

M17812

Lib

X

Involving Communities in Planning and Assessing the Impacts of Development Programmes

**Report on a Pacific NGO Workshop on
Participatory Approaches to Development
Nadi, Fiji 23-25 June 2003**

**Report prepared by Marion Quinn and Kevin Clark
Workshop Organisers**

1427

**Pacific NGO Workshop on
Participatory Approaches to Development
Nadi, Fiji 23-25 June 2003**



**The workshop was funded by the New Zealand Agency for International
Development/Voluntary Agencies Support Scheme (VASS)**

Contents

Introduction	4
Workshop Sessions	
Session 1: Introduction and Participations Expectations	6
Session 2: Introduction to Participatory Development	6
Session 3: Lessons for the VAS PIA Pilot Programme in the Pacific	11
Session 4: Stakeholders in Participatory Development and Gender Analysis	13
Session 5: Setting Indicators	18
Session 6: Data Collection and Analysis	20
Session 7: Participatory Tools	22
Session 8: Finalising Plans and Timetables for Undertaking a Participatory Activity	25
Session 9: Implications for Organisations in Implementing Participatory Approaches	27
Session 10: Wrap Up	28
Appendices	
1 Participatory Activity Plan	30
2 Workshop Programme	32
3 Proposed Participatory Activities of NGOs Involved in the Workshop	35
4 Workshop Evaluation	42
5 Participant Addresses	53

Introduction

During 2001/02 six New Zealand NGOs and eight of their partners in South Asia or the Pacific were involved in a Participatory Impact Assessment (PIA) pilot programme initiated and supported by the Voluntary Agency Support Scheme (VASS) of the New Zealand Agency for International Development (NZAID). The PIA pilot programme aimed to build understanding of the philosophical and methodological approaches to PIA for all involved through workshops and practical experience (ie undertaking a participatory impact assessment of a project).

At a workshop at the end of the Pacific phase of the pilot programme in Nadi in August 2002, the need for capacity building in the area of participatory approaches to development in a Pacific context was raised. It was suggested that it would be useful to share the lessons learnt from the PIA pilot programme with other Pacific NGOs. The VASS PSC and NZAID agreed to provide the funds to bring a number of Pacific NGOs that were supported by New Zealand NGOs or NZAID to such a workshop.

This report is from that workshop held in Nadi, Fiji in June 2003. The objectives of the workshop were:

- to build the capacity of participants in participatory approaches to development planning, monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment
- to strengthen relationships between Pacific NGOs and their NZ partners and between NZAID and NZ NGOs through participation in a joint learning process
- to build core capacity in participatory development in the Pacific and encourage the development of networks that will influence other NGOs' activities and programmes.

Attendance at the workshop was limited in order to encourage active participation. However it was still quite large with 58 people participating including five resource people. Pacific NGOs interested in the workshop had to complete an application form in which they stated their interest in participatory development and outlined a participatory activity they would like to plan during the workshop. Of the thirty NGO applications, 23 were selected from Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Kiribati, Fiji, Samoa and Tonga. Each NGO could send up to two representatives and in all 38 Pacific NGO representatives participated. To encourage the development of strong partnerships between Pacific NGOs and their NZ partners, ten representatives from eight NZ NGOs and five NZAID staff also participated.

Prior to the workshop, participants were sent copies of the South Asia and the Pacific PIA pilot programme reports and a summary report of the two-year programme. On arrival at the workshop participants also received other material on participatory approaches to development.

The timing of the workshop took advantage of the presence in the region of Dr Rajesh Tandon from the Society for Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA). Dr Tandon is a

leading international expert on participatory approaches to development having founded PRIA in the early 1980s. He has also had experience in the Pacific region through his involvement with the Commonwealth Foundation and Asia Pacific Association for Adult Education. Other resource people included Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop from Samoa and Cema Bolabola from Fiji and the workshop organisers Kevin Clark and Marion Quinn.

The methodology followed during the workshop was short presentations, small group work and feedback sessions to assist each Pacific NGO to plan a participatory activity in relation to a specific programme or project. A *Participatory Activity Plan* outline was provided to each participant and this was progressively completed during the workshop after input on specific topics and discussion in small groups. For much of the workshop, participants worked in small groups involving the Pacific NGO and their NZ partner. In some cases where the New Zealand organisation had more than one partner, a number of organisations worked together. Through a video on participatory tools and some experiential learning, participants gained some knowledge of different ways of gathering data with the active involvement of primary stakeholders.

By the end of the workshop most participants had completed a participatory activity plan as a basis for discussion back in their home countries with key stakeholders. All seemed keen to further develop their plan and carry out the activity developed during the workshop.

This report summarises the input provided during each workshop session and some of the key points that were drawn out during feedback sessions. Appendices include a copy of Participatory Action Plan format, the Workshop Programme, an outline of the NGOs' proposed participatory activities, a summary of workshop evaluations and a list of participants.

Day 1: Monday 23 June 2003

Session 1: Introductions and Participants Expectations

Following a welcome to the workshop and introductions each participant was asked to write their expectations of the workshop on a card. These were then discussed and summarised and expectations from the cards were put on the wall grouped under several headings: participatory development, knowledge of PIA, stakeholder participation, learning from others and methods and tools. The main expectations of the workshop indicated by participants were:

- increased knowledge and understanding of PIA including rationale, methods and why they work
- how to integrate PIA into projects and programme work
- how to involve stakeholders
- how to better support partners in using participatory processes
- a desire to understand PIA in the Pacific context
- to develop a network of organisations in the Pacific able to share experiences of PIA
- how to integrate PIA within organisations
- how to use PIA in working with communities
- how to use PIA in working with children
- how to use PIA in working with the disabled
- how to move from PRA (carried out at the beginning of project development) to PIA (used throughout the project cycle).

Session 2: Introduction to Participatory Development – Rajesh Tandon

Development came into common vocabulary after World War II in relation to the reconstruction of Europe, especially Germany and as such has a relatively short history of around 60 years. The underlying assumption was that the US was developed and through the delivery of aid, technology and resources, other countries could reach this “desired” state. With decolonisation the model was transferred to other countries then called the “Third World”. In this context the establishment of the Bretton Woods Institutions (the IMF and the World Bank) defined development in terms of economics and the key indicator of development as Gross National Product (GNP). It was only in the late 1960s and 1970s that the concept of participation began to be discussed.

Key issues raised by the participatory development debate include:

- whose agenda is being pursued
- development is endogenous (ie each situation is different so there is not one solution for all)
- process is as important as product and outcomes if sustainable development is to be achieved
- redefining power relationships is necessary
- participation involves local ownership and initiative.

The conventional means to deliver development was *the project*. A programme is essentially a number of projects or a framework within which specific projects are undertaken. Within this construct there was a specific plan to deliver particular outcomes to achieve a desired goal. The project cycle was developed as a way to discuss the stages in the development of a project intervention. One way of looking at this is shown below.

Design	Identifies desired change (the goal) and how to achieve it	Measuring impact
Plan	Identifies objectives	Measuring outcomes
Implementation	Resource use	Measuring outputs (Monitoring is the process of measuring progress in achieving planned activities)
Completion	In relation to the plan	Evaluation of results

Monitoring is usually seen as a management function undertaken by the head of the implementing agency. Evaluation is usually seen as an independent process undertaken by development consultants. Impact refers to sustainable changes resulting from the development intervention. Often these include changes in power relations.

Two myths: Experts from outside are objective and expertise resides outside. Outsiders can assist but need internal views. Traditional views do not support participatory approaches.

When we talk about participation in monitoring and evaluation there are three questions:

- whose participation
- how – what methods
- for what purpose.

There are two ways of looking at participation:

- as a means to achieve the project goal (donor approach), key ideas being
 - relevance (appropriateness)
 - contribution (eg labour)
 - resources (eg user pays)
 - belonging (limited to maintaining the investment).
- as an end (collective effort for the common good), key ideas being:
 - rights
 - values
 - democracy
 - social capital
 - civil society.

Types of participation:

- information
- consultation
- shared decision-making
- control over resources and outcomes.

Issues:

- will the participatory process lead to empowerment or is it manipulative?
- will it result in knowledge, learning, capacity building for the primary stakeholders

A definition of participation:

Participation is a process through which stakeholders influence and share control over development initiatives, and the decisions and resources which effect them. (World Bank, 1994)

A better definition:

Participation is a process through which primary stakeholders influence and share control over development initiatives, and the decisions and resources which effect them.

Participation in a Pacific Context - Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop

There are three important questions in participation:

- who participates
- where participation takes place
- why.

Who participates in decision-making in the Pacific:

- family, community leaders usually male, those with seniority, age and status
- increasingly those with money
- those that benefit are usually those with money, power and information
- need structures to get others involved including women and vulnerable groups.

Where participation occurs:

- affects the types of interaction possible
- traditionally formal institutions and structures where a small group makes decisions and these trickle out to the others
- need alternative structures or avenues to engage other groups
- need to find places where people gather.

Why participation:

- current channels reinforce the status quo
- need to change the processes if change is desired.

Common patterns of communication in the Pacific include:

- respect for the old by the young
- don't question authority
- it is rude to challenge (seen against the person not about the issue)
- need to find ways that are socially/culturally appropriate to engage in debate.

Informed participation:

- people need knowledge of options/choices to be able to participate in an informed way
- participation is a two way process
- participation combines technical information with local knowledge
- empowerment can be gained through people having access to information.

Ways of sharing:

- don't just ask questions
- look for other sources of information
- use all senses
- learn to use different collection methods
- learn to interpret
- there are different ways to show knowledge and share knowledge
- triangulation/explanation is important.

Obstacles to participation:

- do we understand and are we committed to participation or are we doing it because donors say so?
- most participation occurs in needs identification, with less as the project advances
- it is a challenge to ensure participation throughout the project cycle
- impact assessment should take place throughout not just at the end with primary stakeholders involved throughout
- there are different levels of participation ranging from providing information to sharing decision-making and control over resources and outcomes. What are we aiming for?
- need people to carry it out/facilitate and support it
- takes time, patience, resources.

Participation in a Pacific Context - Cema Bolabola

Why do we want participatory development? Development has involved a power shift from the community to institutions (eg churches and chiefs) putting people on the periphery. Through participatory development it is possible to put people back in the centre (leading but supported by institutions). Traditional decision-making processes are not necessarily the best. Participatory development acknowledges diversity, age, sex, status (by birth or economics).

Today in the Pacific we see a crisis in authority, a change from command and obedience. However it is difficult to find effective ways to operate in this new environment. In the old days resources were scarce and people had to work together to survive. Today there is a new individualism with material wealth as a means of gaining power and status adding a new dimension to leadership.

In Melanesia there are a number of issues that need to be considered when talking about participatory development. These include:

- multiculturalism
- the low status of women
- the status of youth and children
- male only decision makers
- status of chiefs “big men”

There is a culture of silence – consensus by attendance and silence

Basis for power is land ownership. This generally means:

- landownership is in the hands of men
- patriarchal context
- exclusion of women from decision-making
- governance issues

People centred development recognises that the community knows better, the community knows what is needed and the community know the impacts of change.

Small Group Exercise - Participation

The Language of Participation

In this small group exercise people from each country identified words in their local language for participation and expressed their meanings in English phrases. They also discussed their experience of participatory development.

PNG	Working together Commitment, trust, loyalty, doing together Something for a group to talk about, devise together and do together
Solomon Islands	working together, community work
Vanuatu	to take part in an activity, meeting, etc.
Fiji	custom – help each other (women weaving together, men planning together), to show love, support and care, also has a spiritual meaning
Kiribati	holding hands together, joining together
Samoa	those who work together, pull together
Tonga	helping, reciprocity, mutuality

From all these expressions there are a number of common elements to participation:

- collective action
- mutuality
- an emotional dimension.

These elements breath life into the word participation and give it its meaning. Without understanding these elements, participation can lose its meaning, become selfish, individualistic and manipulative.

Session 3: Lessons from the VASS Participatory Impact Assessment Pilot Programmes in the Pacific – Four Pacific NGOs that were involved

In this session the four NGOs involved in the PIA pilot programme (Wan Smolbag Theatre Vanuatu, Save the Children Fiji, ECREA Fiji and the Oxfam NZ Bougainville Programme) talked briefly about what they did and the lessons they learnt. Details of findings and lessons from these case studies are included in the report on the Pacific PIA pilot programme that was distributed to all participants. Further copies are available from NZAID. Below are some of the main points made in presentations to the meeting.

Wan Smolbag Theatre: The case study aimed to assess the impact of a radio soap (Famili Blong Sarah) on the behaviour of young people with regard to reproductive health issues.

Some of the issues and lessons that emerged in undertaking the PIA included:

- it was overly ambitious to try to undertake the PIA in four different communities for logistical and cost reasons, in the end the PIA was undertaken in three communities
- it was very useful to work with communities to identify community members who would play a key role in the process and provide them with training – this has strengthened the relationship between WSB and the communities
- while training was provided to WSB staff and community data collectors they were not confident enough to apply some of the participatory tools learnt, more time needed to be spent piloting tools and training those involved
- too many indicators were chosen and these were not always directly relevant to the purpose of the PIA
- data collection methods changed during the process which made it difficult to compare information
- the need to translate words and concepts appropriately into local language
- it was complicated working with three partners (WSB, Oxfam NZ and the PIA facilitator) in three countries and good communication between all involved was important
- the PIA has helped WSB gain information and ideas from the community that will influence further episodes of the radio soap.

Save the Children Fiji: The context for the PIA was that community relationships in Muaniweni were badly affected by the civil disturbances of May 2000. The case study

aimed to assess the impact of playback theatre on the attitudes and practices of Indo-Fijians and Fijians in the Muaniweni community and school.

Some of the issues and lessons that emerged from the PIA included:

- it was good to be part of the pilot project as this allowed for learning, trying something new and making mistakes
- the process has enabled SCF to concentrate on impacts of their work rather than the usual focus on outputs
- it was important to establish a community committee that involved all key stakeholder groups and to train them to carry out the PIA - the process empowered community members
- each group prepared a community profile which was a good way for them to gather information and understand their community more deeply
- the need to translate materials into local languages (Fijian and Hindi)
- it was important to take the information collected back to the community and they could have been more involved in the analysis of this information
- the process was time consuming and it is important to incorporate the process into organisational systems
- the need to identify appropriate tools – some were developed and used effectively with children as well as with men and women of both ethnic groups
- through the process the community raised various issues – which needed to be followed up

ECREA Fiji: The original intention of the PIA was firstly, to assess the impact of initial training of community facilitators who would be responsible for the community programme in various villages and their capacity to carry out their responsibilities and secondly, to help create a baseline and establish indicators to measure the impact of the Social Empowerment and Education Programme (SEEP) on selected villages. As the project developed slower than expected, the PIA focused on the first objective.

Some of the issues and lessons that emerged from the PIA included:

- not all stakeholders in ECREA were on board with the PIA and more effort needed to be put into ensuring other stakeholders in the organisation understood what the PIA was about and supported it
- it was helpful for the community facilitators to think about how they might measure the effectiveness of the training programme and this itself was an incentive to achieve positive outcomes
- there was a need to be flexible to the context and time it took to develop the programme and modify the PIA to suit this rather than carry on regardless
- PIA approaches need to be incorporated into programmes rather than being special exercises that are likely to be expensive, time consuming and not well understood by communities so it is good to start PIA at the beginning of a project.

Oxfam NZ Bougainville Programme: The case study aimed to assess the impact of the Tako'o Women's Poultry Project on the project holders, their households and the wider Tako'o community.

Some of the issues and lessons that emerged from the PIA included:

- the need to involve community representatives in planning and undertaking the PIA and providing training in participatory tools to do this
- the importance of working in local language as it is easier for community members to understand concepts that are expressed in local language
- tools that fit into how people normally work and interact are more likely to be readily accepted and generate information and discussion – need to identify and trial new methods based on local ways of doing things
- the process gave ONZBP staff/community members tools, skills and knowledge
- it is important to analyse the information generated with the community to draw out lessons and what this means for the future of the programme.

Session 4: Stakeholders in Participatory Development and Gender Analysis

Introduction – Rajesh Tandon

In the old days life was simpler. Communities shared a variety of resources to meet a variety of needs. Communities tended to be seen as homogeneous and working together to meet common needs. As knowledge has expanded, the nature of community has been analysed and it has been recognised as more heterogeneous, made up of different groups not all with the same interests (eg male/female, old/young, landed/landless, educated/illiterate, rich/poor). In any development intervention today, there are many people or organisations with an interest in the outcome. Thus the concept of stakeholders began to be applied in the 1990s and development agencies began undertaking stakeholder analysis in relation to development projects.

Stakeholders are not necessarily individuals but more often groups or institutions that potentially have a “stake” in the development intervention. Some may not recognise or accept that they have a stake in the outcome. Stakeholders can be categorised as:

- primary stakeholders – the beneficiary community who tend to be less visible, less vocal, less able to engage, less powerful. They may be women, children, the disabled, landless, illiterate, an ethnic or religious minority, rural dwellers
- secondary stakeholders – these include the local NGOs (and within the organisation the Board, management, field workers), the donor support NGO (again including Board, management, field staff, volunteers and supporters), back donors (eg NZAID), the government (national, provincial and local), other NGOs and development agencies working in a similar field or region, traditional leaders, local business, etc.

In the past most participation has been by secondary stakeholders. Participatory development places the primary stakeholders at the centre of the development process. Issues around the engagement of relevant stakeholders in a development project include:

- identification of relevant stakeholders
- need for a process to identify relevant stakeholders
- need to determine the significance of different stakeholders
- need to recognise the webs of relationships between different stakeholder groups

- need to recognise power relations and historical connections.

To ensure appropriate stakeholder engagement there is a need to find or create spaces for intra-stakeholder dialogue and to facilitate conversations/dialogue between them. A fundamental principle of stakeholder engagement is that each stakeholder brings a point of view to the table and these may be different. The aim of the dialogue is to negotiate an agreement on how to proceed through discussion.

Role Play

Thirteen participants presented a role play depicting various primary and secondary stakeholders participating in a village meeting called to discuss a potential village development project. The project that a New Zealand donor is interested in supporting is an integrated rural development project. The main objective of the project is to increase production of the main crop, rice. This is to be achieved through the development of small-scale irrigation and the introduction of new varieties of rice that should potentially enable two or possibly three crops of rice to be produced a year instead of one as is currently the case. The project is to include provision of high yielding varieties of seeds, fertilisers and pesticides. A cooperative is also planned that will provide credit, access to farm inputs (including a tractor for hire) and will buy rice from the farmers. The project also plans to introduce a micro-credit programme largely targeting women. It is expected most loans will be used to buy cows, goats and chicken. There are also plans to address health needs through construction of a primary health clinic. (The local NGO has previously supported training of health workers but there are no further funds to pay them or provide medicines for them.) Education is also an issue and the NGO has been trying to encourage children to attend the local school they worked with the community to build and equip.

Stakeholders attending the meeting are:

- the in-country NGO Director
- the NZ NGO Project Officer
- the headman of the Village
- the Agricultural Extension Officer
- two representatives of the rice farmers (male)
- two village women's committee representatives
- the doctor from neighbouring town
- the Primary Health Worker
- the local school teacher
- an environment NGO and advocacy NGO.

The discussion following the role-play identified the different interests of the various stakeholders attending the meeting and a wide range of issues that needed to be addressed prior to project implementation. Some of these included:

Economic/financial issues: The possibility of increased income from increased rice production but also greater vulnerability to market prices through reliance on one crop. Costs of inputs (seeds, fertilisers, pesticides) also needed to be taken into account. The costs of the irrigation scheme and whether villagers were expected to contribute to its

construction and maintenance were unclear. The possibility that with the increased value of land large farmers would move to take over the farms of small farmers. Only men would be represented on the cooperative and it was likely that men would control the additional income earned from the cash crop. From experience in another village it was possible that increased income might be used on alcohol and personal consumption. It was unclear whether the NGO had the capacity to run a micro-credit scheme effectively or whether the women would be given the necessary training and support to manage the credit effectively.

Social Issues: A number of health issues were raised including concerns that land currently used for vegetable growing would be taken over for rice growing and that this would have negative consequences for health. Additional workloads for women as a result of double/triple cropping may also have health consequences including pregnancy related problems. If additional income was spent on alcohol this would have social impacts including the possibility of domestic violence. Increased workloads for women might also lead to further drop outs or irregular attendance of girls at school due to the need to help their mothers with care of siblings, household or agricultural work.

Environment issues: The impact of monoculture, fertiliser and pesticides on soil fertility, rivers, fishing and the effects of forest depletion as more land was cleared for rice growing.

Gender issues: The role play highlighted a number of gender issues. Women were responsible for a number of different roles including agricultural production. Their roles in rice production (including planting, maintenance and harvesting) were time consuming and would increase dramatically with double or triple cropping. They were concerned about how they would manage this additional workload with all the other roles they already had to perform. Women were also responsible for vegetable growing mainly for family subsistence but also earned some income from the sale of vegetables. They had control over this income. They did not have control over income from the main cash crop, rice. They were concerned that they would lose access to independent income and the health of their families would suffer if they were not able to spend time on vegetable production. They were concerned about how men would use the additional income and whether they would have access to it for family needs. The role play also highlighted the fact that women had only limited involvement in decision-making. They were seated near the back of the meeting and were only reluctantly asked to contribute.

Other Issues: Other issues that the role-play raised included those of participation in decision-making (who would make the decisions), capacity building (did the NGO have the capacity to manage a programme of this size and complexity) and sustainability (what would be necessary to ensure that the programme continued after external funding ceased and how could negative impacts be avoided).

Gender Issues in Participatory Development – Marion Quinn

The gender issues raised by the role play were discussed further to highlight the importance of ensuring the full involvement of women as well as men in all participatory development and of being aware of the differential impacts that development activities have on men and women. This is a result of the different roles and responsibilities that women and men have.

Women in most societies have triple roles which involve multiple and often concurrent activities. These triple roles are:

- reproductive role – child bearing and rearing responsibilities and domestic tasks required to guarantee the maintenance and reproduction of the labour force
- productive role – includes both market production with an exchange value and subsistence/home production with actual use value and also potential exchange value
- community managing role – voluntary, unpaid work undertaken by women at the community level, as an extension of their reproductive role

Some important gender issues to consider in all development interventions include:

- women and men have benefited unequally from development
- development planners may have erroneous assumptions about the roles women play
- much of women's work is unpaid and therefore not reflected in national statistics or national planning documents
- the roles women play are directly relevant to any poverty reduction strategy
- women tend to use any increase in income to benefit the family
- development will impact differently on men and women because of the different roles and responsibilities they have and their differing access to resources for and benefits from development
- women are often not in leadership roles and so may not be consulted in development decision-making
- projects which do not involve women or do not take account of gender issues are more likely to have negative impacts and/or be unsustainable.

Three key strategies for ensuring an adequate level of gender analysis in the project cycle include:

- collection of sex disaggregated data
- monitoring of sex disaggregated data and gender equality issues throughout project implementation
- incorporation of gender equality objectives, indicators and risk management strategies into project planning/implementation documents (including logical framework analysis and matrices).

In the role-play case study scenario for instance the impacts of the project on women (should it go ahead) should be monitored separately from the impacts on men. Potential indicators include:

- cash income (do women have increased or decreased access to and control over income)
- workload (has women's workload increased or decreased)
- health (has women's health status improved or declined)
- do women have access to training and extension services
- do women have access to credit
- do women have increased or decreased access to and control over resources such as land, water and animals
- do women have access to appropriate technology and equipment
- has the relationship between men and women improved or declined.

In order to be able to monitor such impacts it is important that baseline data be collected. A brief summary of some methods for collecting gender-related information was presented included gender analysis and time use studies. Articles on both these topics were distributed.

Gender analysis has four steps:

- activity profile – collection of data about what work women and men actually do, time spent doing it and where it is done (may also consider work of girls and boys)
- access and control profile – consideration of what access to and/or control women and men have over productive resources (eg land, credit, equipment) and what access to and/or control they have over the benefits from development (eg income, education, material goods)
- analysis of cultural and other factors and trends that may influence the activities carried out by women and men and issues of access and control
- analysis of the implications for project design and an on-going monitoring process.

Time use studies provide detailed profiles of the roles men and women play, the time taken for various activities and the gender relationships that exist in a community. They provide information that is not readily available from statistics such as the extent of women's unpaid work, or the fragmentation of women's day and the impact of this on productivity. The most accurate means of collection of data on time use in rural areas in a number of countries has been found to be that of non-participant observation. This method involves observers (of the same culture, language group and sex as the people being observed) observing the activities/roles performed by women and men and recording minutes spent on each activity on a prepared chart (including activities undertaken concurrently). This is usually done with small sample populations (often 10-12 families in a village) over a 24-48 hour period. For complete information the time use study should be carried out for a normal working day in each of the major seasons.

An example of a gender analysis activity profile and summary of a time use study were distributed and discussed. The activity profile provided detailed information on the extremely heavy workload and many different roles that women performed in that community in relation to specific tasks associated with agricultural production, livestock,

gardening, construction labour and domestic activities. It also showed that marketing was carried out by men indicating that men were more likely to have control over income earned. The time use study showed that women worked significantly longer days than men, had less personal leisure time and much more fragmented days, dividing their time between many different responsibilities.

Findings of gender analysis and time use studies can be important tools for encouraging discussion on gender issues both in separate gender groups and then with men and women together. The studies avoid theories as they reflect the real situation in that community and are often helpful in identifying issues that men and women need to work together on to resolve.

Small Group Work – Identification of Stakeholders

Participants at this stage broke into small groups of six or seven people according to the thematic focus of the projects they were working on (eg water and sanitation, integrated community development, environment). In these groups they began working on their own organisation participatory activity plan as well as sharing these with other members of the group. This involved initial discussion with their own NGO representatives and New Zealand partner (where present) and then sharing and discussion within the thematic group. The aim was to identify primary and secondary stakeholders in relation to each project that was to be the subject of a participatory activity and to consider how they might be involved in the participatory activity and how any constraints on involving them might be overcome.

Day 2: Tuesday 24 June

The day began with a recap on day 1 and some discussion on the stakeholders group exercise. Points made included:

- primary and secondary stakeholder categories need to be clear to be useful. The intended beneficiaries are the primary stakeholders
- secondary stakeholders should be involved only to the extent that they need to be to achieve the outcome desired.
- development projects are not undertaken in a vacuum so some stakeholders may help achieve the desired outcome while others may hinder this. Either way they need to be considered as to their appropriate involvement
- which stakeholders should be involved will depend on their relevance in the specific project context and/or the socio-cultural context
- it is important to be specific about which stakeholders to involve (eg not all government officials but those who are relevant).

Session 5: Setting Indicators - Rajesh Tandon

Indicators are important for assessing change. Assessing change is not something that should be left to the external experts to do. Participatory assessment involves multiple stakeholders and especially the primary stakeholders. It is necessary to get some

agreement among key stakeholders on what changes should be assessed and why. The interests in the project may be different for different stakeholders.

It is important to decide what to assess.

- Participatory Impact Assessment (PIA) is linked to the project goal and assesses impacts (So what? What has changed?)
- Participatory Evaluation is linked to the project objective and assesses outcomes
- Participatory Monitoring is linked to the plan and monitors outputs.

Having said that, PIA is not left until after the project is completed. Impact indicators need to be determined at the beginning of the project and monitored throughout. So initially it assesses potential impacts and later actual impacts.

How to assess change involves:

- deciding on indicators of change
- collecting data relevant to the indicators - this involves deciding what information to collect, how it will be collected and by whom
- analysis of the data collected
- use of the data and analysis.

A good plan starts with the last of these (ie to decide how it is intended the data will be used by the stakeholders). However it is not a linear process and the different elements emerge through discussions.

Indicators:

- reflect what we want to assess
- signify meaning and different people may attach different meaning to an indicator
- require making a choice, selection of a small number of significant indicators, and selection implies rejection of other potential indicators
- can be tangible (ie they can be counted, they are quantifiable)
- can also be intangible (ie qualitative). In most cases there should be a combination of quantifiable and qualitative indicators
- should be specific, few in number and simple.

Key stakeholders (not all stakeholders but some key stakeholders) should be involved in setting the indicators. This should be a negotiated process and through the discussion/negotiation stakeholders get to understand one another and this is an integral part of the PIA process.

An example of a women's empowerment project involving micro-credit was given to illustrate the different sorts of indicators that might be useful to assess changes at different levels.

Monitoring of self help group activities: indicators might include the savings rate, lending rate and recovery rate of loans

Evaluation where the objective is increased income: indicators might include the % increase in income and the rate of increase in income (by type of activity)

Impact Assessment where the goal is empowerment of women: an indicator might be women's control over use of income, decision-making in family or physical mobility

Session 6: Data Collection and Analysis – Rajesh Tandon

Data is any relevant information linked to the indicators chosen. For example if the indicator is control over the use of income, what information is needed to assess "control" and what information is needed to assess "income"? The latter may not be obvious (eg is income cash income and/or non cash income, is this recorded or not?).

Sources of data may be:

- primary (gained by asking someone)
- secondary (records).

Collection of data includes consideration of:

- what information to collect – for one indicator may need more than one type of data
- from whom
- what methods/tools to use
- by whom – this is particularly important. Conventional assessment would involve external experts to collect data excluding the primary stakeholders who can and should be involved.

Three principles of data collection include:

- use of multiple sources
- use of multiple methods
- use of multiple collectors.

Each of the above gives greater confidence as to the reliability of the data and this is especially important with intangible indicators

Interpretation of data gives it its meaning and this depends on who is looking at the data. For example the temperature in Nadi at the time of the workshop may be average for those living in Fiji, cold for Rajesh who came from 40+ degrees in New Delhi and hot for those from Dunedin who had just come from 5 degrees.

Analysis of data helps assess change or difference that has occurred. It does not necessarily determine better or worse.

Comparison is the most important way of assessing change. Three ways to compare:

- over time (before and after the project), against a baseline
- across groups (similar groups in similar context – experiment/control)
- against a predetermined standard (important how this is defined and by whom – standards also change over time).

It is important to note with data analysis that:

- different stakeholders may see things differently
- there may therefore be multiple analyses from the same data
- who analyses the data is therefore important
- there needs to be discussion and agreement on findings.

Analysis makes sense of changes and it is important that primary stakeholders are involved.

Who uses the data/analysis is important. With multiple stakeholders and groups involved there may be multiple users and possible uses of data collected. The aim is for a transparent and open process from the beginning to the end. Any contractual obligations etc. need to be discussed and negotiated.

A Pacific Perspective – Cema Bolabola

In the Pacific it is important to develop a baseline. People tend to start with where they want to be rather than where they are now. It is important for communities to describe the present before looking to the future. Methods for doing this include:

- community profiles (used in the SCF PIA pilot case study) that describe socio-economic and geographical features
- community characteristics
- identifying prevailing knowledge, attitudes and practices.

There are cultural issues that need to be considered in collecting data. These include the:

- gregarious nature of Pacific communities – groups doing things together
- importance of protocol
- need to fit in with community schedules, time availability
- predominance of oral forms of communication.

Cema mentioned Talanoa as a Pacific way of gathering information. It is customary, open, informal and unstructured. It is defined as “to chat, tell stories, to relate something”. It was unclear how useful this form of communication would be in a PIA context as some of the limitations of this may undermine the active participation of primary stakeholders given that it tended to operate within socio-cultural norms.

Peggy noted the importance of taking information back to communities, showing it and discussing it.

Small Group Work – Setting Indicators and Data Needs

Each NGO worked independently to identify up to three possible indicators and data requirements for projects chosen as case studies.

Session 7: Participatory Tools

An Institute of Development Studies (Sussex) video called "Diary of a PRA Practitioner" was shown. This showed the use of PRA methods during a needs assessment in an Indian village. It showed a variety of methods and tools used in PRA including village mapping, transect walks, wealth mapping, seasonal calendars, social mapping using Venn Diagrams, time lines and ranking.

After the video and some discussion, workshop participants had the opportunity over one and a half hours to try three different participatory tools in groups of 8-12 from five options each led by a resource person: ranking, mapping, time trend analysis, time use surveys and focus group discussion. What occurred in each group is outlined briefly below.

Time line: In this group participants were encouraged to look at historical trends by joining time lines. Time lines can be used to analyse a particular programme or situation over a period of time. The local context in which an intervention takes place can be placed on a time line with parallel time line for the evolution of the intervention process. Participants did time lines on their projects, their organisations and their own personal histories, as a part of the learning process.

Mapping: In this group three different types of mapping shown in the video were discussed briefly: village mapping, wealth mapping and social mapping. Also a form of mapping used in some of the PIA pilot case studies that was useful in assessing women's empowerment was discussed (ie mobility mapping). The main exercise participants tried was social mapping using Venn Diagrams. Each person (or sometimes two from an agency) identified 4-6 key people or organisations that they had to relate to in relation to their organisation or project. They placed themselves in the middle of a sheet of paper then draw circles (bigger or smaller depending on their importance) and placed the circles near or far from themselves (depending on the significance of the relationship). A number then presented their "map" to the group for discussion. This tool helps a group think about who the key stakeholders are in relation to a project and their influence. There are two points of discussion: first the group doing the exercise needs to consider how big to make the circles (ie how important the identified stakeholders are relative to one another) and then where to place them on the map. This process helps identify different stakeholders and perspectives within the group. If different groups (eg women and men) were to do the same exercise they may identify different stakeholders, give different importance to them and see their significance as different. This can be another point of discussion.

Ranking: In this group the example of ranking in the video was first discussed. Ranking was used in this example to determine the views of villagers on the relative merits of different species of trees that might be planted in the watershed. Participants then suggested a number of priorities that might be identified if they were involved in a village needs assessment for an integrated development programme. These were listed and men and women were given different coloured beans to distribute among their top three

priorities. The beans were then counted to determine the top three priorities for the village and to discuss differences between male and female voting. Ranking helps to ensure that all members of a community (even those less able or reluctant to participate in discussion) are involved in decision-making. It is often useful to have women and men vote separately and then bring the groups together for discussion so that women are not influenced to vote as their husbands do. Alternatively voting (with different coloured beans for men and women) can be done secretly by having tins or buckets into which the beans are placed.

Two similar exercises to determine peoples' views on issues were discussed. The mood meter is useful to assess people's level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction and is often used in a before and after situation. Participants are asked to indicate how they felt about a particular situation before the intervention and how they feel about the situation after the intervention by drawing a smiling face, a neutral face or an unhappy face. Again it is usually helpful for individuals to do this separately and then amalgamate the "faces" so that people are not influenced by others' voting. Voting before and after an event can be used more generally to determine change in attitudes and behaviour in a wide range of areas. For example in the Save the Children Fiji PIA case study this was used to measure changes in inter-ethnic relationships such as sharing food and labour before the coup, after the coup and after the WAC play-back theatre intervention. In one exercise, those people with whom school children used to previously share lunch were listed down the side of a paper and the children were then asked who they shared lunch with before and after the coup and later if this had changed after the playback theatre intervention.

Focus Groups: In this group the purpose and optimum size of a focus group was discussed. The group leader then conducted a focus group meeting with the participants (around the subject of PIA) role playing the sorts of things it is not helpful to do when conducting a focus group discussion (eg asking yes/no questions, answering her own questions, directing all responses through herself). The group then discussed what was wrong with this. Participants were then given a handout of good facilitator skills and went through each of these considering them in relation to the "bad" example given. These included making sure only one question is asked (not a series of questions), wait time, taking in ideas without evaluating them and passing these on to other group members for comment - the leader is not the font of all knowledge). The group then looked at patterns of participation (ie petal shaped with all responses coming back to the leader) or zig-zag and discussed these. The group also looked at meaningful participation (eg not just having six women in the group but considering how they participated and how their ideas were used).

Time Use:

In this group the rationale and some methodologies for conducting studies of time use by women and men were considered. There is concern that women are over burdened with work, which is detrimental to their health and well-being. Community development programmes often fail to take account of the women's workloads, work patterns and schedules and can add additional burdens to women. The time taken by women to carry

out their multiple roles needs to be measured and taken into account during programme/project planning.

The division of labour between men and women in rural (and urban) Pacific communities is a reflection of existing gender disparity. This problem is more marked in Melanesia (Fiji, Solomon Islands, Papua New Guinea, Vanuatu) and Micronesia than in Polynesia.

Many rural Pacific Islanders do not have watches to measure precisely when and how long specific tasks take. However for most Pacific communities, meals times tend to divide the day and schedules are made relative to meal times. The three-meal pattern is now common in the Pacific. However some communities have only one or two meals a days (as was shared by participants in the group from PNG). There is a need to identify participatory tools to assist the community to measure the workload of women and identify actions that can be taken to reduce women's workload.

Participants in the group considered two participatory tools for assessing time use.

1. Men and women are asked separately to itemise activities undertaken before breakfast, after breakfast and before lunch, after lunch and before dinner and after dinner and to list these on a piece of paper divided into three (or two) sections according to mealtimes. The two papers are then put up on the wall for discussion which might include: comment on the number of work activities listed on the sheets, the section of the day that women and men are busiest, which of the two groups do the most work activities, why does one group carry out more work than the other, what types of work are mainly carried out by women and what by men and can the workload of women be reduced? Who in the family and community can assist women in their work?

(Note: Women and men can individually fill in A4 paper on their work pattern for the day before and the figures aggregated for transfer on to a butcher paper. See method in Time Use Tool Two. Also similar tools can be used to compare female and male youth, mothers as compared to elderly women, fathers with small children and elderly men. Similar tools can focus on childcare work only comparing mothers and fathers role in childcare.)

2. Counting the hours rural women and men are awake

Rural women spend long hours in their multiple roles waking very early and sleeping late. In some Pacific communities, rural males are late risers and also stay up late at night. The short sleep and rest hours are health risks to rural women and men. The aim of this activity is for the community to collect information on peoples sleep (rest) patterns, discuss the situation and try to find solutions to the situation if need be.

Men and women are given sheets of paper ruled into four columns labelled age, wake up time, time went to sleep, total. Each man and woman in turn completes these columns. *(In some cases sleep times may be considered sensitive information so it may be more appropriate for individuals to complete the*

columns separately and then to amalgamate the information.) The charts are then discussed by men and women together. Discussion should include: what was the longest waking hours for women and men, does sleep affect peoples work patterns and habits, who slept the shortest number of hours and why, who slept the longest number of hours and why, who was working most during their waking hours, what is the recommended number of sleep hours for good health and how can we assist those who have short sleep hours to get more rest?

Small Group Work - Identifying Participatory Tools

Each organisation then looked at what tools might be appropriate to use to gather information on the indicators defined earlier.

Day 3: Wednesday 25 June

The day began with a brief recap of the previous day's work. The participants then moved into small groups to finalise their participatory activity plans and timetables.

Session 8: Finalising plans and timetables for undertaking a participatory activity

In this session participants spent time in their agency/partner groups finalising their plans for undertaking a participatory activity. Participants from two organisations (Village Development Trust – PNG and Women in Business – Samoa) shared key points of their plans with the wider group and these were commented on by the facilitators/resource people. These are briefly described/commented on below.

Village Development Trust (PNG)

The goal of this project is to improve the economic status of women. Objectives focus on increasing the ability of women to produce and market agricultural crops. For the participatory activity VDT plan to focus on one community with primary stakeholders being 20 women. Other important stakeholders are nine men and some grown up children in the families of these women. Secondary stakeholders include VDT, neighbouring communities, local level government officials and donors. The project is at the appraisal stage so information collected will form a baseline. The impact indicators selected were:

- women have control over income
- women are involved in decision-making
- men are supporting women's initiatives.

The data that needed to be collected and how it would be collected for each indicator included:

- data to show that school fees were being paid and an increase in the number of children staying in school and to higher levels. It was felt that this would indicate that women were taking control of the income situation in the family by ensuring money was available for school fees.

- the numbers of meetings women participated in, the types of meetings and level of participation (observation, interviews, priority ranking)
- indication of whether men were supporting women (observation, time use study to show how men and women used their time, before and after the project).

Comments on the key aspects of the plan showed that the plan was proceeding along the right lines. Some suggestions for collecting data on women's role in decision-making (if VDT wish to focus this on decision-making within the family) were to make this very specific (eg to ask men and women separately to indicate whether the man or the woman or both together made decisions about specific issues such as family planning, crops to be planted, schooling etc.). If they wished to focus on decision-making in the community then again it would be helpful to be very specific (eg by focusing on one or two key community committees or forums and assessing women's level of participation in these). In relation to women's control over income it was suggested that while school fees provided a very specific and useful focus for assessing women's control over income, it might also be useful to assess whether women were able to use some income for their own personal use as well and to aim to see important household expenses such as school fees shared between men and women. It was suggested that perhaps it was less important to focus on the extent to which men were supporting women than women's increasing economic status and involvement in decision-making.

Women in Business (Samoa)

The goal of the Women in Business project is to enable women, youth and the disabled to earn an income where they live. This is achieved through provision of skills training (in areas such as fine mat weaving, honey production, coconut oil production, handcraft production, organic farming), small business management training and in some cases small loans.

In most cases the primary stakeholders are the women producers and their families. Secondary stakeholders include the Board and staff of WIB and volunteers, exporter associations, the government of Samoa, the Development Bank, and donors such as NZAID, Oxfam NZ and the Canada Fund.

Indicators selected for the participatory evaluation of WIB business activities in four communities were:

- no increase in women's workload as a result of income generation activities (eg other responsibilities such as household work are shared)
- increase in production and quality of goods
- increase in those involved in the programme
- children of producers staying in school (school fees able to be paid).

Data that needs to be collected includes:

- who does what activities (to be collected through time use studies and focus group discussions)

- weekly production and earnings to be collected through producers' and WIB records
- new people on the WIB waiting list to be collected from records of WIB
- school age children attending school (from interviews and school records).

In discussing the key points of the plan the importance of involving primary and secondary stakeholders in discussion and analysis of data obtained from sources such as records, school attendance registers, etc. was highlighted. In carrying out a time use study men and women should be asked separately about how time use has changed (or consider the results of a non-participant time use study) and then brought together to discuss the changes that have occurred. In relation to school attendance the records may be obtained from the schools but should then be discussed with families, thus combining secondary and primary sources of data collection. The process of data collection and analysis should go hand-in-hand. Different categories of stakeholders should be encouraged to develop their own analysis and then to share that across stakeholder groups. This process of data collection and discussion will help increase the involvement of stakeholders and increase awareness of the impacts of the project.

Session 9: Implications for organisations in implementing participatory approaches

The four Pacific NGOs involved in the PIA Pilot Programme in the Pacific were asked to comment on the impact of their involvement in the PIA for their organisations.

Wan Smolbag - Vanuatu

Initially the involvement was seen as a small extension of a particular project (the radio soap programme Famili Blong Sarah which was the subject for the participatory impact assessment). However over the last two years because of what was learnt, there has been a swing inside the organisation towards a greater emphasis on PIA. Now as projects are being developed there is an attempt to see how PIA can be included into the project planning documents. From WSB's point of view the involvement in the PIA Pilot Programme was a valuable experience. It extended the partnership between WSB and the primary stakeholders involving them from the start of project planning not just at the end.

Save the Children - Fiji

As a result of being involved in the PIA Pilot Programme SCF now thinks more carefully when designing a project or carrying out a needs assessment about what the impacts of the project might be and what changes there might be for the community. The process has some impacts for the duration of projects that will be longer (given the importance of taking time for stakeholders to participate fully and to consider the impacts of what they are wanting to do). It has been an important learning process. SCF staff indicated that often they have focussed on the outcomes and outputs of projects but realise they need to look at impacts of their work more and to develop projects in a way that the impacts of the work can be assessed. Now they involve beneficiaries in assessing projects and their impacts. The involvement in the PIA had also strengthened the partnership with SCNZ.

ECREA - Fiji

The PIA Pilot Programme deepened and strengthened their relationship with the New Zealand partner. Both got a better understanding of how they saw the project. They learnt the importance of indicators to assess impacts and that these need not just be quantitative but can also be qualitative and can measure such things as empowerment of a community. PIA can be a powerful catalyst for change. If potential impacts of a programme are worked out together with the primary stakeholders then it will be easier to work together towards achieving them.

Oxfam NZ - Bougainville Programme

Before being involved in the PIA Pilot Programme they had previously just focussed on working with the community to achieve the project outputs/outcomes. Now after their involvement in the PIA programme they realise the importance of assessing the impact of their work. They look more carefully at the objectives of projects and see how well they relate to the goal of the project. They have also realised the importance of collecting baseline data at the start of a project if they are to be able to measure the impact of a programme and to assess the changes that have occurred. There is now more focus on impacts in their work.

Session 10: Wrap up

The final session involved small group work along agency lines (where there were several country organisations represented from one NGO) or partners of one donor or from the same country discussing where they would go from here – what were the implications for their agencies in carrying out the PIA pilot activity or attempting to integrate PIA into their organisation's on-going work? The following is a summary of some of the ideas resulting from these discussions.

We are a new NGO in our country and will link closely with another NGO that is at this workshop and our partner from New Zealand will also help us with tools etc.'

We hope to share the knowledge and skills we have learnt here with others

As a donor with several partners from different countries in the region here, we want to support our partners in carrying out these PIAs and to coordinate bringing together how they document what they do. We will bring our partners together within a year to see what their on-going needs are and what support is needed. We would like if possible that when Fiji is doing their PIA fieldwork that we could bring our other partners in the region to share and learn. We would like to initiate these linkages as there will be lots of lessons during the pilot phase.

NGOs that have been part of this can help other NGOs in their country.

It would be helpful to have in-country PIA workshops. There is a need for individual NGOs to understand how this can be implemented in their projects.

In the previous two PIA pilots (in South Asia and the Pacific) there were mentors/facilitators on the ground to help the NGO carry out the PIA. This would be helpful.

For some NGOs there are regional networks that have the capacity to provide support for each other and to share ideas and experiences.

As a donor we will continue to be supportive. It would be helpful if there was capacity for further mentoring on the ground both for partners and for our own organisation.

We are cautiously optimistic about PIA. We want to go back and try it out and see how it fits with our programme. It is a time consuming process and can we afford to carry it out as it has been explained or do we need to make adaptations? We need to learn from experience. We are enthusiastic to take it on and try the process. We are already doing some of this work. PIA brings it together.

As a donor we also want to continue to support the PIA pilot process in each of the countries here. We want to look at how we can focus on impacts throughout the project cycle – not just in this PIA pilot project. So we are already changing our focus and philosophical point of view. We want to look at impact throughout the project cycle in all projects. It is especially important at the design stage and it will be important to have a longer participatory appraisal at this stage.

We need to take some risks and see if PIA works or not. From this we will find what lessons there are what are the best models.

As a donor we are also interested in how we can apply PIA in projects in other parts of the world. If we pay particular attention to the appraisal stage and ensure indicators are clear from the beginning then monitoring and evaluation should be straight-forward. It should be possible to integrate PIA into the work we do without a lot of extra effort.

Appendix 1: Participatory Activity Plan

Project Background

1. Name of the Project selected for the participatory activity
2. What is the goal of the project?
3. What are the objectives of the project?
4. What is the intention of the participatory activity planned in relation to this project?

Stakeholders

5. Who are the primary stakeholders of the project?
6. Who are the secondary stakeholders?

Indicators

7. List 3 possible indicators in relation to measuring the impact of the project (ie in relation to the goal of the project).
8. How will these indicators enable you to measure any impacts of the project that are different for women and men?
9. How will you involve primary and secondary stakeholders in determining indicators?

Data Needs and Collection and Analysis

10. List the data that needs to be collected for each of the indicators listed above

Indicator 1
Indicator 2
Indicator 3

Methods/Tools

11. List some possible participatory methods/tools that could be used to collect the data in relation to each indicator.

Indicator 1
Indicator 2
Indicator 3

12. Who will collect the data?

13. What training will they need? How will this training be provided and by whom?

14. How will the data be analysed and by whom?

Steps/Timetable for undertaking the participatory activity

15. List the main activities that need to be undertaken (eg NGO staff meeting to provide feedback on the workshop and get their ideas and views on objectives, indicators etc, meeting with the Board, meeting with primary stakeholders, meeting with secondary stakeholders, etc.), when it will be undertaken and who will be responsible for arranging/facilitating.

Activity Required

When it will be undertaken

Responsibility

Appendix 2: Programme for the Pacific NGO Workshop on Participatory Approaches to Development: Involving communities in planning and assessing the impacts of development programmes

Day 1

- 8.15 – 8.45 Registration (collection of folders, per diems etc)
- 8.45 – 9.45 Welcome and introductions
Background to the workshop
Participants' expectations
- 9.45 – 10.30 Introduction to participatory development - Rajesh Tandon
What is participatory development including participatory impact assessment? What is the rationale for it? Global experience, methods and application to different stages of the project cycle
- 10.30 – 11.00 Morning tea
- 11.00 – 1.00 Pacific perspectives on participatory development - Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop and Cema Bolabola

Small groups: Sharing of experience in participatory approaches to development and issues arising from morning sessions
Brief feedback from groups
- 1.00 – 2.00 Lunch
- 2.00 – 3.00 Lessons from the VASS Participatory Impact Assessment (PIA) pilot programmes: Pacific NGOs involved in the pilot programme case studies
Discussion
- 3.00 – 3.30 Stakeholders in participatory development - Key issues: - Rajesh Tandon
- 3.30 – 4.00 Afternoon Tea
- 4.00 – 6.00 Role play on stakeholder involvement and discussion of issues arising – Marion Quinn

Gender issues in participatory development - Marion Quinn
- 6.30 – 7.30 Dinner

7.30 – 8.30 Who are key stakeholders in development projects in the Pacific and what are the issues in involving them?

Small groups: Identification of primary and secondary stakeholders in the projects chosen as case studies. How will they be involved? How might any constraints on involving them be overcome?

7.30 – 8.00 Setting impact indicators in relation to project objectives – Rajesh Tandon
What is an indicator? The difference between impact and output indicators. The importance of specific, measurable indicators.

8.00 – 9.00 Small groups: Defining indicators for the projects chosen as case studies. How to involve stakeholders in this process.

Day 2

8.45 – 9.00 Recap on day 1 - Rajesh

9.00 – 9.45 Comments on participatory activities and stakeholder analysis

9.45 – 10.30 Setting impact indicators in relation to the project - Rajesh
What is an indicator? The difference between impact and output indicators. The importance of specific, measurable indicators.

10.30 – 10.45 Morning Tea

10.45 – 11.45 Small groups: Defining indicators for the projects chosen as case studies. How to involve stakeholders in this process.

11.45 – 12.30 Feedback from small groups on indicators and the process to involve stakeholders

12.30 – 1.15 Data collection and analysis: Rajesh
The importance of baseline data. What data needs to be collected in relation to the indicators set? What are appropriate tools to collect the data? Who will collect it? How is the data to be analysed and by whom? How will it be used? Particular issues in relation to data collection and analysis in the Pacific - Cema and Peggy

1.15 – 2.15 Lunch

2.15 – 3.15 Small groups: Identification of data requirements for projects chosen as case studies

3.15 – 4.00 Video on participatory tools and discussion

4.00 – 4.30 Afternoon Tea

4.30 – 6.15 Participatory tools: A number of parallel sessions at which participants can learn about/try their hand at different tools

6.30 – 7.30 Dinner

7.30 – 8.30 Small groups: Selection of methods of data collection in relation to projects chosen. How and by whom will data be collected and analysed?

Day 3

8.30 – 8.45 Recap on day 2

8.45 - 10.15 Small group work: Finalising plans and timetables for undertaking a participatory activity based on work done to date including:

- The purpose of the participatory activity
- key stakeholders in the project and how they will be involved
- preliminary impact indicators in relation to the project selected
- identification of data needs and appropriate tools to collect it
- implementation plan/timetable to undertake the participatory activity including:
 - consultation with primary and secondary stakeholders
 - agreement on objective(s) and indicators
 - roles and responsibilities of key players
 - agreement on data to be collected and tools to be used
 - collection, compilation and analysis of data
 - use of findings

10.15 – 10.45 Morning Tea

10.45 – 12.15 Feedback and discussion on plans

12.15 – 1.00 Implications for organisations in implementing participatory approaches

1.00 – 2.00 Lunch

2.00 – 2.45 Small groups: Implications for agencies in implementing this participatory activity and for integrating participatory approaches generally into their on-going work. On-going support required – for individual agencies, within countries, in relation to the Pacific region?

2.45 – 3.30 Feedback including any recommendations from the workshop.

3.30 Finish. Afternoon Tea.

Appendix 3: Proposed Participatory Activities

AMAK - Kiribati

Domestic Violence Project: The goal of the project is to improve the status of women in Kiribati society through addressing domestic violence issues.

Project cycle stage: evaluation

The objective of the participatory activity is to evaluate the impact of police training on domestic violence issues in terms of creating awareness of the issue and monitoring its occurrence.

ATprojects - Papua New Guinea

Health and Sanitation in Eastern Highlands Primary Schools: The goal of the project is to improve student health.

Project cycle stage: monitoring

The objectives of the participatory activity are to measure the impact of the health education aspect of the project and increase the participation of primary and secondary stakeholders.

Deboin People's Foundation - Papua New Guinea

Women's Empowerment Programme: The goal of the project is to strengthen the capacity of the Deboin People's Foundation Women's Programme to effectively empower the women and children in the Binandere Tribal Area through awareness training, advocacy and dissemination.

Project cycle stage: evaluation

The objectives of the participatory activity are to assess the impact of leadership and management skills, human rights, and women's rights training on the empowerment of women and to learn about Impact Assessment

ECREA - Fiji

Social Empowerment and Education Programme: The goal of the programme is to empower rural Fijian communities to be more actively involved in decision-making at both the local and national level.

Project cycle stage: planning

The objective of the participatory activity is to engage individual villages in shaping the project through critical analysis and dialogue.

FSP - Kiribati

Pacific Action for Health Project in Kiribati: The goal of the project is to improve health, lifestyle and self-esteem among young people.

Project cycle stage: monitoring

The objective of the participatory activity planned is to assess the impact of setting up sports groups for young people in reducing alcohol consumption and violence.

Nuanua O le Alofa - Samoa

Empowerment of People with Disability in Siumu District : The goal of the project is to empower people with disability in Siumu District through increasing the skills of people with disabilities and improving positive attitudes within Siumu.

Project cycle stage: planning

The objective of the participatory activity planned is to involve primary stakeholders in planning and develop a participatory monitoring and evaluation system for the project.

O Le Siosiomaga - Samoa

Sili Water Reticulation System Extension Development Project: The goal of the project is to improve health standards through a sustainable supply of clean water to 39 households in Sili Village in Savaii.

Project cycle stage: monitoring and evaluation

The objective of the participatory activity planned is to develop community ownership through developing a participatory monitoring and evaluation system.

Oxfam NZ Bougainville Programme – Bougainville

Merina Women's Sewing Project: The goal of the project is to empower women through increasing access to livelihoods and income-generating activities.

Project cycle stage: evaluation

The objective of the participatory activity planned is to assess the impact of the project on the empowerment of women in the Merina Community.

Partners in Community Development – Fiji

Capacity Building in Rural Education: The goal of the project is to enhance community support for improvement in rural education.

Project cycle stage: evaluation

The objective of the participatory activity planned is to assess the impact of the project to date in terms of community involvement in education through a participatory evaluation with one of the Phase I project sites (Nabobuco).

Save the Children - Fiji

Mobile Playgroup Project: The goal of the project is to provide basic education for economically disadvantaged communities using a mobile kindergarten facility.

Project cycle stage: monitoring

The objective of the participatory activity planned is to assess the impact of the project in improving the social interaction among children, between children and their parents and between parents in two communities, one in Suva and one in Labasa.

Save the Children - Papua New Guinea

National Targeted Peer Education Project: The goal of the project is to maintain the health of sex workers and men who have sex with other men, especially in regards to HIV/AIDs and STDs.

Project cycle stage: appraisal

The objective of the participatory activity is to hold an initial retreat of the project team at which team members will share their experience of behavioural change in similar projects, develop lessons from the retreat and plan the first year's activities.

Save the Children - Vanuatu

Child Rights Project: The goal of the project is to improve the welfare of children in Vanuatu through identifying children's awareness of their rights, agencies working on the rights of children, and positive and negative practices relating to child rights in the community.

Project cycle stage: evaluation

The objective of the participatory activity is to assess the impact of the project through working with children and secondary stakeholders in three schools in three different communities.

Te Toamatoa

Street Theatre on Disability Issues Project: The goal of the project is to raise awareness as well as highlight the ability of people with disabilities.

Project cycle stage: review

The objective of the participatory activity is to assess the impact of the street theatre on disabled people and the wider community in 2 villages

The Leprosy Mission - Papua New Guinea

Socio-economic Rehabilitation Project: The goal of the project is to improve the livelihood of people disabled by leprosy and other causes in Oro Province.

Project cycle stage: needs assessment and planning

The objective of the participatory activity planned is to engage primary stakeholders in designing a project that will include a participatory monitoring and evaluation system to measure changes in family income and integration into the community

Tonga Community Development Trust – Tonga

Rejuvenation of the Village Women's Development Project: The goal of the project is to empower women (and through them their families and communities) to take control of and be responsible for their own development.

Project cycle stage: planning and monitoring

The objective of the participatory activity is to increase the involvement of VWD group members in needs assessment and the development of a village development plan thereby increasing their ownership of it and to establish indicators through which the impact of the project can be measured.

Village Development Trust - Papua New Guinea

Gabsonkeg Women's Vegetable Project: The goal of the project is to improve the economic status of rural women.

Project cycle stage: planning

The objective of the participatory activity planned is to develop an action plan for income generating activities through agricultural cash crops, engage primary stakeholders in a participatory appraisal (establish baseline data and impact indicators) for an agricultural income-generating project.

Wan Smolbag Theatre

Good Governance Project:

Project cycle stage: appraisal

The objective of the participatory activity planned is to engage primary stakeholders in establishing baseline data and determine impact indicators by which change can be monitored.

World Vision - Papua New Guinea

North Bougainville Water and Sanitation Project: The goal of the project is improved health status for 30 rural communities in Bougainville Province

Project cycle stage: monitoring

The objective of the participatory activity planned is to measure the impact of the project in terms of awareness and understanding of the main issues in preventing water-borne and hygiene related diseases focusing on Malasang village.

World Vision - Solomon Islands

Guadalcanal Stap Helti Project: The goal of the project is to provide health care to rural communities.

Project cycle stage: appraisal

The objective of the participatory activity planned is to carry out a participatory rural appraisal process to identify the needs and develop participatory plans to address the health issues within the targeted communities.

World Vision - Vanuatu

Ridim Laef Functional Literacy Project, Tanna, Tafea Province: The goal of the project is to increase the project beneficiaries' (primarily women) ability to take leadership roles, develop small business, make informed decisions relating to personal and family health and participate fully in community development through community based functional literacy.

Project cycle stage: review

The proposed participatory review will assess whether the project is creating desired impacts in terms of enhancing literacy skills and capacity building within the target beneficiaries especially women.

World Wide Fund for Nature - Fiji Country Programme

Community Marine Turtle Reserves: The goal of the project is the establish Marine Reserves that increase community fisheries and turtle population to support their livelihood

Project cycle stage: planning

The participatory activities planned are:

- to increase community awareness at 2 village communities on the importance of their traditional fishing grounds in terms of marine turtle's conservation and for their livelihood
- to develop with the target communities a marine turtle management plan with input from all relevant stakeholders
- to design a community monitoring plan to assess project impact of the marine turtle management plan.

Women in Business Inc. - Samoa

Income Generating Project: The goal of the project is to enable women, youth, people with disabilities and their families to earn an income where they live through development of skills and small business management training, access to finance and markets to enable them to participate in an income generating activity.

Project cycle stage: evaluation

The objective of the participatory activity planned is to assess the impact of the income generating projects in terms of increased income, use of income and gender relations on the extended families in four villages: Tufutafoe, Falealupo, Lotofaga, Vavau.

Appendix 4: NZAID/VASS Pacific NGO Workshop on Participatory Approaches to Development 23-25 June, Workshop Evaluation

Summary

58 participants including five resource people took part in the NZAID/VASS Workshop on Participatory Approaches to Development held in Nadi, Fiji from 23-25 June 2003. Of the 58 participants 38 were from 23 Pacific NGOs (in most cases two from each agency represented). 10 participants from eight New Zealand NGOs and five from NZAID (the NZAID NGO Programme Manager and four from Posts) participated as partners of the Pacific NGOs. Almost all participants completed workshop evaluations. In a number of cases participants chose to complete one evaluation for both representatives from their organisation. In total 39 evaluations were received. The views and comments of participants in relation to eight evaluation questions are summarised below.

1. Please comment on the usefulness of the workshop (rank from 1-5 with 1 being the most useful and 5 being the least useful).

20 participants rated the workshop as 1 (most useful)

7 ranked it 2

3 ranked it 3

2 ranked it 4 (one noting language difficulties as a major constraint on learning)

1 ranked it 5 (a participant who was sick throughout)

In addition to the responses summarised above, a further seven either did not provide a ranking or the overall ranking provided was unclear (eg one respondent indicated a ranking of 1 for learning on process and tools but 5 as the workshop was too short). In most cases comments from those that did not provide a ranking were positive (eg "the workshop was extremely useful – information was great and facilitators interesting ... learnt some very interesting and useful information that will help us to evaluate the impact of our work" and "very useful in all aspects").

Where comments were provided on question 1 these tended to be largely positive.

Very useful and helpful too (8 responses)

It will enable agencies to involve the primary stakeholders in the project as well as getting the focus on the impact of the project that implies quality

The workshop has helped me have a broader understanding of conducting impact assessments in the project cycle

We are about to review the way we work and the workshop has been a great help

Consolidation of knowledge, information and practice, working through the process with partner in detailed manner, taking each step, followed by discussion and reflection from sharing with others, exploring and developing the process

It clarified impact as it clearly related to goals. Makes me think critically before setting a goal of a project

It provides a variety of useful tools to apply in PIA as empowerment to all our projects

We were able to participate in discussions and learn some very interesting and useful information that will help us to evaluate the total impact of our work. Information was great and facilitators interesting. We were not bored!

I would probably have ranked it 1 if I had had more time in the week to process and absorb everything

I gained additional knowledge re PIA in a Pacific context

2. What did you find the most useful things that you learnt in the workshop?

Responses showed a wide range of areas where participants had found the workshop helpful, with most participants noting several areas

The structure within which to conduct a PIA

Definitions

Tools for data gathering (18)

Lessons from the PIA pilot programmes

The role of stakeholders (3)

Impact indicators (3)

That PIA is an iterative process

Methods (4)

Developing a project activity plan

Theory of PIA

Working on an actual example (ie planning a PIA rather than imagining examples like many other workshops)

Clarification of the planning process

Negotiating between partners/working together to clarify what to measure, tools to use etc.

Responses from facilitators, resource people and those involved in the pilot PIAs

The whole range of issues/the whole workshop etc (4)

Further insight into partners work (2)

Learning what other organisations and countries are doing (2)

Data collection and analysis (2)

More results approach (2)

Emphasising the difference between outputs and impacts

Understanding the practical implementation of PIA

Provided a framework for incorporating PIA concepts into the project cycle

The formalising of participatory methods that are unconsciously used regularly in project work

Interesting to see scope of work being done and that PIA is not a new thing

How to measure the impact of work I've done with the people (community)

3. What did you find difficult and least useful

Participants noted the following areas as difficult or least helpful:

Last session at night when the brain cells have been spent

“Talanoa” (a Pacific participatory tool meaning ‘to chat’)

Setting indicators in our activity plan was difficult (2)

Too little emphasis on fact that PIA incorporates concepts which most of us practise already in some form or another

To understand the new principles/tools which can certainly play an important role for the successful result of the project

Lecturing – group work/exercises is more practical

Would have liked more breakouts

Trying to understand what is PIA and PRA

Lack of clear definition of terms at the beginning (2)

Defining priority stakeholders

Just a bit of a lack of clarity in understanding PIA in the AM&E process

Feedback sessions were difficult sometimes to keep a handle on three or more presenters walking through their plans – not helped by technology failure

4. **How do you think your participation in the workshop programme may help you**
- a) **personally?**
 - b) **your organisation?**
 - c) **your relationship with communities?**

Almost all participants commented positively on all three components of this question.

- a) personally:

Absolutely and within my full-time job (outside the aid industry)

Great learning

Will help me in doing my work

Better skill in developing indicators and how to measure them

Have a clear picture of where my project should be heading

More knowledge on participatory development and its importance

Better project planning and implementation skills

Better regional networks

Gives me confidence to try out PIA in a pilot project

Gained experience, share with colleagues

Maybe I'll have to use it whenever I do any new project

New approaches, new skills

Very good – since I'm also the programme developer I can build it in

Adding value to present knowledge of participatory approaches

Appraisal of approaches and assisting groups to improve their AM&E

Think rationally about the whole process of participatory methods

Given me a better understanding of the PIA process and tools which should

Make me more confident about implementation at home

Develop skills/knowledge as a community worker

I am excited about being able to measure the impact

b) for your organisation

Knowledge is power and the fact that I have attended this workshop shows our organisation is willing to learn about PIA

Going to push out some boundaries

Make us better able to measure project impacts and also develop a more participatory project

Setting up a participatory M&E system

Building links with partners

Raised profile of disabilities, strengthen partnerships with other national NGOs

Strengthen relationship with partner and PIA skills in the organisation

Putting back what was learnt

Will help in measuring certain project impacts on stakeholders

To take on broad PIA for continuous monitoring and evaluation

To incorporate PIA in the workplans

Incorporate PIA into assessing our four major programmes

By introducing these new ideas to my organisation will give the organisation a good reputation to donors due to successful outputs of the project

Better proposals put to agency for funding

Review current practice of project monitoring and evaluation

It'll be easy for reporting

Internal capacity building, more effective projects

Helping our Pacific offices through to the next stage

Realise need to support partners and build capacity if we want this integrated into projects

Able to relate better with partners in the use of participatory language

Having partners with a knowledge of PIA

Will affect philosophy, processes and systems

Accomplish better, clear results that will benefit the community

Strengthen and broaden the knowledge in carrying out PIA to put into practice in various projects in the community

It can be integrated in our work

c) your relationships with communities

And with our partners – getting a shared message makes it all more effective

Will build up the relationship as they will then be involved in the project and confident

This will definitely strengthen our organisational and personal relationships with the community. We will be part of the community

Improves my relationship with the community and enables a better understanding in community participation so that the project process represents and is owned by the primary stakeholders.

More aware of ways to achieve participation

Strengthens the impact of projects as there is more refined planning

Enhances the relationship

It will build trust as we work together

More on an equal level in terms of discussions

This will very much improve the agency's relationship with the stakeholders, especially the primary stakeholders

Getting to really understand them by putting myself in their shoes

Development of a good relationship with the communities will take place

It will strengthen and give me more confidence to know them better

Closer and more in touch projects more tailored to their needs

Should build much closer relationship

Understanding need for involvement

Need to strengthen relationships with focal points in the communities

I'll be able to assist better with project design/development

Better understanding of thoughts behind proposals

Closer collaboration with partners

Equal partners, equal weight in decision-making

Will improve now that I feel more confident about the process and a little more knowledgeable

Build trust and capacity of the people

Will enrich it for everyone

5 How did you find the role of facilitators/resource people in the process?

All comments received on the role of facilitators/resource people were very positive. Comments such as *good, great, very effective, outstanding, very useful, very helpful, supportive, excellent, very well facilitated, very professional, very clear and excellent presentation* were the most common comments. Some more specific comments included:

Became clearer to me how to be a practical facilitator

Very helpful in reflecting, commenting, adding information, clarifying

Very important to the whole process

Very good -- good mix of speaking and group work

Very useful to have more than one facilitator

Very supportive of the participants

Would have liked enough people to work more closely with small groups as they wrote their plans

They were very supportive and informative

Very tough but experience can be useful in the long run and even if I do master these things I would call for a regional development project to facilitate

6. Do you have any suggestions on how the workshop might have been improved?

Most suggestions for how the workshop might have been improved focussed on the need for more time for the workshop as a whole and more breaks/free time during the workshop (which included evening work on both evenings). Some restated that they found the workshop great and very helpful and had no suggestions for improvements. Other suggestions included:

Maybe include a field trip to see some tools used at the community or community PIA results; also include some community representation as resource people/participants

More practical, group exercises would expand, sharpen our current skills

Participants be given liberty to eat where they like (ie to have per diems rather than having to eat at the hotel)

More preparatory information provided prior to the workshop

Participants should come back and report for the next workshop the success of what is being implemented

Learning more lessons from the PIA pilots

More information on resources and opportunities

More on tools to gain improved understanding of their use -- in what context, situation and what information they can best provide

More short, sharp breakouts, use power point rather than OHP

Afternoon sessions need to recognise energy low after lunch

More "fun" time

More cultural exchange – songs, stories etc.

More clarification of the PIA "jargon"

More group mentoring and examples of plans and constructing a plan first as a large group, more feedback on real work groups had done to the whole group

Very large group – decrease size of group and have an extra day to allow for increased networking between NGOs/partners.

I wish one NGO had completed a project using all these guidelines so that we can practically realise the strengths and weaknesses and work out how we can do it better

Give the Pacific perspective more time – it is extremely important

7 Do you foresee the need for any on-going support to complete the activity planned during this workshop? Yes/No. If yes, please comment.

A large majority of evaluation responses from participants (31 of the 39 received) indicated a need for on-going support of some kind in building capacity and skills in undertaking PIA, implementing the activity they had planned and integrating the lessons into their on-going work. Some suggested that it would be useful to hold a follow-up workshop to enable participants to share their experience and lessons learned in implementing this pilot PIA activity. Comments included:

So that we can do the work, carry out the PIA on our project and then see or get a comment and feedback from others when we have follow-up

Need for on-going support – but not sure from where

We hope to work with our local partners (in-country) who have taken part in the PIA pilot

On-going support is necessary to sustain or promote sustainability

Need for communication with partner agency as well as facilitators, follow-up workshop

Some organisations have small capacity so facilitation linking with experienced mentors is necessary

Support, discussion with partner, follow-up workshop in one year to check and discuss progress and share with others

Financially to enable successful implementation of PIAs. The NZ NGO/partner could assist on this

Follow-up is necessary – but after we have had a chance to test PIA for ourselves on-going support is necessary in terms of training

Perhaps knowing Kevin/Marion are available for back-up if the PIA hits a rocky patch with partner

On-going support is necessary to ensure we are doing the right thing

Maybe continued dialogue and consultation to ensure PIA is happening

This is something new to my country (Solomon Islands). Can you please keep in touch with us and do not forget us for your next workshop

On-going support is necessary because I'll be starting the PIA as soon as I get home. PIA involves extra resources that we need to locate from somewhere. Not just financial, though that is part, but also technical and human

Yes – but I think we can handle this internally

Resources for further capacity building of project staff and primary stakeholders

Partner group needs to bounce ideas off someone

Support needed at local/national level

Partners with on-going projects need technical assistance during implementation of the PIA activity

Access to the resource people via email to get feedback, resources available to bring national, regional people together, assessment of further training needs and follow-up in a year

PIA is essential for the successful ownership of any community project, staff/project officers need to be well capacitated to enable the implementation of successful projects

We raised with our NZ partner the problem as we see it of programme funding cycle ending shortly but there will be an on-going financial burden of continuing the process

Follow-up workshop later on (next year?) to see how the new pilot projects go, mentorship will have to be developed into the budget/plan. There needs to be a good first experience

8 Any further thoughts, comments on the workshop?

Additional thoughts/comments on the workshop where provided tended to restate points made in response to other questions and in many cases to reinforce the benefits participants felt they had obtained from the workshop. Comments included:

Thanks for the great work. Fantastic – thanks Thanks for all the hard work

Learnt a lot. Highly regard the organisers. Keep it up!

It was a bit rushed but next workshop should see the impact

Invite more disability NGOs in the region to share their perspective

I think the time was very well used by the facilitators

Just that it was enjoyable and so very useful

Some further work needed for all on writing clear goals, objectives and activities

The report should have recommendations on how to address workload and timing issues as well as back donor requirements for competing projects

Great opportunity to share with partner – thanks.

Great to be here. Good interaction between agencies. Good growth in trust.

I'm very glad I came. I look forward to trying to apply what I've learned.

Well done! Can we have it in Solomon Islands sometime in the future too.

Brilliant. What should be part of one's daily life/work (ie work with, not for partners/women/children/disabilities) has been spelt out in palatable chunks.

Follow-up workshop should be conducted

Venue was very good. Having the workshop in a Pacific country was a major advantage

Built the linkage between me and the donor agency and other NGOs who I can get back to for help.

Appendix 5: Pacific NGO Workshop on Participatory Development – Participant Addresses

Organisation	Nominated Individuals	Postal Address	Country	Telephone/Fax Numbers	Email Address
Save the Children Fiji	Titilia Naitini. Unaisi Batiweti Leba Singh	P O Box 2249 Government Buildings Suva, Fiji	Fiji	T : (679) 313 178 F : (679) 313 178	Scf-fiji@mailhost.sopac.org.fj
ECREA	Chantelle Khan	GPO Box 15473 Suva Fiji	Fiji	T: (679) 330 7588 F: (679) 331 1248	manag@ecrea.org.fj
WWF South Pacific Programme	Etika Rupeni	Private Mail Bag GPO Suva Fiji	Fiji	T: (679) 331 5533 F: (679) 331 5410	erupeni@wwfpacific.org.fj
Partners in Community Development Fiji (PCDFiji)	Alisi Daurewa Simione Kotoitubou	P O Box 14447 Suva Fiji	Fiji	T: (679) 330 0392 T: (679) 331 4160 F: (679) 330 4315	ADaurewa@pcdf.org.fj admin@pcdf.org.fj
FSP Kiribati	Taoniti Irata Fergal Barry	P O Box 43 Bairiki, Tarawa Republic of Kiribati	Kiribati	T: (686) 228 101 F: (686) 28 082	fsp@tskl.net.ki
Te Toamatoa	Tiroia Tabwea Taurano Savili	P O Box 505 Betio, Tarawa Republic of Kiribati	Kiribati	T: (686) 26 539 T: (686) 28 101 F: (686) 28 082	toamatoa@yahoo.com mytoddy@hotmail.com
Aia Mwaea Ainen Kiribati (AMAK)	Mauea Wilson	C/- Women Development Officer MESD, P O Box 234 Bikenibeu, Tarawa Republic of Kiribati	Kiribati	T: (686) 28 517 F: (686) 28 334	pacfawkir@tskl.net.ki
ATprojects	Miriam Layton Steve Layton	P O Box 660 Goroka, EHP Papua New Guinea	PNG	T: (675) 732 3278 F: (675) 732 3180	atprojects@global.net.pg

The Leprosy Mission PNG	Riven Johnston	P O Box 447 Madang 511 Papua New Guinea	PNG	T: (675) 852 2627 F: (675) 852 3239	tlmpng@online.net.pg
Oxfam Bougainville	Basil Peso Cosmos Piri	P O Box 15 Buka, Bougainville Papua New Guinea	Bougainville	T : (675) 279 9908 F : (675) 279 9908	onzbp@daltron.com.pg
SC PNG	Tanai Kavana-Boorer Christopher 'Topa' Hershey	P O Box667 Goroka, EHP Papua New Guinea	PNG	T: (675) 732 1825 F: (675) 732 2737	scnz@daltron.com.pg tanai.k.boorer.scnz@daltron.com.pg
WV PNG	Bernadette Vaita	P O Box 4254 Boroko 111 Papua New Guinea	PNG	T: (675) 311 2530 F: (675) 325 4225	bernadette_vaita@wvi.org
Village Development Trust	Aung Kumal Maria Laisik	P O Box 2397 Lae, Morobe 411 Papua New Guinea	PNG	T : (675) 472 1666 F : (675) 472 4824	vdt@global.net.pg www.global.net.pg/vdt
Deboin People's Foundation	John Kawowo Sarah Sepoe	P O Box 153 University, NCD Papua New Guinea	PNG	T: (675) 326 0962 F: (675) 323 0887	dpf@datec.com.pg
Nuanua o le Alofa	Nofovaleane Mapusua Donna Lene	P O Box 981 Apia Samoa	Samoa	T: (685) 71303 T: (685) 20690	nofomap1@yahoo.co.nz
Samoa Umbrella for NGOs (SUNGO)	Papalii Dion Ale	P O Box 1858 Apia Samoa	Samoa	T: (685) 24 322 F: (685) 20 654	sungo@lesamoa.net
Women in Business	Rosalia Polataivao Adimaimalaga Tafuna'i	P O Box 720 Apia Samoa	Samoa	T: (685) 21 959 F: (685) 29 007	adi@samoa.ws
WV Solomon Is	Segema Olita'a	P O Box 1359 Honiara Solomon Islands	Solomon Is	T: (677) 23092 T: (677) 20055 F: (677) 21941	
Commission for Justice and Development	Pamata Fa'asolo Lotiola Manu	Caritas House P O Box 1 Nuku'alofa, Tonga	Tonga	T: (676) 26 890 F : (676) 26 891	senolitav@hotmail.com

Tonga Community Development Trust (TCDT)	Denis Wolff Sisilia Taumoepeau	P O Box 519 Nuku'alofa Tonga	Tonga	T: (676) 21 494 T: (676) 23 478 F: (676) 24 898	tcdt@kalianet.to
Wan Smolbag Theatre	Suila Bulu George Petro	P O Box 1024 Port Vila Vanuatu	Vanuatu	T: (678) 27 119 F: (678) 25 308	smolbag@vanuatu.com.vu
WV Vanuatu	David Tovovur	P O Box 247 Port Vila Vanuatu	Vanuatu	T: (678) 22 161 F: (678) 25 209	
Save the Children Australia	Elizabeth Emil	P O Box 283 Port Vila Vanuatu	Vanuatu Field Office	T: (678) 22 794 F: (678) 25 214	cpmvila@vanuatu.com.vu
Water for Survival	Monika Fry	P O Box 6208 Wellesley Street Auckland, NZ	New Zealand	T: (64) 9 528 9759 F: (64) 9 528 9752	monika@megabright.co.nz johnwfs@clear.net.nz
Caritas Aotearoa	Tim Chiswell Michael Butchard	P O Box 12 193 Wellington New Zealand	New Zealand	T: (64) 4 496 1742 F: (64) 4 499 2519	tim@caritas.org.nz michael@caritas.org.nz
Save the Children NZ	Debbie Petlueng	P O Box 6584 Marion Square Wellington, NZ	New Zealand	T: (64) 4 385 6847 F: (64) 4 385 6793	debbie.petlueng@scfnz.org.nz
World Vision NZ	Paul Martell Robert Choy	Private Bag 92 078 Auckland New Zealand	New Zealand	T: (64) 9 377 0879 F: (64) 9 309 3166	robert.choy@worldvision.org.nz paul.martell@worldvision.org.nz
The Leprosy Mission NZ	David Hall	P O Box 10 227 Auckland New Zealand	New Zealand	T: (64) 9 630 2818 F: (64) 9 630 0784	david.hall@tlmnz.org.nz
IHC/Inclusion International	JB Munro	120 Factory Road Mosgiel 9007 New Zealand	New Zealand	T: (64) 3 489 1995 F: (64) 3 489 1996	jbmunro@xtra.co.nz
Oxfam NZ	Vanessa Zulueta	P O Box 68 357 Auckland 1032 New Zealand	New Zealand	T: (64) 9 355 6500 F: (64) 9 355 6505	vanessa@oxfam.org.nz

Christian World Service	Trish Murray	P O Box 22 652 Christchurch New Zealand	New Zealand	T: (64) 3 366 9274 F: (64) 3 365 2919	projects@cws.org.nz trish@arena.org.nz
NZAID	Suzanne Loughlin	NZAID Private Bag 18901 Wellington NZ	New Zealand	T: (64) 4 439 8448 F: (64) 4 439 8505	suzanne.loughlin@mfat.govt.nz
NZAID	Nicki Wrighton	NZAID/NZHC P O Box 1378 Suva Fiji	Fiji	T: (679) 331 1422	nicki.wrighton@mfat.govt.nz
NZAID	Faga Semesi	NZAID/NZHC P O Box 1378 Suva Fiji	Fiji		faga.semesi@mfat.govt.nz
NZAID	Zoe Coulson	NZAID/NZHC	PNG		zoe.coulson@mfat.govt.nz
NZAID	Tinia Teuriaria	NZAID/NZHC Tarawa Kiribati	Kiribati		tinia.teuriaria@mfat.govt.nz
PRIA	Rajesh Tandon	PRIA, 42, Tughlakabad Institutional Area New Delhi – 110 062 India	India	T: (91) 11 26081908 F: (91) 1126080183 F: (91) 1126085819	msc@oria.org www.pria.org
University of the South Pacific	Cema Bolabola	University Extension, USP, P O Box 1168 Suva, Fiji	Fiji	T: (679) 331 3900 F: (679) 330 0482	bolabola_c@usp.ac.fj
Fairbairn Dunlop & Associates	Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop	P O Box 1585 Apia Samoa	Samoa	T: (685) 24 594 T: (685) 21 433 F: (685) 26 298	fairdun@samoa.ws
Workshop Organisers	Marion Quinn Kevin Clark	150 Te Anau Road Hataitai, Wellington New Zealand P O Box 14 203 Kilbirnie, Wellington New Zealand	New Zealand	T: (64) 4 3861720 T: (64) 4 3692706 F: (64) 4 3892705	marion.quinn@xtra.co.nz kevin_clark@xtra.co.nz