds
- NARS often do not see the need for participatory approaches themselves, nor for training. A project that assessed training needs in the Syrian water sectors showed that the main demand is for technical training. This reflects people's preferences to stay on the station and in the lab doing technical work rather than going out to the field
- We talk about NARS but there is a need to change the thinking and attitude of our research assistants. ICARDA research assistants still don't understand the need to involve farmers in research, they believe it is more efficient to go to the field and do experiments themselves. "Why do we have to wait for the farmer"? "The farmer will do something wrong". "We can do it better than the farmer." These are typical attitudes.

<p>Strategies for developing greater capacity for PR & GA: Use pilot projects with positive results to demonstrate the value of PR & GA</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pilot projects with positive results that can convince people of the value and potential of participatory approaches are needed - the context is not easy and change occurs slowly, but it does occur - the most promising circumstances need to be chosen for the establishment of such projects - otherwise high energy expenditure yields low results - choose winners - choose areas where there is openness

A number of concerns were voiced by ICARDA researchers about the institutional context in partner organisations.

<p>Institutional context in partner organisations</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disciplinary integration and participatory approaches are mutually reinforcing. Both are difficult in ICARDA - more difficult in NARS • Research and extension is split in many NARS -- this is a weakness. Extensionists are delivering messages rather than working with farmers. NARS researchers need to be encouraged to work with extension programs, especially when there is a successful technology to upscale • Extension services have a low presence in rural areas (in Syria) - they have a culture of taking down to farmers; reluctant to listen to farmers; used to working by giving incentives to farmers • Participatory research can not cover all communities so much more effort is needed on a national scale, in for example, farmer to farmer extension • Successful pilot level participatory programs are facing real issues in scaling up - in introducing these approaches in national systems • Each government has an agenda. It's the NARS researchers' job to carry out government priorities. As a result in many projects stakeholder participation is superficial • In NRM it is essential to work with different partners, but sometimes there are tensions with NARS when ICARDA works with other partners who might have more appropriately trained staff. Sometimes partner institutions want to work with ICARDA but not with each other. • There is a lack of social science support in NARS - social scientists are often isolated in special institutes or departments • National programs need to strengthen their social science capacity -- if they have social science it is often not only in a different department, but may be in a different institution or ministry. Social scientists need to be integrated into research teams. • Getting the right national program people into capacity-building events is really challenging --there is resistance to criteria-based selection because travel opportunities are often given as rewards. • The most difficult thing is convincing national program staff to actually do research with farmers - the most difficult thing is to get them off the station and into the field - this is more difficult than convincing policy makers, for example. • More NGO linkages are needed – NGOs are often more effective than researchers in working with farmers

A number of opportunities for ICARDA to play a role in building capacity for PR & GA approaches were identified

Opportunities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current exodus of older researchers and accompanying influx of young researchers to the Egyptian NARS can be seen as an opportunity to develop capacity in PR & GA approaches. The process of learning to do participatory research could be a capacity building laboratory for young scientists • Local participation in research (and development in general) is underdeveloped in the CWANA region and few other agencies are engaging in this; ICARDA is missing an opportunity to be a leader in this area • The new ICARDA program will be much more conducive to integration across disciplines and projects. Integration and participatory approaches are mutually reinforcing. • The establishment and expansion of the new Syrian NGO, the Foundation for Integrated Rural Development of Syria is a huge opportunity. The staff are knowledgeable about participatory approaches and they want to organise projects involving communities, national and international organisations and the private sector. • The director of GCSAR in Syria is very open to PR & GA approaches and is sending young people for training. Some of this is being done in conjunction with ICARDA. • Since nobody else is doing much in the way of participatory research in the region ICARDA could be a real pioneer and make a big difference, but ICARDA would need to raise the profile of PR in order to do this.

4.6.2. National Program Views

National program researchers voiced concerns about PR & GA approaches related to capacity building, integration, adaptation to local institutional and community contests and availability of resources.

Capacity-building
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In capacity building for participatory approaches you need a team to work horizontally; It should not work on the basis of individual programs or projects, this is not efficient • Training for young researchers in the community approach needs to include: What is the community approach? Why use it? When should it be applied? What is the practice? It should also include specific skills such as communication. • In Egypt there was a long period with low recruitment of new staff to the research institutes. Those who have joined recently are not very well trained and a large contingent of older staff will retire very soon. Older colleagues who are leaving within the next 5 years need to train new people. • The community approach requires more training of extension people and researchers. • The problem with the community approach is that most of the younger people don't understand the meaning of it. There is nothing about the community approach in the minds of young scientists. • When participatory methods are used in a research program, farmers need time to understand the process and to learn how it is different from conventional on-farm trials • Key elements for training are: 1) clarify the philosophy behind the approach; 2) pay attention to and involve all actors (strong/weak, good/bad, interferers/facilitators); 3) combine formal and practical (on-the-job) training; 4) ensure follow-up; 5) training has to deconstruct attitudes and habits; 6) include communication skills especially neutrality, questioning (open/probing questions rather than leading questions) and listening skills; 7) practice sincerity, simplicity and normality, relaxed attitude and body language.

Integration
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration among different partners (NGOs, farmer's organizations, research organizations) is not occurring enough; this is because of attitudes and lack of knowledge; each one works for himself and has little confidence in the others. • The future of PPB is as part of a wider effort to sustain development in the difficult rangeland environment. This requires collective action at the local level and support from government authorities; PPB needs to be part of an integrated project involving many actors working together. • In participatory projects fixed teams are not efficient or effective. Teams need to have "variable geography", with the capacity to change and adapt in response to the circumstances

Adaptation to local contexts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities have their own traditions and culture, so participatory methods need to be adjusted to fit for a given community • PPB [in barley] is a useful approach but there are questions on how to modify the approach so that it fits within the GCSAR context - the main issue is how it fits within the current system for releasing a variety. People are concerned about the increased work and time involved and occupied with short term fears about damage to equipment (seed combine) that must be taken off the station to plant PPB trials in farmers fields. People are reticent to make the change to incorporate PPB even though they appreciate the difference in impact compared to conventional breeding -- perdiems are low and it feels like a sacrifice. All this requires changes in the way of thinking.

Resources
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The problem is funding - there is no funding to train young researchers in PR & GA. • A constraints to participatory work in national programs is the lack of vehicles to reach farmers

5. DEMAND AND SPECIFIC NEEDS FOR CAPACITY BUILDING.

5.1. Summary

About half of the projects identified the need for capacity building through stakeholder consultation processes. The other projects based their decisions on technology adoption rates and on perceptions that knowledge of participatory approaches needed to be increased.

Most of the effort in capacity building is being directed at NARS researchers and research assistants. Farmers and extension workers are also included in some of the capacity development plans.

Although the inventory asked specifically about capacity building related to PR & GA some of the objectives of the planned capacity building relate to more conventional research skills such as capacity to conduct household and community surveys, assessing the impact of technologies, improving disease diagnosis and control and decreasing the gap between yield potential and production in wheat fields. Some of the objectives are very general such as getting farmers involved in pest management, improving technology adoption, reducing poverty -- while others are much more specific, such as formulating plans and strategies for implementing PPB in crops with strategic importance for drought-prone areas. The very general objectives do not provide a strong basis for formulating clearly capacity-building interventions.

The formats and approaches for capacity building are diverse and in most cases there are plans to combine workshops with fieldwork, on the job training and other modalities such as cross visits, individual mentoring and action research.

The content of training, which specifically mentioned participatory research, included

- Theory and principles of participatory research
- Livelihoods approaches
- Tools for participatory research
- Design of participatory field trials and analysis of data
- Organization of meetings with farmers, sharing data with farmers
- Need based technology design
- Participatory learning processes
- Encouraging farmers' experimentation,
- Communication/listening skills
- Skills for integrating local/outsider knowledge
- Facilitation skills
- Gender
- The action research cycle
- Joint planning and partnerships with rural communities

Most of the planned capacity building will be designed and facilitated by small teams usually with some support from external consultants.

At least 320 people will be trained and at least 70 days of formal training is planned in 2005 (not counting season -long farmer field schools).

In addition most projects have identified additional capacity-building needs, which are not yet included in proposals or work plans.

5.2. Detailed summary of data from the inventory

To assess demand and specific needs for capacity building an inventory of planned capacity-building was conducted.

	No. inventories sent	No. Respondents
HQ Researchers	23	8
Regional Researchers	13	3 ⁴
National Program Researchers	7	3

The following projects reported on capacity building activities related to PR & GA planned for 2005 – 07:

- Challenge Program Water and Food (Iran)
- Integrated Cereal Disease Management in Eritrea
- IPM of Sunn Pest in West Asia
- Consultative Workshop on PPB
- Improved Land Management to Combat Desertification
- Community based improvement of water use efficiency in water scarce areas
- Maghreb Agropastoral Project

⁴ Emails were received from two other regional researchers who indicated that they were not returning the survey because no participatory research is conducted in their projects

- Resilience project in Karkeh River Basin (Iran)
- Barani Project, Pakistan
- Participatory Barley Breeding, CGSAR
- FPR in IPM of cereal/food legumes in Morocco
- NVRSRP, ARC, ICARDA IFAD-funded project
- Wheat research program, Nile Valley project (NVRSRP), Egypt
- SDC Mountains Maghreb; RIP Mauritania, PADEL Mauritania; Mashreq/Maghreb III livelihoods of agropastoral communities

The responses to the inventory are summarised below:

Respondents	How are capacity-building needs identified?
HQ Researchers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through stakeholder assessment carried out at pre-proposal stage • based on high crop losses to diseases • based on the need to involve farmers identified by NARS • based on growing interest by NARS in training on PPB • based on low adoption rate of technologies developed on station • based on the importance of farmer-led adaptive processes in certain agroecologies pointing to need to incorporate farmers' knowledge • through experience of working with NARES • project proposal output and request from NARS • based on communication between farmers and researchers • based on lack of integration between disciplines and institutions and lack of exposure and experience in PR
Regional Researchers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • based on needs assessment of rural communities and other stakeholder analysis • through meetings with farmers and stakeholders • negotiation with stakeholders; communities, scientists & NARS
National Program Researchers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • based on low adoption and need to minimise research period and breed for specific environments • farmer participatory training and research is a major project tool • highly needed because of lack of knowledge and agricultural technology at extension workers level

Respondents	Whose capacity is being developed?	Their level of experience with PRGA?
HQ Researchers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NARS collaborators and research assistants at ICARDA (about 6 in the social sciences group, and various others in the technology development groups) for the Khanasser project; in the new CP project 4 social scientists in Iran • NARI staff-Ethiopia • Farmers, extensionists, plant protection technicians • Breeders/researchers developing/promoting PPB • Farmers, extensionists, researchers • NARES researchers, mainly water and agronomist scientists • NARS scientists • Senior researchers and assistants, extension workers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have training on participatory diagnosis • • Both with/without PR & GA experience • Little experience • Virtually zero understanding (some socioeconomists have experience and understanding) • Lots of experience • Have training on participatory diagnosis
Regional Researchers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff from federal & provincial research institutes • • NARS scientists, extensionists; farmers/pastoralists/communities/ NARS women scientist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have training on participatory diagnosis, joint research planning and evaluation; have analysed (farmer?) roles from a gender perspective • Capacity with participatory research and gender analysis is modest • Low to medium
National Program Researchers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Researchers, technicians, extensionists • Mainly farmers, some extensionists • Farmers and extension workers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • researchers have some experience with FPTR, but none with gender analysis • lack of knowledge and agricultural technology at extension workers level

Respondents	Objectives of capacity building
HQ Researchers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • build capacity to conduct household/community surveys on livelihoods and assess impact of technologies • Improve knowledge of researchers/extensionists on disease diagnosis and control/ implement integrated disease management at farm level with direct implication of farmers • Get farmers involved in sunn pest management • Create a group of scientists in a number of countries committed to innovative ways of organizing PPB programs/formulate plans and strategies for implementing PPB in crops with strategic importance for drought prone areas and disseminate these widely • Enable use of community-based participatory learning and action research approaches • get NARES teams involved in the project to do successful participatory research for improving water productivity in farming communities • enable [scientists] to perform specific tasks • improve skills for participatory technology development
Regional Researchers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to identify community needs to address problems related to increased productivity of field crops • • To institutionalise the livelihoods approach and institutional learning in NARS; empower local rural communities
National Program Researchers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improve barley productivity and its uses, improve adoption, reduce poverty, improve research system and gender • give all project participants a common background about participatory research and how to utilise it to be able to maximise benefits from the project to farmers • technology transfer to farmers and extensionists/decreasing gap between yield potential and production in wheat fields

Respondents	Format/approach for capacity-building
HQ Researchers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • workshops/training of trainers/awareness raising activities, field action research • in country training on technical disease management aspects/field days with farmers to introduce them to disease symptoms, advise them on how to avoid diseases/visits to individual farmers to discuss causes of disease and how to control them • workshops/hands on training • three wk workshop on PPB (theory and practice)/group discussions, field visits, interaction with farmers, design of PPB programs relevant to different countries/crops • training for participants in community-based research approaches involving field days, community territory meetings/transect walks/community mapping, analysis of local land use and soil management/mentoring of a group of interested farmers • workshop introducing principles & tools/ community meetings to implement and evaluate what is learned and to develop an action plan with a farmer's interest group • formal 3-4 day workshops • awareness raising about need and usefulness of participatory technology development, lectures, fieldwork, group work, follow up, individual mentoring by ICARDA scientists and Iranian staff member

	responsible for FPR
Regional Researchers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> workshops, cross training courses, individual mentoring workshops, individual training, on-job training, field work; farmer/scientist travelling workshops
National Program Researchers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> workshops, internal & external training; awareness raising (among farmers and sheep breeders); rural development workshops in the field for groups of farmers and for individual pilot site farmers; farmers cross visits to different pilot sites; yearly meeting of all farmers from all pilot sites with extensionists and researchers to discuss results and plan for next season extension plots/meeting and visits to farmers field/ maintenance of modern irrigation systems/ organic fertilization, biofertilisers and sustainable agriculture

Respondents	Content
HQ Researchers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> livelihoods and resilience; natural resource use perceptions, adoption of technologies basic disease epidemiology, relate laboratory observations to field; orient farmers to recognise disease problems and how they can be avoided/controlled biology of sunn pest and natural enemies; damage, sampling, economic thresholds, management options theory & practice of PPB, design of field trials and analysis of data, organization of meetings with farmers, sharing of data with farmers collaboration between farmers, scientists and extensionists to improve soil fertility management; encourage farmers experimentation; stimulate learning process and increase farmer's ability for observing and understanding soil fertility dynamics; development of adoptable and practical solutions for SFM based on farmer's specific conditions principles of participatory research; community meetings; problem/opportunity assessments and other most needed tools, community research action plans; learning by doing – no brainwash training in participatory approaches, modelling, GIS, range management listening to farmers; skills to integrate local/outsider knowledge; development cycle (problem, options, selection, implementation, monitoring, evaluation); facilitation skills, role of diversity in technology development, household strategies; gender
Regional Researchers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> integration of operational research with community mobilization/need based technology design; capacity building for local multiplication of technologies; evolving technology validation/diffusion mechanisms; change in researcher attitude through joint planning/partnerships with rural communities the concept of using community participatory approach; gender issues participatory research and action; livelihoods approaches and institutional learning; rural community meeting monitoring; farmers leadership/women's leadership; community development planning
National Program Researchers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> breeding systems; socioeconomic studies; barley end users; environments; gender capacity building; extension activities; farmer's awareness use of participatory research to train farmers on all IPM aspects new cultivars/new technology for sprinkler irrigation and fertilization/ maintenance of modern irrigation systems/ organic fertilization, biofertilisers and sustainable agriculture

Respondents	Who will design and facilitate the capacity building?	Internal or external expertise?
HQ Researchers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local trainer with support from ICARDA, CIAT trainer, Iranian project facilitator • Project members including Eritrean scientists • NARS FFS experts from West Asia (trained by CABI) • International experts (design); ICARDA staff & two external consultants (facilitation) • ICARDA scientists in collaboration with farmers, national researchers and extensionists • ICARDA (Design) external consultant with ICARDA staff (facilitation) • Topics, trainers and participants selected at annual planning meeting • ICARDA staff, CIAT trainer, local trainer, Iranian project facilitator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mixed • Mixed (ICARDA, consultants on specialised topics) • Internal • External (with respect to NARES) • Mixed • Mixed • Mixed • Mainly external, but internal where possible. Inclusion of Iranian trainer & facilitator to guarantee internal design and facilitation in future
Regional Researchers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provincial/ national staff with backstopping from ICARDA • External expertise, who will train local trainees • ICARDA scientists; NARS partners of ICARDA; external consultants; train trainers in each country/project team; use cross country exchange in the region of Maghreb/Machreq 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mixed • External • Mixed
National Program Researchers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal & external expertise • Internal expertise • Wheat research staff expertise and consultants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mixed • Internal • Mixed

Respondents	Number of participants	Dates/duration/location
HQ Researchers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20-30 • 25-30 (2/3 extensionists) • 30 per FFS • 15-20 • >40 • 18 • 10/workshop • 25 • 15-25 in each project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st half of 2005 • 3 days annually in 2000 – 04 to be repeated in 2005 • April/May each year • 23 April – 13 May, 2005 • 2003 – 2005 • Feb 2005/ 10 days • GIS – 2003/ Participatory Approaches – 2004/ Rangeland modelling in each of 5 North African Countries in 2006 • 1 week/ June or Aug 2005 to follow up June 04 training • 7-10 days for each project; locations Mauritania, Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia
Regional Researchers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 provincial, 1 national institute implementing the project in three villages • depends on facilities and funds • 25/course 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2001-2006 • 3-5 years in 7 provinces • 1 week, plus practical training
National Program Researchers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50-70 (mainly farmers) • 25/course 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all season long at farmer's pilot sites • one week

Respondents	Capacity building needs not yet included in proposals or workplans
HQ Researchers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participatory research and gender analysis is lacking [in Eritrea related to plant protection] and could work very well with proper training; develop graduate research program on participatory research in plant protection; content could include disease epidemiology, crop loss assessment and skills in FFS and FPR at community level • Establish and implement participatory research (FFS) in IPM in Central Asia through workshops, repeating process conducted in W Asia • Wide dissemination of methodologies, plans and strategies for PPB via a 1 month residential training course for 20-25 people per course, using the PPB program in Syria as a training ground, to be designed by a committee of scientists. Approach would involve a mix of formal lectures on theory and practice, group discussions, field visits, interactions with farmers & design of PPB programs relevant to different countries & crops • Continue/scale out community based participatory learning and action research approaches with researchers/farmers/extension workers from different NARS in the region, involving 40-60 people during 2005-2007

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reach more natural resource management scientists through learning by doing, exchange visits between national teams/communities/projects & with more experienced teams/communities/projects. Activities should be planned/designed by an integrated ICARDA/NARES team, built into research projects & follow through by ICARDA/NARES socioeconomists. • Third follow up training for Karkheh River basin project (IRAN), topics not yet decided but probably participatory monitoring & evaluation or institutionalisation; conflict resolution for NRM • Improvement of skills of community facilitator of Khanasser Valley project through formal training to develop more conceptual understanding of PR & community dynamics, broader knowledge of tools, sharpening skills in facilitation & reporting. • Other training needs depend on new projects and need to be analysed on case-by-case basis. Possible new projects requiring capacity in PR & GA include NRM in the steep olive growing area of NW Syria and Central Asian mountain agriculture
Regional Researchers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enable the program to benefit from FFS approach, successfully adapted and applied by the National IPM program of PARC, Pakistan; develop capacity of national extension and research system and rural communities through season long training modules; involve male and female members of households in experiential learning on agricultural production management and experimentation skills. This approach would enable development of practical linkages and devise roles and responsibilities involving extension, research and farmers organizations.
National Program Researchers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learn about other countries experiences with participatory research approaches to increase knowledge of participatory research as much as possible; combine workshops, individual mentoring, cross training, awareness raising activities and short courses.

6. LESSONS LEARNED FROM CAPACITY BUILDING EXPERIENCE

6.1. Summary

The current capacity development strategy involves significant reliance on external consultants as trainers, combined with on-the-job training and informal mentoring in project settings. There are also self-motivated individuals in ICARDA and among partner organizations who gained competence in participatory approaches through independent study and learning from practical experiences. A few of these individuals have gained prominence in ICARDA and beyond as pioneers and methodological innovators and have developed the capacity of other individuals and teams through a combination of hands-on experience, mentoring and formal training. Whether done by training consultants or internal innovators, formal capacity-building has mainly been organized on a project basis without much cross-project collaboration or communication.

Since 2002 ICARDA's Natural Resource Management Program has played a role in organizing seven formal workshops on participatory approaches. The Socioeconomics of Production Systems Project has facilitated the organization of most of these workshops. Other significant capacity building has been conducted by the Barley PPB project, by the Wheat IPM project, by the PRODESUD project led by INRAT in Tunisia and by the Agrobiodiversity project in West Asia.

Main lessons learned from these experiences in capacity building for PR & GA include the following:

- Follow-up to is perceived as a weak point in current ICARDA capacity-building strategies. Without follow up it will be difficult for participants to translate what they have learned into good quality participatory research processes. Unless the need for follow-up is acknowledged from the beginning, adequate funding for it may not be factored into budgets.
- Capacity-building needs to be more practice oriented. Training consultants recommend a programmed and iterative local approach where training and mentoring is built into projects and opportunities to discuss and reflect on experiences are a frequent and regular element of the process.

Although significant progress has been made, there is still a great deal of work done to internalize participatory approaches in ICARDA and among partners. Main constraints include 1) the top-down culture in the region; 2) limited knowledge about the participatory approach among managers, researchers and extension staff; 3) disinterest or resistance among researchers and research assistants; 4) a transfer-of-technology culture; 5) compartmentalized organizational structures. It would be helpful if more researchers realized that improving the efficiency and effectiveness of research through by increasing stakeholder participation is compatible with more development and empowerment-oriented views of participatory approaches.

Current capacity-building approaches could be improved by:

- Bringing together innovators identified from the different projects and countries to brainstorm on how to move participatory approaches forward and how to build capacity for it. These people could be the core group of trainers. They could play a key role in designing, training trainers, accessing external skills as needed and in monitoring and evaluation of capacity-building processes.
- Integrating experience from the diversity of projects that ICARDA and partners are involved in as raw material for training. One of the benefits of doing this would be that more people would gain a “broader” picture of the diversity of participatory approaches, the skills, tools and processes and principles common to all of them, and how different approaches suit different contexts. More people would gain familiarity with PR & GA approaches from the region.

6.2. Lessons learned from recent ICARDA experiences

Since 2002 ICARDA’s Natural Resource Management Program (NRMP) has organized the seven formal capacity building events on participatory research (Table 1).

Table 1. Formal capacity building by ICARDA Natural Resource Management Program since 2002.

Date	Title	Venue	Facilitator
9-16 Sept 2002	Participatory approaches for improving the effectiveness of on-farm research in small ruminant production in dry areas	Aleppo, Syria	Werner Stür
20-31 Oct 2002	Farmer participatory research workshop for the Khanasser Valley Integrated Research Site	Aleppo, Syria	Werner Stür
16-22 Sept 2002	Workshop for members of the Barani Village Development Program in Islamabad, Pakistan	Islamabad, Pakistan	Yorck von Korff

25-27 March 2003	Training Workshop on Improving and institutionalizing Farmer Participatory Research in the KVIRES project	Aleppo, Syria	Yorck von Korff
27 Apr – 6 May, 2003	Training workshop on participatory research methods and community approach and characterization, Nile Valley Project	Cairo, Egypt	Yorck von Korff
25-29 July 2004	Training workshop on “Community Approach” for IDREN, Agrobiodiversity, Badia Benchmark and Vallerani Projects	Amman, Jordan	K. Shideed
14-24 Sept 2004	Training on Participatory diagnosis, Water and Food Challenge Program project	Karan and Kermanshah, Iran	Njeri Muhia
6-10 Sept 2004	A Training Workshop on Participatory Research Approaches for the project on Improving Rural Livelihoods through Efficient On-farm Water and Soil Fertility Management in Central Asia	Tashkent, Uzbekistan	Ann Braun
16-18 Nov 2004	Farmer Innovation: an “old but new” tool in research and extension, Water and Food Challenge Program project	Kermanshah, Iran	Will Critchley

Very few of the workshop participants were interviewed during the present assessment (See Table 2), three of the events took place very recently, and the workshop process documentation was accessed only after the interview process was over, therefore, the present analysis is based primarily on review of the process documentation and workshop reports, communications (by email or in person) with the trainers and an analysis of the interviews with ICARDA and national program staff in light of the main messages developed during the capacity building events.

Table 2. Numbers and types of participants in recent formal capacity building events associated with the ICARDA Natural Resources Management Program.

Event	No. Participants	No. participants from			Participants interviewed
		ICARDA	NARES	Other	
Small ruminant project	11	1 Res 5 RA 2 JPO	2 Res (Central Asia)	1, JICA	Luis Iniguez Malika Martini Brigitte Hartwell
Khanasser valley project	20	1 TO 11 RA 1 PDF 1 Res	3 Ext	1 Con 1 IFAD 1 UNDP	Roberto La Rovere Zuhair Masri Kasem Al-Ahmad Francis Turkelboom
Barani project	26		20 Res 3 AD	3 NGO	
Nile Valley project	14	1 Res	7 Egypt 1 Ethiopia 2 Sudan 2 Yemen		Asma El Bilasi
Central Asia Livelihoods project	22	2 RA	19	1 JPO	
Challenge Program, Iran	23		23		

Res = Researcher

RA = Research associate/assistant

JPO = Junior Professional Officer

TO = Training officer

PDF = Postdoctoral Fellow

Ext = Extensionists

Con = Consultant

AD = Assistant director

NGO = NGO staff

6.2.1. Observations and insights by trainer consultants

Werner Stür, Yorck van Korff and Will Critchley were contacted either in person or via email and asked to reflect on their experiences as trainer consultants. Njeri Muhia was contacted but did not send input. Their observations⁵ and insights can be summarized as follows:

Training workshop organizers are expecting a great deal to be packed into a short time. This can be counterproductive in terms of the quality of action plans developed by participants during the final stages of the capacity building event.

Better participant selection could help to reduce the number of people attending training events who are not really interested or committed to learning and trying participatory approaches.

Better planning and support for externally facilitated capacity building events would make them more effective. It is particularly important to make sure that:

- A practical field component is included
- Motivated project staff (champions) are participating fully
- Process documentation is developed that can be used in subsequent training by local trainers

Follow-up to training is weak point in current ICARDA capacity-building strategies, which seem to hinge on one-off, “stand alone” training in many cases. Without follow-up it may be difficult for participants to translate what they have learned into good quality participatory research processes. Unless the need for follow-up is acknowledged from the beginning funding for this will not be factored into projects.

Capacity-building needs to be more practice-oriented. An alternative to reliance on external consultants would be a programmed and iterative approach where training is built into projects. This would enable ICARDA and partners to build on local experiences. When the need for additional skills is identified follow-up training can be organized. This programmed approach requires a local champion, someone who manages the process internally

Innovators from the different projects and countries could be brought together for brainstorming on how to move participatory research forward and build capacity for it. These people could be the core group of trainers.

An overall idea for how the development of participatory research should be tackled seems to be missing at ICARDA.

ICARDA could play an important role in facilitating the wider sharing of farmer experiences and innovations

More people might be enthusiastic to spend time learning about participatory approaches if there was more recognition at the institutional level of participatory researchers through staff evaluation and reward systems.

When developing TORS for external trainers managers should be as clear as possible about expected outputs and include more detail with respect to post training follow-up and documentation. TORS should ensure that process documentation is developed at the

⁵ My observations are also included based on the recent experience of serving as a training consultant for researchers involved in the Livelihoods project in Central Asia

workshop and ICARDA should make sure that the trainer has the necessary support to produce this. This is especially important when the training is in English and the workshop is in another language.

6.2.2. Detailed feedback on capacity-building experiences from trainer consultants

Expectations of capacity building events
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of those organizing training in PR approaches have limited knowledge of these and may have unrealistic expectations of what can be accomplished through short training courses. • There is a tendency by course organizers to expect a great deal to be covered during a short course. When too much is included participants become saturated and even exhausted. This may mean that they do not respond as well as they could during the latter part of a course, when action plans are being developed.
Participant selection
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the participants perceived little need for PR in their work, so development of action plans for incorporation of PR approaches learned through training events was difficult in these cases; more attention to selection of participants is needed. • Participant selection is important. When people arrive half way through the workshop one wonders whether there was really a strong interest and commitment to the training on the part of the participant's organization. This might indicate a need to pay more attention to integrating the needs of the partners at the stage where the training is being proposed and formulated.
Getting the most out of capacity building events
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is important to make sure that externally facilitated events are adequately planned and supported. Care should be taken to make sure that motivated project staff are available to work with trainers and to learn from them. Sufficient time for field work needs to be factored into workshop plans. • It should be standard practice to make sure that process documentation is developed. This can be used by local champions of PR & GA to develop future training, and to provide follow-up support. Planning and support is generally necessary to develop process documentation, especially in cases where the trainer is working with a translator. The TOR should make sure that the training will be designed to have tangible application. • In such a short workshop, there is not adequate time to do skill building - for example on critical communication skills • Process documentation is important in participatory research. This is an area that should be covered in training. • Follow up seems to be the weak point in current ICARDA capacity building strategies. • Unless the need for follow-up is acknowledged from the beginning, funding for this will not be factored into projects and it may be difficult to find funds to arrange for follow-up. • People do not become proficient just by attending a workshop. They need to practice the approach with farmers, and need support and follow up. • Course organizers may not fully appreciate the importance of back-stopping by more experienced people and of follow-up training to the development of skills in participatory research. This needs to be built into projects so that participants can practice what they learn. Follow-up courses should build on this experience. However this kind of follow-up does not seem to be happening. • Peer-to-peer support can be one form of follow-up, but it often needs some sort of impetus and support in order to become established. • The role of "stand alone" training is to get people enthused about participatory

approaches and to expose people who are unfamiliar. Stand alone training seems to be the main strategy in use by ICARDA at the moment, but without backup and follow up it may be difficult for participants to translate what they have learned into good quality participatory research processes

Improving capacity building in PR & GA in ICARDA and among partners

- An alternative to reliance on external consultants would be a programmed approach where training is built into projects. This would enable ICARDA and partners to build on experiences of participants and take them to the next level. When the need for additional skills is identified follow-up training can be organized. Once again, after this backstopping and review should be skillfully used to take participants to a yet higher level. The process of building capacity is iterative.
- To move from "stand alone" training to a programmed, iterative approach requires a local champion, or someone within a given project who manages the process internally.
- In farmer field schools new facilitators were involved for a whole season in FFS training and they were trained by an experienced facilitator. Something similar needs to be done for participatory research - capacity building needs to be more practice-oriented. But adequate resources are needed to do this
- Perhaps the innovators from the different projects and countries could be brought together for brainstorming on how to move participatory research and build capacity for it. Maybe these people could be the core group of trainers.
- An overall idea for how the development of participatory research should be tackled seems to be missing. Researchers could set up an environment where farmers could draw on both farmer and research options for testing. Farmers' and researchers' ideas need to stand side by side. Doing this requires facilitation - but here are not many Cecarellis among the researchers. Perhaps the most practical approach might be to take researchers as they are. Integrate them into participatory processes to offer what they can after giving farmers the opportunity to present their ideas first. Research with farmers could be led by extension. It makes sense for extension organizations to become the process experts on how to accompany farmers in their research.

Getting the most out of external trainers

- TORs for consultants are rather loose - this gives trainers a lot of freedom but may not be ideal from an institutional point of view. TORS should make sure that process documentation is developed at the workshop that can be used in future by workshop participants and local trainers. ICARDA should make sure that the trainer has the necessary support to produce high quality process documentation. This is particularly important when the training is in English and the workshop is in another language.
- When developing TORS for external trainers managers should be as clear as possible about expected outputs and include more detail with respect to post-training follow-up and documentation
- When it is necessary to use external consultants, bring in specific, proven expertise and consider ways to involve the consultant in critical follow-up and backstopping.

Other Feedback

- Issues of cooperation among partners needs to be sorted out before participatory work with farmers can actually begin.
- One of the challenges during the workshop was dealing with pressure from the participants who wanted to be told what participatory approaches are is and how to achieve them
- Few of the participants had actually practiced participation in their professional life - they found it a completely different approach.

- In many cases participants equate participatory research with diagnosis, and with asking farmers for their opinions on technologies. They see things mostly in terms of fitting farmers in to researcher-led processes.
- Participatory research is seen by many participants in the training as simply another way of promoting existing technologies to farmers
- Understanding the different forms of participation and internalizing this into research processes is not easy. This requires both a shift in thinking and going out to the field and using the approaches in a research setting.
- A prerequisite for training to have impact is to have a core group of people committed to participatory approaches.
- A common understanding of what is meant by participatory is needed in a project. - as well as a clear idea of what is meant by participatory research. How many people in ICARDA and NARS really have a clear idea of this?
- More people might be enthusiastic to spend time learning if there was recognition at the institutional level of participatory researchers - if the institutions show that they value this through staff evaluation and reward systems.
- Why doesn't ICARDA facilitate the wider sharing of farmer experiences and innovations?

6.2.3. Innovators in PR & GA approaches

Trainer consultants suggested that innovators from different projects and countries be brought together to develop strategies and plans for moving participatory research forward and to serve as a core group of trainers. To facilitate follow-up on this those interviewed were asked to name innovators in participatory and gender approaches (Table 3).

Table 3. Recognized innovators in PR & GA Approaches.

Kamel Shideed	Ali Nefzaoui (Tunisia)
Salvatore Ceccarelli	Saadia Lhaloui (Morocco)
Stefania Grando	Fatima Nassif (Morocco)
Francis Turkelboom	Abdelai Laamari (Morocco)
Adriana Bruggeman	Abdul Azis Hisham (Sudan)
Hanadi Dessougi	Mustafa Malki (Algeria)
Zuhair Masri	
Kasem Al-Ahmad	
Mohamad El-Mourid	
Aden Aw-Hassan	
Malika Martini	

This list could be developed further by consulting ICARDA regional offices and ICARDA partners.

6.2.4. Synthesis of formal capacity building events

The following synthesis (Tables 4 & 5) from these formal capacity building events organized in conjunction with the NRMP should be useful in the future as a benchmark for future self-assessment⁶ of the internalization PR & GA skills and knowledge gained through formal capacity building.

⁶ A checklist for assessing whether a proposal or a project embraces a participatory, gender sensitive approach is included in Appendix X. This was commissioned by the Water and Food Challenge Program as a tool for reviewers to use when assessing proposals; it was developed by the working group on Participatory Natural

Table 4. Summary of recent capacity-building events on participatory research

Facilitator	Stür	van Korff - Cairo	Braun	Critchley
Structure	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Participant expectations & experiences 2. concepts & principles 3. communication & facilitation skills 4. individual & group tools / methods for evaluating technologies with farmers 5. Field exercises to practice skills & tools with farmers. 6. Analyze & interpret results from field 7. Develop work plans to integrate participatory approaches into current research. 8. Develop strategy for mentoring & further developing skills 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Participatory Rural Appraisal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PRA & RRA: differences - Introduction to empowerment - Relationship of farmer participatory research to PRA 2. Field visit to apply methods 3. Review of field visit 4. Integrating PRA into ongoing work 5. Workshop evaluation 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Participant expectations and experiences 2. Understanding PR & GA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Analysis of case examples - Theory/concepts 3. Enabling PR & GA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - tools and skills - potentials and constraints for adapting PR & GA for livelihoods project 4. Doing PR & GA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - exploiting potentials & overcoming constraints - How are we doing research now & how can we make it more participatory 5. Workshop evaluation 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Expectations 2. Historical overview of research and extension 3. Participatory research & extension systems 4. Identifying & working with farmer innovators 5. How can we build on farmer innovation in Iran? 6. Field trip: looking for farmer innovators in the field 7. workshop evaluation
Methodological case studies	Claveria Santo Niño FLSP CIALs		Claveria Santo Niño FLSP CIALs	Farmer Field Schools CIALs Farmer Innovation
Tools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Village walks ▪ Resource maps ▪ Wealth analysis ▪ Calendars ▪ Problem-cause diagrams ▪ Preference analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Semi structured interviews ▪ Maps and other visualizations ▪ Ranking matrices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Resource mapping ▪ Calendars ▪ Gender & diversity analysis ▪ Wealth analysis ▪ Livelihood analysis ▪ Problem & opportunity analysis ▪ Preference analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Program development processes ▪ 10 steps in field activities
Skills	Visualization (Technology of participation) Facilitation skills: Neutrality & Questioning skills	Visualization (Technology of Participation) Empathetic listening Questioning skills	Visualization (Technology of participation) Facilitation skills: Neutrality & Questioning skills Designs for participatory experiments	

Table 5. Main messages contained in recent capacity-development events on participatory research

Facilitator	Main Messages
von Korff	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PRA fits in to farmer participatory research as the initial diagnostic phase 2. Visualization is an important communication tool in participatory work, and can be adjusted to different literacy levels 3. PRA requires: team preparation, awareness of the context, purpose and process, empathetic listening, asking the right questions, cross-checking of information (triangulation), process documentation and self-critical review 4. Empowerment can be achieved by PRA to the extent that the researcher facilitates the ability of farmers to describe and understand his/her life situation 5. The contribution of PRA to community building happens through the joint work of farmers on PRA topics and the jointly derived understanding
Stür/Braun	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Participatory approaches can improve the efficiency and effectiveness of research by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ helping researchers identify and work directly with the groups of farmers they have targeted ▪ helping researchers identify a range of options to work on with farmers early on in the technology development process ▪ incorporating farmers' ideas and innovations into technology design ▪ building relationships with farmers 2. Establishing a clear process of interaction with farmers is critical to the success of participatory research. It can be difficult to scale up successful innovations unless plans for scaling up are included in the process. 3. Doing participatory research doesn't mean abandoning traditional research approaches. We are not talking about right or wrong ways to do research, but rather looking at incorporating more dimensions into our way of doing research. The dimensions that we incorporate will depend on our particular research question. 4. The problems and opportunities farmers perceive as important are often different from those perceived by researchers and other development workers. 5. Careful farmer/community selection makes a difference to the success or failure of participatory processes 6. Make sure to monitor if you are working with the 'right' farmers (wealth, gender, ethnic group) you want to help 7. Farmers rarely adopt technology packages. Rather they pull them apart, take the useful parts and put them together in different ways. In this respect we need to provide "ingredients" not "recipes". Farmers adapt rather than adopt technologies 8. Often development workers are pushed by their organizations to get quick results over large areas. Beware! Start small – small successes are better than big failures. You can rarely "photocopy" technologies from one place to another. Farmers everywhere need to go through a learning process. Experienced farmers can help with the dissemination to other farmers. 9. As successes are scaled up, new process are called for and the relationships and tools used when testing on a small scale cannot be maintained. New (group) approaches are needed.
Critchley	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Farmers and communities are innovators; innovation is widespread 2. Agricultural innovation systems have evolved from linear, to linear but interactive, to more integrated forms 3. Sources of farmer's innovation are mostly travel and thinking 4. Innovations and innovativeness spread quickly 5. Formal organizations (governmental, non-governmental) can help to encourage and spread farmer's innovations 6. Challenges include: integrating researchers into the process, IPR and ownership; gender/age – how to involve more youths and women

These workshops focused primarily on participatory approaches related to development of technology and involved three main capacity-building approaches:

- The Cairo workshop facilitated by Yorck von Korff focused on building a set of fundamental skills for participatory research. These were listening and questioning skills for the approach to participatory diagnosis called PRA.

- The Stür and Braun workshops presented a set of different experiences or methodologies carefully selected to illustrate different stages in the development of farmer participatory research and extension approaches. Stür and Braun also illustrated how different types of participatory research and extension approaches have been developed to fit into specific existing national research and extension contexts. The FLSP case illustrated a development of a process for participatory research in the context of a strong national program in extension. In the FLSP example the national extension service was involved in learning how to support research with farmers. The CIAL approach illustrated a context where the formal national extension system had collapsed. The CIAL approach depends on government institutes or NGOs to catalyze and facilitate the development of community-based farmer research groups which identify farmer innovations and carry out local research, calling up on results and outputs of the formal system and feeding information back to influence the agendas of formal research organizations. Eventually the groups become self-managing and self-supporting and the role of the facilitating organization changes accordingly.
- The Critchley workshop illustrated how the approach of identifying and promoting innovations developed by farmers can be useful as entry points for any model or approach for participatory technology development and how farmer innovation can be useful as a sub-programme particularly difficult areas which are not adequately served by formal research and development systems.

Several other major capacity building efforts have been conducted over the past few years by ICARDA and national programs related to 1) participatory plant breeding for barley, 2) Farmer Field Schools (FFS) for IPM in wheat and 3) participatory development planning in agropastoral communities in conjunction with the PRODESUD project, which has built on the earlier Mashreq & Maghreb project and a number of other research and development experiences in the M&M region. The PPB and PRODESUD projects have developed significant documentation and capacity building materials⁷. The FFS training was provided by CABI International, and local trainers are now scaling up the efforts.

ICARDA and INRAT, a close partner, have made significant contributions to the field of participatory research and development methodologies in plant breeding and agropastoral community development and collective action for rangeland management. Taken together with the recent capacity building and emerging experience in FFS, farmer Innovation and participatory technology development ICARDA has a foundation for “raising the flag” of participatory research, or more broadly participatory research & development.

6.3. *Has capacity-building been internalized?*

6.3.1. Views of ICARDA researchers

Responses to this question during interviews with ICARDA staff indicate that while progress has been made there is still more work to be done to internalize participatory approaches in ICARDA.

⁷ The PRODESUD project is in the process of translating its French language operational guide for elaboration of community development plans with agropastoral communities into Arabic and English. The French version of the guide is available at:
http://www.prgaprogram.org/modules.php?op=modload&name=Web_Links&file=index&req=visit&lid=436

<p>To what extent have concepts and skills for participatory research been internalised at ICARDA?:</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are changes in attitude -- people were controlling farmers in the past are now treating them in a more collaborative and collegial way. • The need to do staff training if participatory research is planned within a project is now accepted • Instead of asking one of the social scientists to accompany projects to the field all the time when doing participatory work, it is now accepted that projects need internal capacity • We see a variety of reactions by ICARDA staff to training on participatory approaches: some are now more enthusiastic; others gained some skills for working with farmers more effectively; others were not affected at all, some see it as useless • Participatory training has become associated with the process of integration across projects • Attitude changes spread much faster in farmer communities than in scientific communities • Participatory research is not mainstreamed in ICARDA • Participatory research is seen as appropriate for marginal areas and for working for resource poor farmers • ICARDA still does not have enough in-house expertise

6.3.2. Views of trainer consultants

The following reflections were gleaned from reports submitted by trainer consultants. The most positive view of the impact of a capacity-building event came from an workshop attended by participants with previous training and evident interest in participatory approaches.

<p>To what extent have concepts and skills for participatory research been internalized by the participants in capacity-building events?</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is uncertain to what extent participants understood the two central educational target areas of the course: empowerment and community building • For many researchers community building does not appear to be a priority – this possibly has to do with the nature of their work, which traditionally has not been concerned with building communities – but at least some sensitization has been achieved. • At the start of the workshop most participants were comfortable with the concept of the conventional linear approach to technology development with researchers developing technologies, extension workers “extending” technologies to farmers and farmers adopting technology packages. By default farmers were regarded as passive recipients of research rather than as potential partners in technology development. Overall most participants felt that they had learned useful new concepts and skills, but is important to continue to support the participants in incorporating these and to help them further develop their skills – these can only be improved with practice. It would be useful to plan a follow-up workshop in 3-6 months. • At the end of the workshop most participants felt that they had a good understanding of FPR and could clearly see the need for working with farmers to achieve the goals of the project. It is important to build on this by supporting researchers who are keen to work in a participatory way. Mentoring and action/reflection are the key to do this. The project needs to carefully monitor the skills of people, form groups with the necessary skills for different tasks and provide ample opportunities for reflection and discussion. The project should consider scheduling another workshop at the end of the first cycle to review experiences and develop strategies for the next stage.

- The lack of understanding among many researchers regarding the participatory approach was reflected in their frequent emphasizing during the workshop that farmers had to be educated with regard to the importance of research and the needs of researchers. On the level of institute directors and in the upper hierarchy of project management the use of participatory approaches seems to be completely absent.
- There are five main hurdles to the introduction of the participatory approach: 1) a prevalent top-down culture throughout almost all project components; 2) limited knowledge about the participatory approach among managers; 3) disinterest of the researchers; 4) a transfer-of-technology culture; 5) compartmentalized organizational structures
- The workshop process had impacts in several areas: 1) Very significant improvement in group dynamics, consisting of more discipline in terms of courteous and active listening, building on contributions by others rather than trying to compete or outdo them. This is significant because of the importance of such skills in working with farmers and in enabling the interdisciplinarity required by participatory research; 2) Improvement in analytical skills among some participants, particularly the younger ones.
- Basic concepts of participatory research absorbed by many of the participants include: shared decision-making among researchers, farmers and other actors as a key dimension of participatory research; the importance of having a clear process for working with farmers; the importance of involving farmers early in the technology development process; advantages and strengths of participatory research; the roles of farmers and researchers in participatory research; the importance of neutrality; the importance of equity (considering benefits for women AND men and disadvantaged groups); designing participatory research according to project goals. However, the workshop was short (4.5 days, and did not include a practical component in the field to allow participants to try new tools and skills directly with farmers). It would be unrealistic to expect that the participants will be enabled to conduct participatory research without further support. In particular, participants will need: 1) first hand exposure to participatory research occurring in the field; 2) access to materials in the Russian language for supporting capacity building 3) mentoring and support through the process of trying out participatory methods and tools in the Central Asian context 4) ongoing support in order to be able to test and adapt participatory methods and tools for their specific context.
- This was a 2.5 day training course in farmer innovation methodology with a group with wide ranging professional specializations, all of whom had previous training in participatory methodologies and had an interest in the topic of farmer innovations. According to a brief round-the-table evaluation – the course gave a convincing argument for the existence of and potential of farmer innovation – eyes are now open to seeing innovation on the ground and listening to farmers. The group was excellent, attentive and continuously asking pertinent questions.

7. STRATEGIES FOR FUTURE CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

7.1. Summary

Three complimentary strategies emerge from the context, demand, needs, lessons learned and views on how capacity building can be improved.

4. Each project undertaking PR & GA integrates capacity-development into its project cycle and strengthens follow-up, mentoring and reflection processes building in order to make the learning process iterative and practice oriented.
5. Projects and programs undertaking PR & GA form a resource group or network to support capacity development across the board. The resource group is composed of methodological innovators and facilitators identified by each project. These innovators

and facilitators could become a core group of trainers for the ICARDA network of projects.

6. The projects undertaking PR & GA could contribute core funds or collaborate in resource mobilization to engage a resource person who could coordinate the network of innovators/facilitators/core trainers, help raise the visibility of the PR & GA work being carried out by the ICARDA network and facilitate linkages to other networks and resources. In addition this person could conduct research related to methodology development for PR & GA and/or to monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment. He or she could help stimulate and support discourse in ICARDA and regionally on key issues related to PR & GA approaches such as multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary models of integration and the relationship between the functional and empowerment objectives or functions of participatory approaches.

The strengths, weaknesses and risks of these strategies are summarized.

7.2. Details

The previous sections present information on the context of PR & GA in ICARDA, on demand and needs for capacity-building in these approaches, lessons learned and views on how capacity building can be improved. Drawing these together, the current situation can be described as follows:

- There is widespread interest in improving PR & GA among ICARDA and partners
- An array of experiences exists in within ICARDA's collaborative network related to participatory research for technology development in plant breeding, for natural resource management and for the development of community approaches related to biodiversity and to the management of commonly held agropastoral rangelands.
- More integration is needed across disciplines and projects within R&D actors and among R&D organization needs
- The importance of gender approaches is widely acknowledged as a particularly weak area that requires much more attention.
- Integration and PR & GA approaches go "hand in hand" and are mutually reinforcing.
- There is some tension between the functional and empowerment views of participation in the ICARDA network. These are seen by many as distinct and even as incompatible modes.
- There is some tension related to researcher roles in conducting participatory research. Some researchers prefer a multidisciplinary approach, while others believe that interdisciplinary approach is necessary.
- A few self-trained innovators in the ICARDA network have played a major role in developing participatory methodologies and in capacity building.
- Others in the network look to these innovators and to socioeconomists familiar with participatory approaches to provide support in further capacity-building; however those who have the expertise can not fulfill the demand for capacity building
- With many more projects wanting to develop capacity in PR & GA new approaches are needed.
- Experience shows that successful capacity-building in PR & GA requires an iterative, practice-oriented approach which can build on formal training
- Much of the recent formal capacity-building has not been backed up with sufficient follow-up necessary to achieve this interactive and practice-oriented ideal of hands-on capacity building.

Three complementary strategies for moving forward emerge from this current picture:

1. Integrate capacity building into projects with strong follow-up: Each project undertaking PR & GA develops an internal capacity-building plan based on an internal assessment of current capacity and needs. Part of this assessment would involve identifying skill areas and levels of the team members and assigning responsibility for functions related to facilitating, monitoring and mentoring. The project would set some initial capacity-building goals, identify resources for this purpose, commit to combining formal capacity building with on-the-job practice and to holding at least one workshop during each cycle (season) to discuss and exchange experiences, identify areas needing improvement and plan ways to bring about needed adjustments. If new skills are needed, ways to bring in missing knowledge would be identified and planned for. In effect, each project sets up an internal monitoring and evaluation system for assessing its own progress in applying PR & GA approaches. A part of its internal development process the project team would agree on criteria and indicators related to capacity development and on the process documentation that would need to be developed in order to assess its own progress.
2. Form a resource group or network to support PR & GA capacity development across projects and programs: Each project undertaking PR & GA identifies its methodological innovators and facilitators, or those with skills that could be employed to build the capacity of others. The innovators from this pool of projects hold a workshop to exchange experiences and information and to identify ways that expertise and experience can be shared across projects. These innovators and facilitators could become the core group of trainers for the ICARDA network of projects. They could consider whether questions such as whether the core group should cover the whole network or whether subgroups also need to be formed to look after specific sub-areas (e.g. these might be geographical or thematic, for example PPB, technology development for NRM, biodiversity, common property management). If subgroups were formed, then mechanisms would need to be developed to facilitate networking and cross-fertilization across them. This core group could provide key services such as identifying external resource people when some particular expertise is needed that they cannot provide, and could develop process tools that could be used across the network, for example template terms of reference for external trainers.
3. Provide full-time coordination to the resource network supporting PR & GA capacity development across projects and programs: The projects undertaking PR & GA could contribute core funds or collaborate in resource mobilization to engage a resource person to coordinate the network of innovators/facilitators/core trainers, help raise the visibility of the PR & GA work occurring the ICARDA network and facilitate linkages to other networks and resources. In addition this person could conduct research related to methodology development for PR & GA and/or to monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment. He or she could help stimulate and support discourse in ICARDA and regionally on key issues related to PR & GA approaches such as multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary models of integration and the relationship between the functional and empowerment objectives or functions of participatory approaches.

Some strengths, weaknesses and risks of these strategies are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6. Strengths, weaknesses and risks of possible capacity-building strategies

Strategy	Strengths	Weaknesses & Risks
One-off training events at the project level designed and facilitated by external consultants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ External consultants bring in external perspectives and experience ▪ Projects can pick and choose trainers with skill in the capacity areas they need. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ With out follow-up investments in capacity-building may fail to yield desired outcomes ▪ With inadequate staff capacity, participatory work is of poor quality and does not result in the desired functional and empowerment outcomes ▪ Little cross-project learning ▪ capacity to make good decisions about trainers, process and content is limited by lack of knowledge
Integrate capacity building into projects with strong follow-up	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The participatory internal process for developing capacity in the project team mirrors and reinforces the participatory nature of the work with other partners including farmers ▪ Helps to increase integration within projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Resources for follow-up need to be incorporated at the proposal development stage ▪ Little cross-project learning
Form a resource group network to support PR & GA capacity development across projects and programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decisions on trainers processes and content will be better informed ▪ Trainers could be trained by the resource group ▪ Contributes to raising visibility of PR & GA ▪ Helps to increase integration in the system as a whole ▪ Makes it easier to mobilize resources ▪ Experience from the diversity of projects that ICARDA and partners are involved could be integrated to serve as the raw material for developing training resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The network might not get off the ground without a formal coordinator ▪ The network might not get off the ground unless there is support from management in participating organizations ▪ Requires resource mobilization ▪ Language could be an issue if the network cuts across all the geographic areas in the ICARDA mandate
Provide full-time coordination to the resource network supporting PR & GA capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Improves the chances that the resource network will produce desired outcomes ▪ Can ensure that progress 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Requires resource mobilization ▪ The coordinator becomes a “slave” to projects and becomes over extended

development across projects and programs	of the network is adequately monitored and evaluated <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Contributes to raising visibility of PR & GA▪ Makes it easier to mobilize resources▪ Facilitates linkages to other networks	
--	--	--

REFERENCES

1. Allen, W. 2005. A role for integrated and interdisciplinary science: Getting technical environmental information used in watershed and regional-scale decision-making. IN: Hatfield, J. (Ed.) OECD Proceedings. Soil and Water Conservation Society.
2. Braun, A. 2004. A training workshop on Participatory Research Approaches for the ICARDA project on Improving Rural Livelihoods through Efficient On-farm Water and Soil Fertility Management in Central Asia. 6-10 September, Tashkent, Uzbekistan. Facilitation Plan.
3. Braun, A. 2004. A training workshop on Participatory Research Approaches for the ICARDA project on Improving Rural Livelihoods through Efficient On-farm Water and Soil Fertility Management in Central Asia. 6-10 September, Tashkent, Uzbekistan. Report.
4. Critchley, W. 2004. Farmer Innovation: an "old but new" tool in research and extension. Mission Report.
5. Horton, D., A. Alexaki, S. Bennett-Lartey, K.N. Brice, D. Campilan, F. Carden, J. de Souza Silva, L.T. Duong, I. Khadar, A. Maestrey Boza, I. Kayes Muniruzzaman, J. Perez, M. Somarriba Chang, R. Vernooy, and J. Watts. 2003. Developing and Evaluating Capacity in Research and Development Organizations. ISSN 1021-2310. 8p. ISNAR Briefing Paper.
6. Nefzaoui, A. Y Saadani, H. Jallouli, N. Raggad et A. Jemai en collaboration avec Grigory Lazarev. 2003. Guide operationnel pour l'elaboration et la mise en oeuvre de plan developpement participatif avec les comunautes agro-pastorales. Projet de developpement agropastoral et de promotion des initiatives locales dans le sud est (PRODESUD). INRAT/FIDA/ICARDA.
7. Stür, W. 2002. Participatory approaches for improving the effectiveness of on-farm research in small ruminant production in dry areas. Workshop held at ICARDA, 9-16 September 2002. Report
8. Stür, W. R. la Rovere, R. el-Khatib and F. Turkelboom. 2002. Farmer participatory research (FPR) workshop for the Khanasser Valley Integrated Research site (KVIRS) held at ICARDA, 20-31 October 2002. Report.
9. von Korff, Y. 2003. Regional training workshop on participatory research methods and community approach and characterization. 29 April – 6 May 2003. Cairo, Egypt. Nile Valley Red Sea Regional Program of ICARDA/IFAD. Report.
10. von Korff, Y. 2002. Workshop for members of the Barani Village Development Program in Islamabad from 16 – 22 September 2002. Report.

APPENDIX 1. Terms of Reference

Assessment of capacity for Participatory Research and Gender Analysis among ICARDA and partners

TERMS of REFERENCE (Modified 2 Dec 04)

Background

ICARDA's is part of a vast collaborative network. The center has seven regional programs and ca. 70% of ICARDA's work is conducted in collaboration with NARS. NGOs are relatively underdeveloped in the region, so the NGO partners are not many, but this is changing. Universities are also partners mainly through students, collaborative research projects and consultancies.

ICARDA has been including participatory aspects of its projects for some time now. The Participatory barley breeding program of ICARDA is among the leaders globally in this field. Currently, most new projects include some participatory approaches. This is partly driven by pressure to embrace participatory approaches as a way of increasing the chances of successful funding bids, and partly by the expectation that participatory research would yield better results and enhance research impact.

There is no across-the-board program with a wide view that supports methodology development and lends support to capacity development to ICARDA program and partners. Capacity building needs are often raised by ICARDA researchers during project implementation and are included in some project plans. Funds for capacity building in PR & GA are mostly small and are within projects which often are inadequate to address the capacity development needs in a comprehensive way not influenced by the specific needs of short-term projects.

ICARDA's goal for PR & GA capacity development is to achieve increased research impact through effective targeting of research to the rural poor, who are most directly affected by low returns from agriculture as well as damages from environmental degradation, through enhanced flow of knowledge among producers, extension staff, policy makers and other partners. This study will help ICARDA to achieve that goal.

Objectives:

1. Assess demand and specific needs for capacity development in Participatory Research and Gender Analysis (PR & GA) in ICARDA and among partner institutions
2. Develop a strategy and plan of action for capacity development
3. Identify mechanisms for sustaining networks of national trainers associated with ICARDA

The results of this assessment will provide inputs for proposal development.

Methodology

1. **Key questions:** The key questions for the assessment include the following:

- What are ICARDA scientists and partners expectations of PR & GA methods?
- What do they feel are the realistic potentials of PR & GA approaches and why?
- What are their concerns about these methods and how can these be addressed?
- How do ICARDA scientists and partners characterize participatory research and gender analysis?
- What criteria they use to classify their research as participatory, gender-sensitive or gender-equitable?
- What capacity do scientists believe their projects have for participatory research and gender analysis?
- What are their needs in terms of capacity building in PR & GA?

2. **Identifying and interviewing innovators:**

Capacity in PR & GA, demand for capacity building and specific capacity building needs at ICARDA and partners will be assessed using an Innovation Systems Framework.

PR & GA innovators together with their innovations in tools and methods will be identified through individual interviews and focus group discussions with selected ICARDA scientists and partners. The assessment will trace how these innovations have spread through the network, and what has inspired, enabled, sustained and constrained their spread.

Those identified as PR & GA innovators by others will be contacted during field visits or via phone and/or email. In this way ICARDA's innovation tree for PR & GA will be constructed and at the same time information about what is actually working and what more is needed to sustain innovation will be gathered as an input to designing better ways to support and enhance the process in the future.

This method will be complemented with traditional tools such as SWOT

It is very important that this cascading process of identifying innovators and learning about the process that they have followed is not confined to internationally-recruited principal scientists. It is critical to include regional and non-principal scientists, research assistants who may be the major innovators and are the key drivers of the implementation of the approaches in the field.

Malika Abdilali Martini is a key ICARDA resource person on gender and diversity analysis and its inextricable relationship with participatory research.

3. **Visiting regional programs:**

All ICARDA regions will be included. Visiting all 7 regional programs is not feasible nor is meeting with all of ICARDA's partners in any given region. However given the need to limit travel in order to ensure sufficient research time only 2 regions will be visited in addition to ICARDA headquarters in Aleppo. These are:

- North Africa
- Nile Valley/Red Sea

This calls for a strategic approach focusing on locations where a number of partners can be contacted in a single location. Face-to-face visits can be complemented by using email and telephone interviews in order to limit travel to what is absolutely necessary.

4. Assessing participatory content of projects:

ICARDA has a Project Office that could be called upon to provide a roster of projects with participatory components, significant gender aspects, and demand for capacity building. Some analysis by this office to assess the density of PR & GA in ICARDA's projects will be instructive.

Work plan

The assessment will be carried out in four main steps as follows:

1. Preparation – analysis of background documents, identification of institutions and individuals to be contacted, framing of key questions
2. Field visits -- individual interviews and small group meetings with researchers from ICARDA and partner institutions
3. Email and phone call interviews with people who need to be included but could not be seen in person. (while at ICARDA and from 1-15 Jan)
4. Synthesis and report preparation
5. Submission of report (31 Jan)

Assumptions:

- ICARDA will make logistic arrangements so that an array of ICARDA scientists and partners can be contacted in person at HQ and through the regional offices in Amman, Tunis and Cairo. Translation support will also be provided as necessary.
- ICARDA will provide contact details for ICARDA scientists and partners who should be interviewed by email and/or telephone
- ICARDA will brief potential participants about the assessment, requesting their collaboration, and will request the data indicated in this TOR from the Project's Office.
- ICARDA will arrange for Malika Martini serve as a resource person for the assessment

APPENDIX 2. Schedule of interviews

Timetable for meetings with ICARDA/NARS scientists and managers on capacity building needs related to Participatory Research & Gender Analysis				
Day	Time	Persons to meet	Tel. ext.	Comments
4 Dec 04	11:00-16:00	Aden Aw-Hassan	537	
5 Dec 04	10:00 -11:00	Richard Thomas	505	Director of NRM
	11:00-12:00	Stefania Grando	407	PBB
	12:00-13:00	Break		
	13:00-14:00	Salvatore Ceccarelli	408	PBB
	14:00-15:00	Francis Turkelboom	545	WCP Iran, Khanasser
6 Dec 04	9:00-10:00	Mustafa Bohssini	750	FFS, IPM
	10:00 -11:00	Hanadi Dessougi	543	Nutrient Cycle
	11:00-12:00	Roberto La Rovere	534	Khanasser
	12:00-13:00	Break		
	13:00-14:00	Luis Iniguez	504	Livestock, Elbab, Khanasser
	14:00-15:00	Birgitta Hartwell		Livestock, Elbab, Khanasser
	15:00-16:00	Theib Oweis	538	Water, WCP Iran
7 Dec 04	9:00-10:00	Open		
	10:00 -11:00	Haben Asgedom	550	Nutrient cycle
	11:00-12:00	Osman Abdalla	509	Bread wheat Breeding
	12:00-13:00	Break		
	13:00-14:00	Miloudi Nachit	402	Durum Wheat Breeding
	14:00-16:00	Amor Yahyaoui	447	Cereal pathology
8 Dec 04	9:00-10:00	Jim Tiedman	503	Community rotational grazing
	10:00 -11:00	Hanadi Dessougi	543	Nutrient cycle
	11:00-12:00	Adriana Bruggeman	502	Khanasser, WCP Iran
	12:00-13:00	Break		
	13:00-14:00	ICARDA Seminar		
	14:00-15:00	Mustafa Pala	743	Conservation tillage
	15:00-16:00			
9 Dec 04	9:00-10:0	Rajendra Malhotra	406	Chickpea Breeding
	10:00-11:00	Ashtosh Sarker	410	Lentil Breeding
	11:00-12:00	Human Resources		Inventory of recently advertised international positions
	12:00 - 13:00	Break		
	14:00 - 15:00	Zuhair Masri	741	Khnesser
	15:00 - 16:00	Kamel Shideed	509	M&M Project
10 Dec 05	Travel to Cairo ⁸			
11 Dec 05				
12 Dec 05	9:00 - 10:00	Asma El-Belasy		Socioeconomist, NVRSRP, Egypt
	10:00 - 11:00	Mahmoud Zaki		Director, FCRI, ARC, Egypt
	11:00 - 13:00	Mossad Abdelaleem		Head, Wheat department
		Ahmed Helmy		Head, Food Legume department
	14:00 - 15:00	Habib Halila		Regional Coordinator
	20:00 - 21:30	Yorck van Korff		independent consultant, trainer for

⁸ Travel was originally planned for 10 Dec, however due to an error with airticket I was obliged to return to Aleppo to make new arrangements.

				ICARDA
13 Dec 05	7:30 - 9:30			Travel to Fayoum Governate with Ismail Moneim
	10:00 - 10:30			Visit Farmer Field School (fava bean virus project)
	11:00 - 12:00			Visit Women's Farmer field school
	12:00 - 13:00			Visit enterprise development project
	Travel to Tunis			
14 Dec 05	9:00 - 10:00	Mohamed El-Mourid		Regional Coordinator, North Africa
	10:00 - 12:00	Ali Nefzaoui		Director of Research, INRAT/M&M Project
	14:00 - 15:30	Ahmed Amri		Agrobiodiversity project coordinator (telephone interview)
	15:30 - 16:00	Saadia Lhaloui		INRA, Morocco (telephone interview)
15 Dec 05	9:00 - 11:00	Mouldi el Felah		INRAT, Barley Breeder
				Travel to Syria
16 Dec 04				Visit PPB farmers with Salvator Ceccarelli
17 Dec 04	Rest day			
18 Dec 04	10:00 - 17:00	Kaseem Al-Ahmad		Khnesser facilitator
19 Dec 04	9:00-10:00	William Erskine	210	Director of Research
	11:00-12:00	Attention to administrative matters with Marica Boyagi		
	12:00-13:00	Manzoor Qadir	507	Barani project, Pakistan, CA project
	13:00-14:00	Magdy Madkour	207	Director International Cooperation
	14:00-15:00	Malika Martini		Gender specialist
20 Dec 05	9:00 - 11:00	Majd Jamal Mwaffak Mohammad Baha'a Jamal		Director, GCSAR, Syria GCSAR, Syria/M&M project Barley Breeder, GSCAR
	11:00 - 1:00	Meeting on PPB with M Jamal, B. Jamal, S. Cecarelli, S. Grando. M. Michael, Dr. Afif (GCSAR) and Dr. Ahmad (ICARDA)		
Jan 2005	Regional offices contacted via email: Abjul Majid (full response) Habib Ketata (no response) Anwar Agha (no response) Abderrezak Belaid (no response) Isin Kusmenoglu (no response) Ahmed Moustafa (no response) Raj Paroda (can respond in February) Ismail Muharrum (no response) Nasrat Wassimi (study not relevant to Afganistan) Flavio Capettini (responded, but has not provided input)			
	Inventory of capacity building plans sent to all persons interviewed and to all regional offices			
	External trainers contacted via email: Njeri Muhia (responded, but has not provided input) Werner Stür (full response) Will Critchley (full response)			

APPENDIX 3 Considerations for proposal development and review

(Source: CGIAR Challenge Program on Water and Food. 2003. An overview of participatory research and learning processes and their relevance to watershed management and development. Paper commissioned to the working group on Participatory Natural Resource Management of CGIAR System wide Program on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis.)

What are some characteristics of a proposal that reflects a gendered, participatory approach to research as part of a adaptive management and development process?

Evidence that a proposal embraces a participatory approach:

- Involvement of local people and other stakeholders at various stages in the work and not just at the end of the project or in a subsequent phase.
- Involvement of local people and other stakeholders in decision-making
- Priorities of poor men and women taken seriously as priorities for the project
- Appreciation for and building upon local knowledge and local institutions.
- Methodological descriptions indicate how local people and other stakeholders are to be involved in the work.
- Use of facilitation
- Sharing of findings
- Flexible approach to allow for adjustment to the process
- Iterative planning, action, reflection and replanning.
- Impact orientation.
- Development of documents, guides, etc useful to local people and other stakeholders
- Local involvement in monitoring and evaluation
- Project management operationalizes concepts of gender and participation and assigns corresponding resources in the budget

Evidence that a proposal has not embraced a participatory approach

- Only scientific understandings and characterization work without involvement of local people (a study from the outside rather than one based on direct involvement)
- Only reports and scientific papers as outputs.
- Monitoring and evaluation that mainly relates to “numbers” and does not reflect the impact or outcome orientation of the work.
- Resource use assessments are not disaggregated by social criteria (gender, wealth etc)

Evidence that the participatory research is a key element of the proposal

- Research questions are clearly formulated
- Links between research and development outcomes are clearly drawn
- A process for participatory research is clearly described

Additional evaluation questions

- Is there evidence that the priorities of poor men and women and social groups have been identified?
- Is there a space for clarification of stakeholder expectations, negotiation about how research will be done, how the results will be disseminated?
- Is there evidence of mechanisms to support effective communication among resource users, researchers and other stakeholders

- Is there evidence that local sources of innovation are valued/utilised?
- Are women/women's groups included as important stakeholders
- Is there evidence that options for entry points have been explored?
- Are plans included for analysis of existing land water management institutions (formal, informal) in the watersheds?
- Have the full range of factors (policy, institutional, biophysical, and social) that affect the quality and availability of water and other resources been considered?
- Are both technical and social options considered for improving resource use and availability?
- Are local capacity-building activities contemplated and are corresponding resources assigned in the budget?
- Is capacity building contemplated for a number of critical areas: (e.g. collective action, advocacy, technology evaluation, group management)
- Is strengthening local decision making capacity in an equitable and inclusive manner a priority and are mechanisms and resources in place for doing so?
- Is there an intention to establish an iterative process of role negotiation and clarification?
- Is there an action-learning component?
- Are mechanisms in place to involve researchers and stakeholders in reciprocal learning processes
- Is documentation built in to support learning purposes?
- Is participatory monitoring and evaluation an integral element and provided for in the budget?