

HASARNET Malawi

**HIV/AIDS and the Agriculture Sector
Action Research Network**

HASNET Uganda

**HIV/AIDS and the Agriculture
Sector Network**



**Regional Network on AIDS, Rural
Livelihoods and Food Security**

**Report on the
Regional Workshop On Methods And Indicators**

Sunset Hotel
Jinja, Uganda

November 26-28, 2002



Note:

RENEWAL is a regional network of national networks of agricultural institutions, public, private, NGO and farmers' organizations, together with partners in AIDS and public health. The joint purpose of these networks is to show that fresh thinking in agricultural research and development policy and concerted action can help prevent HIV infection and lessen the impact of AIDS. RENEWAL is jointly facilitated by the International Service for National Agricultural Research (ISNAR) and the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) and coordinated by ISNAR with the support of Norway, Canada (CIDA and IDRC), USAID, DfID and WFP.

This document is an output from a project funded by the UK Department for International Development (DFID) for the benefit of developing countries. The views expressed are not necessarily those of DFID. The workshop organizers also gratefully acknowledge the support of the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), Canada.

Regional Workshop On Methods And Indicators

BACKGROUND TO THE WORKSHOP

Broad and intensive consultative processes were conducted in Malawi and Uganda from June 2001 – July 2002 aimed at identifying the content and shape of an initiative that would enable agricultural R&D organizations to contribute effectively to the fight against HIV/AIDS. These involved the preparation of background papers describing the state of knowledge on HIV/AIDS and agriculture and the state of the response by sector organizations, public and private. Think Tanks in both countries, bringing together a wide range of persons involved in agricultural R&D and in AIDS control and public health, drew on these papers to identify the critical gaps in knowledge and the priorities for action research to address them. Stakeholders then met and refined these priorities and recommended the establishment of national networks that would support a broad-based initiative in each country. Out of these processes were born HIV/AIDS and the Agriculture Sector Network (HASNET)-Uganda and HIV/AIDS and the Agriculture Sector Action Research Network (HASARNET)-Malawi. These are the founding members of the Regional Network on AIDS, Rural Livelihoods and Food Security (RENEWAL). Their joint purpose is to support institutional innovation contributing to the prevention and mitigation of AIDS' impacts. More specifically, their objectives are:

- To fill critical gaps in understanding of the links, in both directions, between HIV/AIDS on one side, and agricultural systems, food security and rural livelihoods on the other
- To fill critical gaps in understanding of how agricultural policies and programs can contribute to prevention and/or mitigation of AIDS impact and how this knowledge can be used to support local responses
- To enable agricultural research and development institutions to act on realistic priorities for responding to HIV/AIDS epidemic in partnership with at-risk and affected communities and institutions in other sectors.

In July and August 2002, Calls for Proposals were released in both countries based on the agreed priorities. In total some 50 concept notes were received. National technical committees are reviewing these, with input from regional and international partners, and authors of the most promising are being invited to proceed to full proposals. National Action Research Funds will support those selected.

This Methods and Indicators workshop represented a key step in the operationalization of the stakeholders' vision. Its aim was to strengthen the methods that will be used in the networks' action research and in evaluating its progress and impact. Since many of the priority themes are shared between the countries, a degree of harmonization in methods will promote collaboration, without stifling diversity in areas where "what works" is still uncertain.

The workshop brought together some 40 persons from Uganda, Malawi, Zambia, Mozambique, Kenya, United Kingdom, United States, Canada and The Netherlands. It was organized by the National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS) and the National Agricultural Research Organization (NARO) in Uganda and by the International Service for National Agricultural Research (ISNAR) and the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI). The financial support of the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) and the Department for International Development (DfID) is gratefully acknowledged.

This report summarizes the workshops proceedings. A more synthetic publication, for wider circulation, is in preparation.

WORKSHOP PROGRAM

The workshop was conducted in 6 sessions over 3 days. An introductory session served to put the program in the context of the networks' development and to highlight key themes and issues that would be discussed during the workshop. There followed presentations of selected concept notes dealing with the assessment of HIV/AIDS impacts and local responses. These dealt with themes whose benefits to affected communities are likely to be felt in the medium term (2-5 years). The concept notes presented are not assured of funding; they were selected to illustrate the range of research themes and ecological settings that are of concern in the region. In their talks, authors were asked to highlight their uncertainties in terms of methods and the skills to use them. Interspersed among these were presentations by regional and international resource persons with practical experience in using methods that might respond to some of the major areas of uncertainty. A session of working groups followed during which participants could discuss methodological "demands" and potential "supplies" in greater detail.

In the fourth session, concept notes were presented dealing with the implementation and assessment of actions aimed at preventing and mitigating AIDS' impacts. These dealt with themes that are likely to begin to bear benefits in the short term (1-2 years). Again, these presentations were interspersed with presentations by resource persons. A further working group session followed. On the final day, an "open space" forum was organized which permitted participants to meet one-on-one or in small groups and to explore and develop collaborations, within and among countries. In the final session, the way forward was discussed, the workshop was evaluated by participants and officially closed by the Minister of Agriculture, Animal Industries and Fisheries, Hon. Dr W. Kisamba Mugerwa.

SESSION 1 INTRODUCTION

Welcome Remarks (Francis Byekwaso, Acting Executive Director, NAADS)

Dr Byekwaso welcomed the participants to the workshop and observed that it was a privilege for NAADS and Uganda in particular to host this very important workshop on HIV/AIDS and agriculture. He informed the guest of honor that the workshop participants were from Malawi, Zambia, Mozambique, UK, Canada, USA, The Netherlands and Uganda and requested the participants and resource persons to introduce themselves. Thereafter he introduced the guest of honor and invited him to open the workshop.

Opening of Workshop (Jesse Kagimba, Senior Presidential Advisor on HIV/AIDS)

In his opening remarks the guest of honor Dr Kagimba observed that initially, HIV/AIDS was perceived as a health problem but it is now becoming clear that HIV/AIDS affects all sectors. HIV/AIDS therefore needs a multi-sectoral response. He further observed that:

- o The multi-sectoral response needs to be shaped and interpreted by each sector. This includes contributing to prevention and mitigation through a sector's core business while complementing and not duplicating the work of the health sector professionals.

- o The agricultural sector is key to Ugandan society and economy, as it is also throughout the region. In this regard, AIDS impacts hard on rural people who predominantly derive their livelihood from agriculture. Hence, a multi-sectoral response to the epidemic is meaningless without the engagement of the agriculture sector. HIV/AIDS affects agricultural production as the affected and infected farmers are taken away from productive activities on the other hand good agricultural production can generate food and cash, which are highly required by HIV/AIDS affected and infected families.
- o Regional cooperation is essential if we are to make progress against HIV/AIDS. There is much that we can learn from each other. That goes as much for researchers and development workers – those of you who are around the table – as it does for rural people themselves. The theme of your satellite meeting on ‘Logical Innovation and Rural Radio’ shows me that you have not forgotten that formal Research and Development is not the sole and was certainly not the first engine of invention.
- o We need research and we need good research aimed at the critical questions that confront us. I am pleased to see that you all share that commitment. We need to mobilize all the creative elements in the sectors if we are to make a difference together. In this regard, he stressed the importance of scaling up instead of filling shelves with results from basic and applied research without their being disseminated promptly.

He acknowledged with great pleasure that the Minister who is a researcher and scholar in his own right will be closing this workshop. On this note, he officially declared the regional workshop on Methods and Indicators opened and invited participants to deliberate freely.

Workshop Objectives (Catherine Barasa, HASNET Interim Coordinator)

Mrs. Barasa welcomed the participants and thanked them for having submitted concept notes to their national networks. These concept notes will need to be developed further into full proposals for funding. This workshop was to improve the capacities of the concept note authors so that they can produce the proposals accordingly, and to improve and render more transparent the assessment process. She informed the participants that the objectives of the workshop were:

- To strengthen the methods that will be used in the networks’ action research projects and in monitoring and evaluation processes
- To achieve increased coherence without stifling diversity in methods used in similar projects between and within countries.

She explained that the expected outputs of the workshop include a synthesis report on the workshop proceedings; initiation of new partnerships and collaborations and an improved capacity for developing and implementing project concepts. In this regard, she said that the workshop outcomes were (a) better understanding of useful and promising methods and therefore more effective action research and (b) enhanced project concepts in order to achieve desired outputs and impacts.

HIV/AIDS as a personal issue (R. L. Adupa, Workshop facilitator)

Dr Adupa explained that the objective of the presentation was to facilitate the participants to reflect on HIV/AIDS in their own lives.

He observed that the participants (a) were living males/females, having basic needs (of food, clothing and shelter) and characteristic social behavioral patterns (b) have spouses, children,

dependents, parents, grandparents and/or relatives that they relate to in different ways (c) relate to their communities which include: women (widows, women headed households etc), men, children (including orphans, children headed households), youths (in-school, out-of-school) and disadvantaged/marginalized people.

Dr Adupa also observed that the participants have their respective work places where they have supervisors, subordinates (including support staff), peers and clients with whom they interact on a regular basis. At the national level, the participants have leaders (political, religious/faith based organizations, cultural and civic society) while at international level they have donors, leaders and international civic society.

The common features between/among all the participants and their associates referred to above were that: they are all people (e.g. males/females, sick/okay, rich/poor etc) and that they relate to one another one way or the other (e.g. roles/responsibilities and expectations/benefits).

(a) As people, participants are:

- Biologically susceptible to HIV infection (through sexual transmission, mother to child transmission, contact with infected blood and blood products)
- Likely to experience morbidity, disability and mortality at some point once infected with HIV
- Going to have serious socio-economic impact of the HIV/AIDS epidemic in their lives if they did not respond appropriately.

(b) Through their social relations they can:

- Prevent infection through (meeting most of basic needs, abstinence, being faithful to each other, using condoms etc)
- Delay progression to AIDS (through positive living, access to psycho-social support, treatment of opportunistic infections etc.)
- Care for sick by providing them their basic needs, facilitating treatment of AIDS related illnesses
- Mitigate impact of the epidemic at various levels and sectors, communities etc.

Dr Adupa stressed the importance of empowerment at the personal level if the research communities in the agriculture sector are to survive. Empowerment includes having basic relevant/accurate information on HIV/AIDS, developing skills and positive attitude to PLHIV, appreciation of circumstances, environment and people, accessing services, supplies and equipment as and when necessary, commitment, confidence and power to sustain positive behavior change, capacity to advocate for the programme at all times and ability to mainstreaming HIV/AIDS in all their daily lives and work.

HIV/AIDS, rural livelihoods and food security: Key methodological issues (Michael Loevinsohn, RENEWAL Coordinator)

Dr. Loevinsohn provided the background to the workshop in terms of the networks' development then outlined the key concepts and perspectives they share and the methodological challenges that emerge from these.

He began by recalling the common purpose and objectives of the national networks that had been endorsed by their stakeholders (see above). Out of those intense consultative processes had emerged a sense of increasing convergence in the perspectives of agricultural and HIV/AIDS-oriented organizations in terms of food and nutrition security being central to the epidemics in rural Africa, though with many areas of uncertainty. The networks share a commitment to action research – research focused on actions and involving those implementing them; research also focused on those themes that, if better understood, would permit more effective actions. Central to what they hope to achieve is the notion of the “HIV/AIDS lens”: a way of looking at situations and actions in the light of HIV/AIDS that can be learned by professionals at all levels. It incorporates what we know and what we come to learn about the links between HIV/AIDS, agriculture and those who live from it. He went on to note a number of common “distortions” in the lens at present:

- The lack of a systems perspective:
 - HIV/AIDS as external rather than as influenced by actions within the sector;
 - Concern with impacts on agriculture overshadows concern with its contribution to the epidemics;
 - The failure to see how local features of agricultural and livelihood systems shape the epidemics..
- The lack of an actor and innovation-oriented perspective:
 - Focus on “coping” and on mean responses to the neglect of the inventive and distinctive;
 - Weakness highlighted at the expense of strength: susceptibility to the neglect of resistance; vulnerability to the neglect of resilience;
 - AIDS-affected people lose access to information networks, as well as suffering from loss of labor and productive assets.
- HIV/AIDS perceived as a threat like no other:
 - Seen to require new programs, rather than building on/re-orienting existing ones;
 - Risks neglecting those whose poverty is due to causes other than HIV/AIDS.

Yet HIV/AIDS *is* different. It will require using existing methods in new ways and learning to use and adapt new ones. He then outlined some of the methodological challenges that the networks are becoming aware of – the core of the workshop’s concern:

- Characterizing local epidemics – local sources of risk; local prevalence
 - Possible methods include the verbal autopsy
- Facilitating reflection on and understanding of susceptibility/resistance, vulnerability/resilience and feasible responses
 - Possible methods include “Stepping Stones”, Farmer Field School variants
- Uncovering local innovation
 - Possible methods include Appreciative Inquiry
- Participatory research and technology development with particularly susceptible and/or vulnerable groups
 - Possible methods include: farmer research groups, CIALS, FFS
- HIV/AIDS in perspective: interactions with other forces and risks
 - Possible methods include: Gender analysis (in the inclusive sense) and ethical review
- Learning to be effective

- Monitoring and evaluating the progress of initiatives agreed with communities, drawing on the experience of participatory M&E in agriculture and health
- Ensuring that actions make sense in both “agricultural” (broadly sustainability) and “health” (broadly risk reduction) terms.

Action research will need to use a judicious mix of quantitative and qualitative methods in order to show effectiveness and to speak to different stakeholders. Resistance and resilience are unifying concepts. If we can demonstrate progress towards them, we will have progressed toward our joint purpose.

SESSION 2 ASSESSING IMPACTS AND LOCAL RESPONSES

Farming systems and resilience to HIV/AIDS in Malawi (Naomi Ngwira (CN))¹

Dr Ngwira gave general background information on Malawi including basic information on agriculture and the HIV/AIDS situation in the country. Thereafter she noted that the goal of the concept note was to contribute towards policy and action that responds appropriately to the HIV/AIDS epidemic at the household level. Thus the study would use action or participatory research methods that allow final beneficiaries and other stakeholders to contribute to the selection of policy and action alternatives through participating in the data collection analysis and interpretation stages.

The objectives of the proposed study were:

- to find out if adoption of agroforestry (AF) technologies, cassava based cropping systems or maize based ones confer any differential advantages to households in terms of resilience to the impacts of HIV/AIDS
- to investigate the other determinants of resilience to the impacts of HIV/AIDS.
- to assess the appropriateness of proffered agro-forestry and agriculture technologies and extension to the needs of HIV/AIDS affected household

She then described the research design and data to be collected. In talking about data collection, she noted that (a) Household composition; labor availability; record of illnesses; size of landholding; crops grown; level of adoption of AF; other IGAs; incomes; overall food security situation; school enrolment and attendance are some of the data to be collected. The use of communities to choose the best indices of resilience and also of the impact of HIV/AIDS; use of community leaders to access households; holding quarterly meetings in villages to discuss findings and get feedback and use of research assistants well trained in participatory methods were highlighted as some of the approaches to be used in data collection.

She proposed to use the following as indices of resilience:

- the difference between pre-AIDS income/food security and post AIDS income/ food security i.e. construct a resilience index = (post-AIDS household per capita income/food security as a proportion of pre-AIDS income/food security)
- Ability to meet or finance the labor requirements of agriculture and household chores
- Change in school enrolment or attendance in a household or community
- Change in participation in community or social activities

¹ CN - Concept note presentation.

Finally, she briefly highlighted data analysis methods (viz regression and qualitative analyses) as well as the ethical issues (e.g. confidentiality) to be observed during the study.

Characterizing local epidemics sources of HIV infection and the experience of AIDS-linked chronic illness and death (Lucas Owuor-Omondi (R))²

Mr Owuor-Omodi started by highlighting the difference between perspectives of a local situation from the insider and outsider points of view as shown below.

From insider	From outsider
• Local recognition of the problem (epidemic)	• Helping people to recognize the problem
• Local interpretation of the problem	• Helping them interpret the problem
• Local response	• Helping them respond
• Local degree of internalization	• Helping them internalize

Thereafter, he introduced verbal autopsy which is a methodology that probes into the history of a situation by asking questions such as:

- Who are the people who have died in the last one year?
- What was the nature of death?
- Were there any signs and symptoms of disease/condition leading to death?
- What the people’s perception of cause of death --- witchcraft, TB, malaria, pneumonia, AIDS and don’t know?

In so doing the researcher facilitates the group/community to link the description and explanation of illness and death with HIV/AIDS. In so doing the group tries to establish the chronic nature or length of illness and the local susceptibility to HIV infection. In establishing the chronic nature of illness, the following questions can serve as guides:

What can you say about the problem? What is the problem? What do you think is the cause of the problem? What are the effects? What have you done about the problem? Are you satisfied with your action? If yes why? If No, why not? What can you do better?

Characterizing local susceptibility to HIV infection can be achieved by probing using questions such as: From your observation, who is most affected by the problem? What are the characteristics (viz age, sex, occupation, area of residence - and any other characteristics) of those affected? Why are these characteristics associated with the particular problem? This should be able to generate discussion around sex as the major cause of HIV; this discussion will usually include school going age in sex, orphans in sex, widows in sex, intergenerational sex, socio-economic status in sex, commercial sex, cultural specific factors in sex, migration in sex, nature of work in sex. In this regard, Mr Owuor-Omondi stated that four dimensions of sex and HIV can be discerned, namely: planned sex “sex in marriage”, sex for pleasure, accidental sex and , sex based on pressure or coercion. These discussions should also include perception of non-sexual factors to HIV such as body fluids and mother to child transmission of HIV infection.

² R – Resource presentation

Finally, Mr Owour-Omondi presented to the participants aspects of participatory monitoring and evaluation. He suggested that, through participatory approaches, how can they map the problem (viz transect walk, drawing maps and indicating by dots where people are ill or have died)? He also stressed joint development of indicators for monitoring and evaluation based on core themes such as access to condom, condom use, ability to negotiate safe sex, ability of adolescents and youth to say no and “postpone” sexual debut, condom use with partners other than regular partners, sex with non-regular partners, consistency of condom use, indicators related to orphans and indicators related to widows.

Long term and aggregate effects of HIV/AIDS on rural society and the agricultural economy (Teo Rutagwenda (CN))

The presentation started with a description of the livestock subsystem. Participants were informed that Uganda’s economy is based on agriculture and that within this small holders in mixed farming system and pastoralists own 90% of the total cattle. The pastoral economy revolves around livestock that can be sold for food, fees, clothing, cultural ceremonies, dowry, compensation, etc. Dr Rutagwenda observed that some pastoralists cultivate arable land. In Nyabushozi county of Mbarara District where the study would be conducted, the pastoralists own 25% of the national herd and pastoralism is in transition.

Against the above background, Dr Rutagwenda observed that some of these pastoralists are infected with HIV. Consequently, they fall sick for a long time. In this regard, they sell some of the livestock for treatment and care of the sick. Another problem among the pastoralists is that the wife/widow belongs to the clan and the brother-in-laws usually remarry the widows thus increasing the risk of spreading HIV infection. It is therefore important that the impact of HIV/AIDS on household economy be assessed. Similarly the implications of gender in the context of HIV/AIDS and pastoralism need to be investigated.

The objectives of the study were given as:

- To understand the dynamics of the problem among pastoral communities
- To assess how the way of life of pastoralists contributes to the spread of HIV/AIDS
- To identify the gender implications of HIV/AIDS among pastoralists
- To determine the implications of HIV/AIDS on food security and household incomes
- To determine mitigating strategies on how to alleviate the problems of HIV/AIDS among pastoralists

Based on the above objectives, it is expected that the outputs of study will include a better understanding of the dynamics (cultural, social, economic, political) of HIV/AIDS among pastoral communities; assessment of consequences of social/economic impact of HIV/AIDS among pastoralists; assessment of the gender implications of HIV/AIDS among pastoralists; and information generated that will guide development of appropriate messages and formulation of policies for the control of HIV/AIDS.

Various methods are to be used in data collection including key informant interviews, PRA, use of questionnaires and livelihood and market survey in addition to literature review. There will also be a community feedback workshop as well as a national workshop to be held in Kampala to review the findings.

The uncertainties associated with the study include rural communities not knowing causes of sickness/death; lack of information on partners involved in the 'social circle'; sparsely populated study area thereby making it difficult to reach the pastoralists from time to time; and poor memory recall of major events by the communities.

Facilitating reflection on susceptibility resistance to HIV and vulnerability/resilience to AIDS' impact (Baron Oron (R))

Mr Oron opened his presentation by showing a short video that presented aspects of vulnerability to HIV infection in a local community. Thereafter, he associated susceptibility to risk and exposure to HIV/AIDS and STDS and vulnerability to the impact or consequences of HIV/AIDS. Thus, he described that according to Stepping Stones, several factors contribute to susceptibility to HIV/AIDS including alcohol, traditions, need for money and insecurity. He then stated that SS has a training package on HIV/AIDS Communication and relationship skills, gender relations, community mobilization and integration. The package includes a manual and video which promotes discussions based on four themes, namely, group co-operation and skills in communication, HIV/AIDS and sex, why we behave the ways we do and ways in which we can change. Through participatory methods like role play and tableaux songs and dance, people are able to communicate what appears to be sensitive but without being stigmatized. As a result of the training, positive effects including knowledge and skills, increased knowledge, improved skills, increased safer sex, improved communications skills, improved gender relations, better relationship between different generations are some of the outcomes observed. In addition, reduced alcohol consumption and conflict have been reported variously.

He concluded by noting the challenges of using the approach are as follows: 3-4 months at community level of implementation is a long period of time; men's resistance to women participation and the method of facilitation in SS is different from the conventional systems. Consequently, he recommended that (i) adaptation of the methodology to suit various needs should be explored (ii) a system of continuous follow-up be implemented and (iii) specific emphasis should be placed on men.

Gender Analysis and HIV/AIDS (Carolyn Baylies (R))

Dr Baylies started her presentation by explaining gender analysis and gender training. She said that gender analysis involves consideration of gender division of labour, the way in which access to, control over and the distribution of resources follows along lines of gender, and the gendered power relations which underlie custom and practice, decision making in households and communities and negotiations in relations of intimacy. She noted that gender analysis must occupy a prime place in any development work because gender is a particularly fundamental basis of differentiation and inequality, deeply embedded in cultural norms and ideologies of masculinity and femininity. Thus, gender analysis is important as a priority for any intervention and as a basis for assessing the impact of policy and legislative change.

She reported that the gender analysis framework includes an activity profile, an access and control profile, analysis of factors influencing activities and project cycle analysis. Activity profiles consider gender and age profiles (i.e. who does what?), time allocations (i.e. how much time, every day and seasonally? and activity locus (i.e. where an activity is carried out). On the other hand, access and profiles include access to and control over resources and the

flow and distribution of benefits. In this regard, she observed that factors influencing activities, access and control include: general economic conditions, institutional structures, demographic factors, socio-cultural factors, community norms, legal parameters and training and education.

In explaining gender training, she emphasized the transformative potential of gender training. Drawing from information in literature, she characterized gender training as ‘a tool, a strategy, a space for reflection, a site of debate and the possibility of struggle. Training is a transformative process, It aims to increase knowledge and to develop understanding as a way to change behaviour, and to offer new skills with which to do this’. However, she cautioned participants on what gender training can and cannot accomplish. In particular, she noted that training by itself can never be enough: it must be part of an organizational strategy of transformation which incorporates a gender analysis into all policy, procedures and practices.

In order for gender to be addressed in development projects, she asserted that the project cycle should be en-gendered i.e. the gender dimension needs to be identified at all stages of the project cycle, namely, in project identification, design, implementation and evaluation. In this regard, she also observed that efforts to make development policy more gender – aware have been fuelled by two different, although not necessarily incompatible, types of considerations, namely, integrationist tactics and transformative strategies. Integrationist tactics have emphasized how the advancement of women can contribute to the achievement of agendas set by those with no particular concern for women’s needs or interests. On the other hand, transformative strategies – have focused on changing the rules – broadening the goals of the development agenda to include social justice – and giving women a vehicle for setting the agenda. Thus, accordingly and the world over, the widespread enthusiasm for applying gender analysis to all aspects of development, rather than just to women or women’s issues, has been termed ‘gender mainstreaming’ and has been broadly accepted.

In the context of HIV/AIDS, gender can be mainstreamed by (a) designing programmes which take account of the specific ways AIDS impacts on household (e.g clustering in households; staging across the illness cycle); affecting young adults and leaving remnants of households in need of emergency support and (b) with particular reference to gender effects (e.g. the impact of gender asymmetries in regard to control over intimate relations, use of labour, access to resources, etc.) which have a direct bearing on the spread and impact of HIV/AIDS.

She illustrated the gender, AIDS, and household impact by explaining

- Men’s greater mobility; women’s greater vulnerability within marriage
- The importance of women’s role in caring and productive labour
- Effects of drawing girl children out of school
- Customs which reduce women’s control over household assets and resources.

Finally, Dr Baylies underscored the importance of mainstreaming both gender and AIDS in poverty alleviation/rural development initiatives through building programmes which are attentive to gender asymmetries and the particular way AIDS affects households and by ensuring that those who are most vulnerable are at the forefront of initiatives – so as to challenge a reinforcing of the status quo.

Maximizing the contribution of food and nutrition policy to HIV/AIDS prevention, care and mitigation in Uganda (Suneetha Kadiyala (CN))

Ms Kadiyala started her presentation by first looking at some of the important terms such as nutrition, livelihood and capacity in the context of HIV/AIDS and food security. Thus, she highlighting the importance of nutrition, namely, that,

- It's fundamentally relevant to all areas of response to HIV/AIDS
- Prevention (nutrition status, MTCT)
- Care (prolongs quality and duration of life)
- Treatment (anti-retroviral -ARV - efficacy in malnourished populations? Toxicity???)
- Mitigation: well-nourished are more able to stay healthy, be active, respond effectively.

She observed that livelihood encompasses the range and diversity of potential and actual responses to HIV/AIDS; a livelihood may be susceptible or risky if it exposes individuals to HIV infection and that livelihoods also differ with respect to the vulnerability to HIV/AIDS impacts, depending on how resilient they are. On the other hand, she noted that capacity here refers to the ability to assess and analyze the problem of HIV/AIDS and its two-way links with livelihoods and nutrition-related outcomes, and to respond effectively and sustainably.

She then present the objectives of the concept note as:

- To understand the types of HIV/AIDS impacts and responses that households and communities have made
- To understand the way in which existing household and community level capacities have been modified by these responses, where the strengths lie, and where and how capacity gaps/weaknesses constrain effective responses
- Using an HIV/AIDS lens, to elucidate how key nutrition relevant policies and programs (at local and national levels) can strengthen or constrain local capacities to lower the risk of HIV spread and/or increase resilience to HIV/AIDS.

Noting that the HIV/AIDS lens represents a way of re-viewing a problem (e.g. nutrition insecurity) and potential solutions from the perspective of its links with another problem (e.g. HIV/AIDS), the lens needs to be applied to households (impacts, capacities, responses), communities (impacts, capacities and responses) and district (local) level programs and national programs and policies. The use of the lens should be through an action research process involving problem assessment (HIV/AIDS, food and nutrition), local capacity and response analysis, policy analysis and policy review and modification. She then explained the process by posing the relevant questions to be asked at each stage.

Ms Kadiyala briefly described the study design to be used and the methodology, indicators and methods of analysis. The indicators highlighted are shown in table below.

Finally, she indicated the challenges to the study which include:

- Defining and differentiating households
- Measuring change in coping strategies, including changes in diet
- Measuring exchange entitlements (ability to trade what is owned for what is needed)
- Teasing out independent effects of HIV/AIDS (vs drought, price shocks etc) .

	Household	Community
HIV/AIDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chronic illness • Premature mortality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevalence rates
Capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assets (human, e.g dependency ratio, economic, physical, financial, social capital • Capacity to care 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assets (physical, natural) • Community capacity • Social networks • Service delivery capacity
Responses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g. labour division, caring, practices, diet etc 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community participation
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nutritional status • Health status • Diet quantity and quality • Food security (% income on food) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Size, demography • Community cohesion • Vulnerable group care? • Stigma?

Ensuring research is ethically sound (Lucy Ndyomugenyi (R))

Ms Korukiiko made a short presentation in which she identified the key issues that should always be borne in mind when conducting research, particularly those related to HIV/AIDS. The issues included focus on avoidance of harm, minimizing risk, ensuring more benefit than risk, no coercion, maintaining confidentiality, informed consent, contributing new knowledge, knowing what is available, participants rights (right to participate and right to withdraw), clear inclusion and exclusion criteria and benefit to the study population of the research outcome (feedback programmes).

She also observed that the framework against which ethics should be looked at all the time includes: international standards which operate in a national framework; relevant review and approval channels; and sticking to the approved protocol.

Impact of restocking on Livelihood and food security in HIV/AIDS affected households in Kumi and Soroti (Francis Ejobi (CN))

Dr Ejobi stated that the Government of Uganda & NGOs/CBOs are restocking the districts of Kumi and Soroti following a period of insurgencies in late 1980's and early 1990s and cattle rustling. However, against this good gesture by government, the HIV/AIDS epidemic is a reality in rural households in these districts and is posing a unique challenge to affected households to effectively manage their livestock. The current restocking policy has little specific regard to HIV/AIDS affected households yet the HIV/AIDS affected households which are already disadvantaged have to compete for selection just like any other resource poor rural households. The impact of the restocking programme on HIV/AIDS affected households is largely unknown and similarly, the nature and magnitude of the constraints to livestock keeping due to HIV/AIDS in the household is also unknown.

The objectives of this proposed study were therefore to:

- To investigate the access of HIV/AIDS affected households to livestock for restocking in Kumi and Soroti districts;
- To identify the major constraints, opportunities and practices of HIV/AIDS affected households in the management of restocked animals; and

- To find out the demands of individuals in HIV/AIDS affected households for livestock keeping.

It is expected that the major outputs of the project would include: (i) restocking policies that are tailored to assist (empower) HIV/AIDS affected households identified and recommended to stakeholders (ii) the most suitable livestock enterprise(s) for HIV/AIDS affected households identified; and (iii) a comprehensive technical project report to be distributed to various stakeholders.

The methods to be used in the study will include cross-sectional and longitudinal (follow-up) methods as well as appropriate use of both qualitative and quantitative methods. He proposed that in selection of study households, a combination of approaches involving individuals attending TASO clinics/other HIV/AIDS related organizations and the LC system. Selection will include those households in which; (i) wife(s), husband or both are HIV positive with or without C/S, (ii) married son(s), son's wife or both are HIV positive; (iii) child headed households where one or both parents died of HIV/AIDS; and (iv) unmarried son(s) or daughter(s) or both are HIV positive.

The uncertainties presented to the meeting included accuracy of information given by respondents; respondents withholding pertinent information; and stigmatisation of HIV/AIDS affected households to be researched on. Again in the context of ethics, permission to carry out research be as outlined by the National Council of Science and Technology and at all times, there will be informed consent from respondents.

Assessing the Impact of HIV/AIDS on agriculture systems in Uganda and identification of appropriate strategies for intervention (Denis Byarugaba (CN))

Dr Byarugaba started his presentation by highlighting that people (85% of total population) in Uganda suffer chronic poverty, socio-economic marginalisation, food insecurity and, most recently, devastating impact of the HIV/AIDS epidemic. He then reported on the two methods of classifying the farming systems in Uganda, namely, the traditional classification and a different classification. According to the traditional classification there are 6 systems, namely, Banana/Coffee, Teso, Northern, Pastoral, Banana/Cotton and Montane while under the different classification, there are only 3 systems, Livestock/Crop, Commercial/Subsistence and Large/Small scale. In any case, he noted that AIDS causes severe labour and socio-cultural and economic constraints that: disrupt agricultural activities, aggravate food insecurity, and undermine the prospects of rural development under all these farming systems.

The problem now is that it is not known:

- a). Whether HIV/AIDS impacts on all the farming systems similarly
- b). Whether households in the different systems cope the same way and if they have similar needs
- c). If resilience or resistance of the different systems are similar
- d). What and how the different systems can contribute to the prevention, care and mitigation against HIV/AIDS.

Hence he observed that there is need to carry out impact assessments and determine coping needs disaggregated into spatial and temporal dimensions in the different: agricultural systems, socio-cultural conditions (including gender and vulnerability), economic conditions,

agro-ecological conditions and community groups at the *pre-impact* (i.e disease present, no visible impact), *early impact* (visible impact, community coping well) and *full impact* (high morbidity and mortality, traditional coping strategies failed). this would enable specific interventions applicable to the different environments to be designed accordingly. The expected outputs include: specific impacts on different agriculture systems and extension services; current coping strategies and their failures, and the needs of the affected households, communities and support groups (including extension needs); possible contribution of the sector towards care, prevention and mitigation against HIV/AIDS; and recommendations on appropriate intervention strategies

The outcomes of the study would be (a) a better understanding of how HIV/AIDS impacts on the different agriculture systems as well as extension services and what interventions can be adopted to support current coping mechanisms to improve the livelihoods of the households, increase agriculture production and food security and (b) an insight of what the agricultural systems themselves can contribute to prevention, care and mitigation against HIV/AIDS.

In discussing the study design, he stated that a cross-sectional study using both qualitative and quantitative methods will be used. In sampling, due consideration would be given to the agricultural production systems (crop/livestock farming, small scale/large scale, subsistence/commercial) and categories of affected communities (viz no impact, early impact and high impact). Key informants such as community leaders, health service providers, traditional healers, extension agents and NGOs/CBOs would be contacted to provide information. However, the biggest challenge expected is the stratification of the affected communities into the three categories (no, early and full impact).

SESSION 3 WORKING GROUPS ON ASSESSING IMPACTS AND LOCAL RESPONSES

Ensuring that the perspective of women and other social groups figure at all stages (reported by Renaud de Plaen)

Gender analysis is not so much a methodological technique as the application of a perspective which ensures that gender awareness informs all aspects of a research project or an intervention. It involves consideration being taken of the gender division of labour, the way in which access to control over and distribution of resources follows along lines of gender and the gendered power relations which underlie custom and practice, decision making in households and communities and negotiation in relations of intimacy. Incorporation of a gender perspective does not merely imply the need to disaggregate data along a male/female divide, nor to identify the specific interests of men and women. Nor is it based on an assumption that women are powerless, nor men oppressors in all aspects of social behaviour. Rather a gender perspective must be attuned to the *relations* between men as a gender and women as a gender and the dynamic nature of those relations. In some cases these relations are acted out between individual women and individual men. In others they are embedded in societal institutions, legal systems and social expectations. Mainstreaming gender is not about targeting women or men, but, rather, incorporating an appreciation of gender structures and relations in *all* stages of a research process, as well as in projects and policy.

It is thus important to see gender analysis not as something which is added on to a research design, for example at the point of carrying out an initial baseline survey or mapping of the

social structure of a given community or target group. Gender awareness - or the application of a gender lens - must be a permanent, embedded feature of research, operative across all of its stages. It must be present in the formulation of the research question, in determination of the research design, in selection of appropriate populations and of the samples drawn from them, in development of the tools of data collection, in data analysis, in dissemination activities and in monitoring and evaluation.

Arguments about comprehensiveness, giving voice and inclusion may also apply to other social divisions or dimensions of inequality - be they age, ethnicity, caste, disability, etc. Given the nature of the population being studied and the nature of research objectives, there may be need to ensure sensitivity to some of these as well. Moreover, it is important to recognise that gender is cross-cut by other dimensions of inequality. The category of women, for example, is not homogeneous. In particular situations it may also be important to incorporate sensitivity to particular disadvantaged groups - e.g. orphans, widows or street children. However, gender is particularly fundamental basis of differentiation and inequality, deeply embedded in cultural norms and ideologies of masculinity and femininity. Hence it may be held to be crucial to all social research, or development work, and certainly to work in respect of HIV/AIDS, not least as regards questions of food security.

Applying a gender perspective to the specifics of research design and execution may entail consideration of such issues as sampling procedures and the deploying of particular research techniques, and may deepen an understanding of the notion of participation. Keeping gender to the fore in research on/with communities means ensuring the inclusion of women and men in samples or in the selection of key informants or recruitment of members of focus groups. Where households are units of analysis, it entails an appreciation of the way households are not internally homogenous, but structured (in terms of entitlements and authority) along lines of gender (and age). It is important that diverse voices are heard and that one (e.g. the head of households) does not speak on behalf of the others.

Questions of gender may also inform composition of a research team. If power relations along lines of gender have led to a silencing of voices, then it may be important, for example, for women to interview women or facilitate focus groups of women participants. But there are no hard and fast rules here. Gender awareness on the part of researchers can sometimes overcome such limitations. Hence, the importance of not just of incorporating a gender perspective in a research design, but ensuring that all members of a research team have been beneficiaries of gender training.

As indicated, research techniques should similarly be attuned to gender issues. A frequently employed example is recruitment of focus group participants on the basis of gender (and often of age or other crosscutting patterns of differentiation). Yet recognition of the significance of gender power relations in the context of AIDS may also be a basis at some point in the research of holding mixed sex focus groups or focus groups of couples.

A gender perspective can also ensure that participatory approaches are genuinely participatory in the sense of incorporating participants across the gender divide. By extension, awareness of diversity can lead to inclusion in participatory activities - whether they be at the stage of setting agendas, monitoring and evaluation or dissemination - of all those who might be excluded by virtue of their social marginalisation. Participation should thus not be restricted to community leaders; it should not reinforce existing structures of power and

privilege. It should be inclusive of all; indeed there may be an argument for bringing those otherwise marginalised to the fore in such activities so as to challenge the status quo.

A gender perspective encourages reflection on prevailing gender relations and may heighten awareness that gender is a social construct and as such that gender relations are not static or set in stone but subject to change. In the case of AIDS such reflection can increase understanding of the way prevailing gender relations can be harmful to both women and men, underlining the need for change. In this sense gender analysis and the incorporation of a gender perspective is not just a necessary adjunct to the research process but a transformatory tool.

Ensuring that research is ethically sound (Reported by Sam Bota)

It was understood that ethics is a framework for defining what is right or wrong so as to protect research subjects. In addressing ethical concerns it was noted that there was need to ensure consensus, consent and acceptance at all appropriate levels as a means of ensuring utilization of research findings. It was further noted that it is necessary to ensure that adequate resources are available before embarking on research in order to maintain ethics and integrity of research.

The group observed that the researchers should be aware of the opportunity cost of research subjects to the research and make necessary arrangements for ensuring that direct and indirect benefits flow back to community. However, the researchers should ensure that they don't unnecessarily raise expectations and hopes without ability to meet them.

The group further noted that there was need to use opportunity for research to build capacity of the community and not only ensure feedback to concerned subjects and community but also involve researched community in preparation, dissemination, ownership (IPR) and utilization of results. Thus, the study should minimize manipulation of the subjects but mainstream partnership with research subjects and avoid over-researching a particular community or group

The balance between the researcher as change agent, facilitator, advocate & social mobilizer should be taken care of. The research assistants should also be adequately prepared to provide basic information on HIV/AIDS and handle emotional situations during field visits. In all cases, selection methods and involvement of subjects should not lead to stigmatization of any specific groups or persons.

Uncovering local innovation (Reported by Suneetha Kadiyala)

Examples of innovation:

- Tanzania: Groups of orphans producing vegetable crops. Concerns include high pesticide usage
- Malawi: youth club members irrigating land to grow maize. Concerns include loose ownership of land
- Malawi: Households writing messages on the walls of their house
- Northern Uganda: IDPs. Lack of food security innovations due to insecurity. Discussions about parallels with urban agriculture
- Masaka: Informal orphanages by the elderly

In adversity, households respond, and despite adversity, many households survive. Understanding what households and communities are doing to survive and adapt helps uncover innovation. This is important, feasible, credible, inspiring, and a source of ideas. It may help enable communities to undertake similar innovations more effectively and efficiently. e.g. IPM in Tanzania; helps in scaling out local innovations to other areas, and enables local institutions to respond effectively e.g disseminating local innovations to local NGOs

Why is knowledge of local innovations limited?

- Some ways of doing things are taken for granted. Such practices are not perceived to be significantly different
- Inappropriate research methods
- Current inquiry techniques may be blinding us to innovations. Our enquiry tends to be dominant
- How we ask questions is important
- Getting the balance of outsider vs. insider perspectives
- Lack of resources. Outsiders with resources tend to dictate.
- Researchers reach fewer communities

What methods are available?

- Contests/shows e.g. *Srishti* in Gujarat, India conducts contests for best innovation
- Appreciative Inquiry
- Studying outliers—Positive Deviance Inquiry
- Documentation is vital
- Advocacy to uncover local innovations

What are the strengths and weaknesses in the methodologies?

- Contests/shows: Getting the poorest to participate. Important to make it worthwhile for them to participate
- Positive deviance: statistically not representative
- Appreciative inquiry
- Method of interaction is the key
- Local context to the message is crucial in dissemination
- Two factors to bear in mind
 - HIV/AIDS is only one of the challenges to communities. Caution in linking innovations to HIV/AIDS survival
 - Communities do not accept the presence of HIV/AIDS. So linking innovation to HIV/AIDS is difficult
- Innovations by the poor
 - But innovations by poor will depend on the shock.
- Innovations depend on social networks.
- In HIV/AIDS where social networks are weakening, *should we still be looking for social networks?*

How to increase access to methods and skills to researchers?

- Write up from this workshop and presentation
- Access to references/literature
- Conscious inquiry of local responses when studying coping

- Identifying local resources including people
- Fora for network members to exchange information
- Contest for researchers/NGOS/CBOs for uncovering innovations

How to improve methodologies?

- First understand the methodologies, their strengths and weaknesses

SESSION 4 IMPLEMENTING AND ASSESSING ACTIONS

Participatory research in HIV/AIDS-affected areas (Sam Page (R))

Farmer-participatory research (FPR) provides one of the best methods of empowering farmers to overcome problems of food insecurity, poverty and environmental degradation that result from the HIV/AIDS pandemic. This research method depends on persuading scientists to regard farmers as fellow enquirers rather than mere recipients of extension messages, re-training extension workers as facilitators rather than instructors, and the ability of researchers and their partners to build capacity amongst the farmers so that they can collaborate fully in the process.

Clearly it is very difficult for untrained, poorly educated farmers to make a meaningful contribution to scientific research. However, experience has shown that with some positive inputs such as awareness raising and discovery learning, many farmers become sufficiently observant and reflective to be able to raise significant research questions, while a few are motivated to take a part in some of the research activities required to answer these questions.

The FPR process is in 3 phases: firstly “capacity-building amongst stakeholders”, secondly “planning and implementation with farmers” and finally “results dissemination and evaluation”.

She cautioned that in HIV/AIDS-affected areas appropriate measures should be taken to enable farmers from impoverished and time-constrained households to attend meetings. These could include paying local women to provide a nourishing meal for all participants and their children during the course of the meetings and rotating the venues of these meetings from “house to house” or village to village throughout the project area. She went to present the methodology for promoting discussions with vulnerable groups. Thus, she explained that the researcher should: be positive, avoid creating fear, provide motivation for openness, provide information that is relevant to everyone (not just those suffering from HIV/AIDS), give hope, avoid blame, use people who are “living positively with HIV” as resource people, use peer groups, especially for young people and where appropriate use separate gender groups for older people.

She described the main activities in the Farmer Life Schools (FLS) that are being promoted by FAO in Cambodia, as a method of building capacity within HIV/AIDS-affected communities. She explained that the objectives of FLS are

- To prevent adverse social and economic effects from HIV/AIDS in farming communities in the project area; and
- To strengthen farmer’s understanding of how their socio-economic vulnerabilities relate to risk-taking behaviour.

She explained that (a) FLS don't focus only on HIV/AIDS, but on all socio-economic issues which affect the community (b) they are facilitated by Farmer Trainers – volunteer farmers who have completed an IPM FFS (c) each FLS involves 19-25 participants whose ages range from 18-50 years and last 3 weeks and (d) exchange visits and training workshops take place through out the year.

The Farmer Life School programme usually includes; problem identification; problem analysis; problem web; seasonal labour needs; local resources; life skills; communication skills and human ecosystem analysis. She explained that Human Ecosystem Analysis is a participatory study of all the supporting and non-supporting factors under 6 headings: Health, economy, social factors, education, environment and culture. The process focuses on empowering communities to solve their own problems in the on-going fight against poverty, HIV/AIDS and proactive issues on other rural society issues. Through the process, community farmers who have contacted HIV understand the relationship between their behaviour and HIV/AIDS and explain to others how to avoid the problem.

- When the Cambodian farmers evaluated the FLS programme last year they called for more work to be done on supporting members of the community who are already HIV positive. As a result she is currently preparing a training manual entitled “Healthy Living and Living with HIV”. This will be a “discovery learning” training manual which deals with the following issues: What does a healthy body need?
- Looking at the underlying causes of disease
- Cleaning up our environment
- What was the nutritional content of the food that you ate yesterday?
- Calculating household food security
- Making weaning foods
- Planning a nutrition garden
- Planning a nutrition orchard
- Growing and processing herbs for medicinal use.

This training manual will be field-tested in Malawi in February 2003 After this the manual will be available on the inter-net by visiting www.CABI-Bioscience.org

By providing training that helps farmers to both reduce vulnerability to HIV and prolong the lives of people already infected by HIV, it is possible to motivate the community to take part in participatory research to further mitigate the impacts of this disease.

The Use of Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation in Agro-Based/HIV/AIDS Action Research (Lucas Owuor-Omondi (R))

Introduction

A Management Information System is a system of collecting, compiling, analyzing, interpreting, utilizing, storing and retrieving information. A number of factors characterize Management Information Systems: widespread underutilization of results from monitoring and evaluation, minimal involvement or lack of involvement of stakeholders in the monitoring and evaluation process, and an emphasis on information on accountability rather than the generation of lessons for the future.

Essential steps in setting up a Management Information System include a Baseline Study, Information Audit, development of indicators, measurement, feedback and re-planning. A well-formulated and well-conducted baseline study together with a well-structured Information Audit forms a basis for the development of indicators, that is, measures of change. Performance may be assessed through indicators of process, outcome or impact. Information Audit should be able to provide information on the type of information that should be collected; how much information should be collected; who should be involved in the information collection and what skills they should have; how frequently the information should be collected; how the information should be used and how much it should cost to service the system.

Monitoring and Evaluation in the Context of the Intervention

In the context of the proposed studies, monitoring will imply a systematic and ongoing documentation and analysis of the research activities with the goal of improving how the activities are being implemented. To this extent, monitoring should not only help the researcher determine the strengths and weaknesses of the study but it should help the researcher make appropriate and timely decisions that should be able to improve the quality of the research. On the other hand, in the context of research, evaluation will imply assessment of impact of the interventions built into the research activity as well as an assessment of the extent to which the stated research objectives will have been achieved.

Objectives of Monitoring and Evaluation

The studies proposed within the Regional Network on AIDS, Rural Livelihoods and Food Security (RENEWAL) fall into two main categories: those that set out to uncover new information on the problem of HIV/AIDS and those that set out to test alternatives to mitigating the effect of AIDS in the agricultural sector. Monitoring and evaluation will, therefore, play an important role in providing information to the researchers, funding agencies, stakeholders on how resources allocated for the studies are being utilized, whether planned activities are being carried out and whether the objectives of the studies are being met.

Approaches to Monitoring and Evaluation

There are two basic approaches to monitoring and evaluation: the “Blue-print” approach and the Learning Process Approach. In the “Blue-print” approach the objectives and activities of the piece of work are defined at the outset and this helps define how a piece of work should be implemented. An implementation calendar is also developed based on the “blueprint”. Monitoring and evaluation in this case consists primarily of determining the extent to which in our case, the research activities and objectives are accomplished in time. In the “Blue-print” approach primarily quantitative information is collected to verify number of activities accomplished. No structured system for understanding why activities were accomplished or not, nor how they were carried out is built into the process. The approach also makes no provision for feeding back the findings into the planning process.

Like the “Blueprint” Approach, in the Learning Process Approach, objectives and activities are designed at the outset and an initial implementation calendar developed. However, unlike the “Blueprint” Approach, with the Learning Process Approach monitoring and evaluation

activities are concerned not only with the extent to which the planned activities are carried out but also with HOW they are carried out. Similarly, mechanisms are developed to help the actors, in our case researchers, to learn from both the successes and problems encountered in implementing the planned research activities. Based upon the information collected, “lessons learned” are formulated which are fed back into the research implementation process. A reviewer, or an evaluator, often from outside the collaborating institution or organization, works in partnership with the researcher and stakeholders to define the M&E objectives, to develop M&E evaluation methodology, to collect and interpret information and to develop conclusions and recommendations. In the Learning Process Approach it is assumed that the quality of the evaluation will be better if the results reflect both the *subjective* perspective of the program implementers or researchers and the more *objective* perspective of an outside evaluator.

Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation

Based on the assumption that stakeholders’ involvement will help ensure that monitoring and evaluation addresses the appropriate issues and will give them a sense of ownership over the results. By broadening involvement in identifying and analyzing results, a clearer picture can be gained of what is happening on the ground. One of the main advantages of the participatory approach is that it builds feeling of ownership of the process amongst the stakeholders. To that extent it puts local stakeholders in charge, helps them develop skills, and demonstrates that they count for assessing results and needs. Effectively conducted, participatory approach can strengthen accountability and transparency.

Participatory monitoring and evaluation is characterized by four key principles: participation, negotiation, learning and flexibility. Stakeholders are expected to *participate* in all aspects of participatory monitoring and evaluation, including choosing indicators and analyzing data. Stakeholders *negotiate* what will be monitored and evaluated, how and when data will be collected and analyzed, what the data mean, and how findings will be shared and action taken. Participation and negotiation lead to *collective learning*, ownership, and investment in key findings by those able to use the results for corrective action. Since the purpose of participatory M&E is improved learning for improved results, leading to ongoing change and adaptation, *flexibility* is essential. When multiple stakeholders work together to develop indicators, they also clarify expectations and priorities, negotiate a common framework, build ownership of outcomes, and ensure that assessment reflects principles of partnership

Prerequisites of Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation

Participatory monitoring and evaluation do not take place in a vacuum. All the stakeholders have to be taken through a thought process that enables to participate more effectively rather than merely just raising their hands or nodding their heads in agreement. Capacity building in indicator development, monitoring and negotiation for all stakeholders is, therefore central to the process. Once an enabling environment has been created joint indicator development and designing processes for gathering and sharing data openly is achievable. Support for high level *champions* may be needed who will support and defend the new process and justify the need to address critical questions or uncomfortable findings.

Steps In Participatory Stakeholder-Driven Evaluation

The organization of participatory evaluation lends itself into six overlapping phases: i) planning; ii) fieldwork: preparation, data collection and compilation; iii) data processing: data entry, analysis, interpretation, summarizing fieldwork findings; iv) formulation of lessons learned; v) summarizing of evaluation results; vi) development of an Action Plan; finalization, dissemination and discussion of evaluation report. The specific steps in the six phases are summarized below:

PHASE-1: Planning

- Step 1: Define evaluation goal and objectives
- Step 2: Identify Evaluation Team members
- Step 3: Plan logistical & administrative arrangements
- Step 4: Develop visual framework for the project
- Step 5: Orient evaluation planning workshop facilitators (Evaluation Coordinating Group)
- Step 6: Organize stakeholders into a working group
- Step 7: Define evaluation questions
- Step 8: Identify data collection sources and techniques
- Step 9: Develop data collection instruments
- Step 10: Finalize sample of data collection sites and interviewees (Evaluation Team)

PHASE-2: Fieldwork-Preparation, Data Collection and Analysis

- Step 11: Prepare fieldwork teams: Data collection techniques and logistics
- Step 12: Conduct interviews and observations
- Step 13: Analyze data collected
- Step 14: Summarize fieldwork findings (Fieldwork Teams(s))

PHASE-3: Workshop To Formulate Lessons Learned

- Step 15: Formulate lessons learned for each evaluation question
- Step 16: Team assessment of the evaluation process (Evaluation Team)

PHASE-4: Summarize Evaluation Results

- Step 17: Summarize evaluation findings and lessons learned

PHASE-5: Development of an Action Plan

- Step 18: Develop an Action Plan based on evaluation findings

PHASE-6: Finalization, dissemination and discussion of Evaluation Report

- Step 19: Write evaluation report
- Step 20: Distribute and discuss evaluation results with program stakeholders

Conclusion

In the six-phase participatory evaluation methodology, the role of community members, as interviewers or interviewees, is very important although it is limited in scope. A critical question, therefore, is “How can community members and other stakeholders play a more active role in the monitoring and evaluation of research activities?” The answer to this question becomes even more complex if one appreciates the fact that the exercise may be conducted against the backdrop of low level literacy, that the exercise in itself is an intense and demanding analytical task and the fact that some elements of the scope may not be of direct interest to the community or the stakeholder. One is, however, encouraged; particularly

in Africa when one notes that the profiles of our communities are changing. It is becoming commonplace to find highly qualified people deep down in our communities.

All research projects; development projects and programmes should aim at increasingly building the capacity of stakeholders, particularly the community to participate in monitoring and evaluating research activities. There are no magic formulas on how to develop M&E activities and use them with communities and other stakeholders. Creativity and ongoing experimentation are required to develop approaches and tools, which are useful to communities themselves and to researchers. Methods and tools developed for use with communities should be simple. At the same time they should stimulate in-depth analysis on the part of the community members and other stakeholders.

References

- American Council of Voluntary Agencies for foreign Service. *Evaluation Source Book for Private and Voluntary Organizations*. New York, 1983.
- Aubel J. *Participatory Program Evaluation Manual*. A joint publication of the Child Survival Technical Support Project and Catholic Relief Services, 1999.
- Fetterman, D.M.; S. J. Kaftarian, and A. Wandersman. *Empowerment evaluation: Knowledge and Tools for Self-Assessment and Accountability*. Sage , Thousand Oaks, 1966.
- Fuerstein, M. *Partners in Evaluation*. MacMillan Education, London, U.K., 1986.
- Patton, M. *Utilization-Focused Evaluation*. Edition 3. Sage Pub., Thousand Oaks, 1997.
- Rugh, J. *Self-Evaluation: Ideas for Participatory evaluation of Rural Community Development Projects*. World Neighbours, 4127 NW 122nd Street., Oklahoma, 1986.

Mitigating the impact of HIV/AIDS in Agriculture: What can agroforestry contribute? (J Okorio (CN))

Mr Okorio noted that the HIV/AIDS epidemic has created a big impact on a large proportion of Uganda's population and that the dimensions of the epidemic transcend all sectors of the society and economy and are borne at individual, household, community and national levels. Thus, HIV/AIDS impacts on the agricultural sector mainly through (i) labour availability for various farm activities (ii) household energy requirements, and (iii) food security and nutritional status. In this regard he observed that Agroforestry (growing & management of trees on farm) can play a critical role in helping to mitigate some of the impacts of HIV/AIDS among farming communities.

Based on the above, Mr Okorio indicated that this proposal intends to address the above problem by identifying trees/shrubs, including indigenous knowledge (IK), cultural norms and policies, to be promoted to mitigate the impact of HIV/AIDS in four target communities in Uganda.

Mr Okorio stated that the overall objective of the study is to identify tree/shrub species for mitigating the impact of HIV/AIDS among the target communities in Lira (North), Busia (East), Kumi (East) and Mukono (Central) districts. However, specific objectives include:

- (i) To identify traditional/indigenous knowledge used by rural communities to mitigate the impact of HIV/AIDS
- (ii) To identify tree/shrub species to be integrated on farms for household energy, food security and nutritional needs

- (iii) To promote suitable tree/shrub species which will have been identified in objective two
- (iv) To review and document local government policies promoting and/or hindering the growing, management and use of trees and shrubs for HIV/AIDS mitigation
- (v) To review and document cultural norms, practices or customs promoting or hindering the use of trees/shrubs for mitigating impact of HIV/AIDS
- (vi) To integrate trees/shrubs into health, food security and household livelihood strategies.

A number of methods were identified for data collection. These include desk studies, PRA, village meetings, survey, focus group discussions and discussions with key informants. The study will also use demo sites and exchange visits.

At least six outcomes are expected. These include (a) the target communities will become aware of the traditional knowledge of the trees/ shrubs available to mitigate the impact of HIV/AIDS (b) the target communities will become aware of the possible agroforestry species that can be integrated on farm to mitigate the impact of HIV/AIDS (c) the target communities will integrate into their farms appropriate agroforestry species to mitigate the impact of HIV/AIDS (d) local government authorities will become aware of the policies hindering and/or promoting adoption of appropriate agroforestry technologies for mitigating the impact of HIV/AIDS (e) agricultural researchers will develop appropriate agroforestry innovations using the “HIV/AIDS lens” (f) target communities will develop stronger and more sustainable linkages for exchange of agroforestry information for mitigating the impacts of HIV/AIDS.

Mr Okorio observed that technical assistance would be required to backstop the project in participatory monitoring and evaluation, policy analysis, nutrition (for determining the nutritional value of trees/shrubs) and chemistry (for determining the efficacy of spp).

Preventing HIV infection and mitigating impact of HIV/AIDS through livelihood and food security interventions in South Malawi (Mac Bain Mkandawire (CN),

Vision: ‘An HIV/AIDS free society that respects democratic values’

Mission: A youth serving nongovernmental organization that is committed to combating the spread of HIV infection, mitigating the impact of AIDS and promoting human rights and democracy

Problem Statement:

- The impact of HIV/AIDS on the agricultural sector, in particular food security in a number of areas.
- HIV infection translates into a direct shock on household livelihoods with loss of productive and financial assets, because of the increased health care and funeral expenses.
- Inadequate time for cultivation and other agricultural activities as families affected by HIV/AIDS spend more time caring for the sick and attending funeral services.
- Inadequate nutrition for people living with AIDS and the communities in general
- Reduced agricultural productivity by families.
- Lack of access to land and other resources by women and orphans.

- Poverty levels that force women and children to be engaged in risk behaviour (increasing vulnerability) and vice versa.
 - Cultural practices that predispose women to HIV/AIDS infection including cultural rites, gender imbalance, societal attitudes.
- Food insecurity among the young people forcing them into risky behaviours.
- Lack of alternative livelihood for youth and young women.
- Adverse poverty increasing the vulnerability of youth and women to HIV/AIDS.
- Lack of coping mechanisms for HIV infected and affected communities and families. Food insecure communities and families have more social, health and economic problems.
- Food insecure individuals and families face more challenges to cope with the impact of AIDS.
- Food insecurity reduces community participation in issues of national and social concern including the conducting awareness on HIV/AIDS activities.

Project Goal

- To build community competence and capacity in preventing HIV infection and mitigating the impact of AIDS at household and community level through improved livelihood and increased food security at community level.

Project Objectives

- To explore and understand the links between youth and women vulnerability to HIV/AIDS and poverty and food insecurity.
- To determine whether food security and alternative livelihood initiatives at household and community levels would increase community participation in and response to HIV/AIDS prevention and mitigation.

Hypothesis 1

- Poor youth, women and children including orphans are involved in high risk behaviour due to lack of alternative livelihood and food insecure situations. Promotion of alternative livelihood activities for such groups will enhance behaviour change. The improved livelihood and food security for women, youth and children will empower them to develop necessary skills to negotiate for safer sex and be able to deal with pressure from this insecurity and enhanced decision making.

Hypothesis 2

- HIV/AIDS infection renders women, children and youth to be vulnerable as it increases poverty at household level. This reduces their participation in development activities as they spend more time looking for food and alternative livelihoods. Availability of food and increased household economy will allow the communities to participate in development activities and cope with the HIV/AIDS pandemic.

Project outcomes

- Increased food security and increased household base economy that will improve the behaviour and reduce the HIV infection at community level.
- Improved household base economy and food security that will enable families cope with the impact at household and community levels.
- Clear link between HIV/AIDS infection and impact and poverty at community level

understood.

- Increased participation of individuals and communities in HIV/AIDS and other development activities as a result of food security and alternative livelihoods initiatives at community level.

Project outputs at programme level

- Number of meetings and focus group discussions conducted
- Number of interviews conducted
- Supervision meetings conducted
- Number of youth and women trained in various action research skills
- Amount of materials procured and distributed

Project outputs/indicators at community level

- Number of grain banks established
- Production levels for various products including eggs, vegetables, chickens
- Number of people participating in development activities
- Amount of food being produced and distributed
- Income levels of the members of the groups at household levels
- Change in life styles for youth and women
- Increased condom use and improved negotiation skills
- Community approach and participation in programmes
- Economic status of households participating in the programmes
- Change in life styles for youth and women
- Increased condom use and improved negotiation skills
- Community approach and participation in programmes
- Economic status of households participating in the programmes

Methodology: Data collection, monitoring visits, data analysis, documentation and record keeping

Risks and uncertainties: unforeseen factors that can halt the activities eg weather conditions, negative community perception about donor funded projects, poor coordination among stakeholders

Areas requiring assistance: technical assistance on research and data collection especially action research, technical assistance in agricultural activities, evaluation techniques for the entire project

Action Research on HIV/AIDS and Food Security in Central Malawi (Kuzemba Mlenga (CN))

The presenter observed that home based care (HBC) is aimed at building, improving, strengthening, and sustaining a quality of life of people infected and affected with HIV infection and AIDS and those being nursed at home for chronic illnesses. He illustrated by using a case in Malawi in which the HBC is implemented through 10 community functional groups managed by community HBC committees with services being provided by trained community HBC volunteers; in the service area, the community has about 700,000 people out of which an estimated 10,500 are living with HIV. HBC service is currently being

provided to 450 people. In the area, maize is the main food crop and cash crop for more than 85% of the population. It is produced through small holder farming. Lack of support and lack of farm inputs have resulted in very low agricultural production.

He observed that some issues that call for Action Research on HIV/AIDS and Food Security have emerged. These include:

- Families that have little or no food at all have many social and health problems than those that have food. More families that have little or no food at all seek for HBC services while those that have enough shun them, and do not even want to see HBC volunteer care or assist the caring of their patient. Families that have little or no food at all have far greater difficulties in coping with the impact of AIDS. Functional Areas that have little or no food at all have low community participation and very low volunteer registration. More people, especially men, register as HBC Volunteers when there are monetary incentives attached to the HBC activity.

Against the above background, the presenter noted that this proposed study is to promote food security and protect environmental degradation. The objectives of the study are:

- Explore and know about the links between HIV/AIDS And Food Security
- Determine the role of Nutrition in Promoting a quality Of life for an HIV Infected person and living with AIDS
- Determine whether Interventions at the Level of food Security can raise a community Response to HIV/AIDS epidemic

He indicated that the outcomes expected of the study would include: (a) acquisition of enough information and knowledge that will help develop strategies and interventions of responding to the AIDS epidemic effectively (b) identification of gaps in community response to AIDS epidemic that exist in agricultural sector (c) a clear understanding of the role that food security plays in the prevention of HIV infection and the mitigation of the impact of AIDS (d) a clear understanding of the link between food security and the spread of HIV infection and the impact of AIDS.

A farmer based goat breeding and dairy program for sustainable livelihoods, food security and AIDS mitigation in rural Malawi (W M Mfitalodze (CN)

Mr Mfitalodze started his presentation by indicating that HIV/AIDS impacts on all sectors of life (viz poor health, food insecurity, impoverishment and non-sustainable livelihoods). HIV/AIDS reduces labour output for agriculture, changes roles in household headships, reduces agricultural outputs and contributes to property dispossession. Consequently, there was need for a multi-sectoral approach to reduce the impact.

He also reiterated the role of agriculture in food production (crops, livestock and fisheries), food security, cash crops production for poverty reduction and food utilization (processing and marketing) and consumption. In view of the negative impact of HIV/AIDS on the agriculture sector, he queried whether there are; less taxing labour saving technologies; alternative agricultural production systems; and possibilities of changing emphasis or orienting focus. It was against this background that he proposed goat milk for improving the health and nutritional well being of rural households.

In the context of Malawi, he observed that malnutrition is a major problem and it is compounded by famine and HIV/AIDS. In this regard he asserted that goat milk can be used to improve the health and nutritional well being of rural households, targeting children

including orphans, the elderly, and the sick -including HIV/AIDS patients. This is on the premises that the dairy goat is of a small size which is manageable by women, children and elderly, it requires no major capita input yet it has high milk production, male offspring can be sold for income or slaughtered to provide meat for the household.

He observed that proposed project has short, medium and long term strategies, namely, to enable rural households (including HIV/AIDS affected) acquire and own goats and to use goat milk; to cross breed using Saanen dairy bucks to local does on station and in villages and on a longer time horizon, to embark on goat selection programme to improve milk production for expanded goat distribution. Bunda College in Malawi has used a similar approach to study the health and nutritional well being of infants and children using products from small ruminants especially goat milk, with very encouraging results. Hence, the College would like to adapt and re-orient the approach to mitigate impacts of HIV/AIDS. The key question is: Can goat milk diets substitute breast feeding as an intervention to prevent mother-child HIV transmission?

The ultimate goal of the project is to improve the health and nutritional well being of rural households through the utilization of goat milk and meat thereby mitigating the effects of HIV/AIDS. However, specific objectives are:

- a). To strengthen the current efforts in the Department of Animal Science at Bunda College of Agriculture to produce crossbred dairy and high milk producing local goats for distribution to farmers
- b). To expand the base for and train rural households in the effective utilisation of goat milk among severely affected household
- c). To encourage rural households to milk and consume milk from their goats
- d). To develop and promote diets incorporating goat milk e.g. weaning foods
- e). To train rural households in simple animal husbandry techniques
- f). To supply local and crossbred dairy goats to needy and vulnerable households
- g). To enable households obtain milk throughout the year to better combat malnutrition and alleviate poverty
- h). To introduce soy growing and utilisation among needy households to supplement goat milk during the periods goats go dry.
- i). To monitor the performance of the animals (adaptability and productivity) and the health and nutritional well being of beneficiaries households.

The research will have animal and human components. The Animal Component will monitor adaptability and productivity of dairy goats under rural management while the human Component will Monitor the health and nutritional well being of beneficiary households.

The research team will conduct a baseline survey and rural appraisal to determine and prioritize household needs and potential beneficiaries of the project. However in the process of conducting the research there are ethical considerations to be addressed such as stigmatizations of participating households if in HIV/AIDS or malnourished categories in case insufficient numbers of milking goats for distribution may preclude some needy households from timely participation in programme. In this case, who should own the milk goat?

He reported that the research team will be multidisciplinary including Animal Science Department (Animal research), Home Economics and Human nutrition Department

(Household nutrition status monitoring), Rural Development Department (Extension and Socio-economic impact and monitoring). In any case it is envisaged that it will be a collaborative research. On this note he concluded by stating that this is a long term study requiring at least five years of implementation and monitoring to assess impact of this intervention in HIV/AIDS mitigation.

SESSION 5 WORKING GROUPS ON IMPLEMENTING AND ASSESSING ACTIONS

Challenges of Participatory Research (Reported by Grace Malindi)

The group proposed that farmers and stakeholders should be involved in setting the research agenda, carrying out research so that they own the results and share benefits from research. In this regard, the challenges of scientists were identified as:

- Developing techniques and skills for involving communities in research
- Balancing the research agenda between the interests of scientists and communities
- Balancing indigenous knowledge with external (new knowledge)
- Use of CBOs/NGOs as entry points to communities
- Ensuring stakeholder analysis and their involvement in research
- Identification and facilitating the roles that the communities can play
- Converting the research results into farmer friendly materials/language.

The challenges to communities included training of trainers (i.e. identification of sources of technical assistance for capacity building e.g. FAO's Global IPM Facility, CABI's Bioscience's Farmer Participatory Training and Research Group, International Centre for Women); empowerment, leadership skills - enabling communities to identify leaders for the research process and recognising different levels of leaders in community; monitoring and evaluation - need to find ways of involving communities in assessing the process and direction of research and the potential for readjustment of the protocol and also enabling the communities to be able to identify outputs and outcomes indicators and the overall impact).

The group observed that empowerment should include developing/revitalising community skills while scientists should be ready to face challenges from communities (e.g. learn from them be able to compromise); be flexible in approach; facilitate farmers to demand for appropriate research; and determine different levels of community empowerment.

On the other hand, challenges for donors were identified as

- Need to accept certain minimum objectives of studies while being flexible in accommodating others that arise in the process of research
- Need to support the learning process (i.e. TOTs and support reflection on the research process -during and after the project process)
- Need to build on old projects
- Need to assess overall impact at donor level

Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (Reported by Sam Page)

This is a method by which the community monitors the progress and evaluates the results of on-farm research and community action. For this to be successful the farmers must be

involved in setting the research agenda as well as understanding the research process. Base-line data should be collected from the community and their environment during the capacity-building phase of the project. The community should then be encouraged to come up with realistic development goals that can be attained on an annual basis, through full participation of both the community and the scientists. The community can then select key indicators of progress to act as sign-posts along the way to alleviating problems/constraints and reaching the development goals that have been set by the farmers. Useful participatory approaches that will help to identify sign-posts, or key indicators are wealth-ranking and identification of well-being criteria, problem tree construction and SWOT analysis. The indicators or sign-posts that are selected must be obvious to farmers in terms of contributing towards improved knowledge transfer, improved household food and nutrition security, improved natural resource management or improved income generation.

Dissemination of Information (Reported by Carolyn Baylies)

Dissemination was defined as the sharing of research findings and the packaging of findings in such ways as to be appropriate for the receptivity and utilisation of various audiences. Such audiences include communities in which research is carried out (and particular sub-groups within them); policy formulators, officials and the wider public.

Dissemination should be seen as an ethical imperative. Participants in the research, in particular, have a right to receive feedback and a general sense of what the research has accomplished, what its primary findings are and what their significance is.

Dissemination audiences can be identified in terms of the objectives of the research and this should be established as integral to the research.

Dissemination characteristically occurs at the end of a research project, but it is also important to see it as potentially occurring throughout the course of a project. In this sense it can be formative as well as summative. It should be built into a research design from the outset (and properly budgeted). If incorporated as part of the research it can ensure continuous feedback and input from all those participating in or having an interest in the research.

Dissemination can be active or passive. This may vary for different audiences, but is probably most useful if active. Active dissemination should be participatory in nature. It can serve as a means of bringing into the discussion voices which are sometimes silenced.

In the case of action research in particular, dissemination may contribute to further reflection, possible changes in behaviours and consideration of ways in which research findings can be acted upon or incorporated into policy or programmes. In some cases it may contribute to the reconciling of differences among segments of a community or between communities.

Different modes of dissemination may be appropriate for different audiences. Dissemination may take the form of a feedback workshops; it may involve the production of written reports, newsletters, memos or academic articles; it may utilise such media as drama, radio, or involve messages specifically tailored to particular groups. Dissemination should be sensitive to language to ensure effective communication. Reports should be translated into local languages. In some cases dissemination may use visual representations.

Feedback workshops may be designed for particular groups, but may also be so designed as to incorporate and bring together a range of different groups, including representatives of communities where the research has been carried out, representatives of NGOs active in the area, district authorities, ministry personnel, politicians, etc. A mixed audience may be particularly useful as a means of opening up and extending dialogue.

Advocacy was characterised as often a crucial part of action research, which is distinct from dissemination. Advocacy may entail working with a community being researched to ensure that findings are taken up and acted upon. It involves selling an idea. Dissemination workshops may be particularly important in determination of the key idea which needs to be sold. It is important to be very clear about what this idea is and to ensure that it is expressed with great clarity. If this is a joint enterprise, then there may be need to build local capacity in respect of effective advocacy.

It may also be important to identify effective platforms for advocacy and effective communicators. Traditional leaders, for example, might be useful in this regard as may be other high profile figures. It is also important to identify to whom advocacy messages should be directed to have greatest impact.

Partners should assist with advocacy activities. But the networks should also devise an effective advocacy strategy from the outset and should prepare the ground by maintaining close contacts with key figures such as politicians and key ministry personnel, as well as with NGOs which might contribute to the implementation of findings.

SESSION 6 ENHANCING PROJECT CONCEPTS, DEVELOPING COLLABORATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Plenary discussion on the guidelines for proposals

Dr. Loevinsohn gave a brief background to the call for proposals. In the presentation, he outlined again the purpose and specific objectives of RENEWAL (see Background). He then summarized the action research priorities including activities with short term benefits and those with medium term benefits.

In presenting the guidelines for proposals he highlighted the eligibility criteria, expected outputs and the proposal format. The format is to include cover page, abstract, main text, methodology, ethical considerations, work plan, budget, allowable items, payment schedules and curriculum vitae of investigators.

During discussions, the participants were in agreement with the guidelines and made the following suggestions:

- a). The overview in the call for proposals should contain vision and goal of RENEWAL
- b). Gender mainstreaming in the multidisciplinary team and in content of the proposal was considered very important
- c). In the main text, it was suggested that the proposal should also show linkage with national priorities in the agricultural sector and national response to HIV/AIDS epidemic
- d). The proposal should make clear the logical relation between activities, outputs and expected outcomes.

Report back from Interaction for one-to-one and small group discussions

This activity was a very good one as most participants reported that they had fruitful deliberations during which they exchanged ideas and learned in greater details: issues of methodologies (viz outcome, outputs, inputs in log frame); design (i.e. how to tease out effects due to drought and HIV/AIDS, etc); new perspective (e.g. the Stepping Stones approach); gender analysis; issues of livelihood; and how to develop concept notes. Other participants learnt how the network was initiated, its current governance set up and possibilities of joining the network. Participants also reported that there is need for this level of sharing experience because although they may be using different methods and with different orientation. Usually they are involved in the same or different activities but with the same intention.

The participants also reported that the one-on-one meeting gave opportunities for participants to map out how to collaborate and network locally and internationally as well as how to bring in CBOs and NGOs into the research. In this regard, it is of value to note that some linkages were made with researchers and institutions; for instance, participants from Makerere University-Uganda and Bunda College-Malawi observed that they can collaborate; other participants said they would team up for consultancies.

For some NGO participants, it was the first time to link up with scientists and researchers. For others it was a good opportunity for exchanging information and experience between participants with social science background and those with applied science background.

In general, the activity helped to sharpen the resolve of participants to take the next steps forward from concept paper to full proposal and implementation of study.

Workshop evaluation (facilitated by R. L. Adupa)

The participants were given an evaluation form which they had to fill. The information was captured in SPSS statistical package for the purpose of generating descriptive statistics for evaluation. The results are summarized below.

(i) Organization of the Workshop

When the participants were requested to assess the organization of the workshop, 58.3% of the 24 participants who returned the evaluation forms indicated that the period between notification and the start of workshop was adequate while 65.3% were satisfied with the transport arrangements to the workshop venue. The workshop venue was also assessed by 80.9% of participants as suitable with goodness of accommodation and food rated at 83.3% and 79.1% respectively. However, 23.5% were unsatisfied with the subsistence allowance.

(ii) Management of workshop

When the management of workshop was assessed in terms of preparation of resource persons, preparedness of concept note presenters, clarity of presentations, group discussions and presentations, use of audio-visual teaching aids, facilitation of workshop, handouts and in-

house keeping, over 70% of participants were satisfied in respect of these criteria except for in-house keeping which only 57% of participants were satisfied with.

(iii) Appraisal of the workshop presentations and discussions

All the presentations and discussions held were rated by at least 75% of the participants as having met their expectations except the group discussions and presentations on characterization, gender mainstreaming, ethics and innovation which only 61% of participants reported as having met their expectations. It was the discussions on guidelines for proposals and next steps that had 50 and 56% of respondents reporting having met their expectations respectively. In the context of learning, over 76% of participants reported that the discussions and presentations were relevant.

(iv) Conclusion and suggestions

The topics that the participants reported not having been covered sufficiently or wanted RENEWAL to provide additional training included (a) those on HIV/AIDS such as raising and sustaining hope for the affected households; Positive living for PLWHIV; Mainstreaming HIV/AIDS in own institutions (b) those on research methodologies such as Action research; Participatory methods in research; Appreciative inquiry; Retooling researchers in M, E and impact assessment in context of HIV/AIDS and agricultural sector; Log-frame preparations; Stakeholder analysis; gender analysis and (c) and those relating to management of program such as Network management; Advocacy and lobbying.

Out of 24 participants, 20 ranked the whole workshop as having been very helpful to their work. In so doing, they variously reported that it was a big eye-opener, a great exposure to knowledge and opportunities as well as a real think-tank, an opportunity to share ideas among individuals and countries. In general, the current momentum was appreciated and RENEWAL urged to maintain it and ensure that participants and stakeholders remain committed to networking, which is crucial to research and development institutions. Regarding the development of concept papers, it was suggested that RENEWAL should encourage in-country filling of gaps and issues related to sharpening the methodologies in various concept papers so that proposals can be developed as soon as possible. Some participants also suggested that national network management and coordination should get 15% of the cost of each protocol once concluded.

Finally, many participants recommended that the governance of RENEWAL should be clarified and a linked regional and national management system put in place. A website for exchange of information should be established.

Recommendations and conclusions

In the final discussion, the following recommendations appeared to represent the participants' consensus:

Proposal writing

- The proposal guidelines should be amended as discussed in the workshop. The criteria that will be used in assessing proposals should be consolidated in the form of a checklist in order to guide proposal authors and those charged with assessing them.
- The guidelines and grant agreements should make clear the ownership of and credit for the products of network-supported research.
- National networks should arrange a workshop in which the revised proposals are presented to various stakeholders in order to strengthen national ownership, ensure good links with local government efforts and create a broader awareness of what the networks are doing.

Methodology

- A glossary of terms commonly used in the response against HIV/AIDS should be developed for ease of reference by agricultural scientists and other stakeholders in the sector.

Training

- Participants and other partners need to improve their knowledge of and practical skills in using the methods discussed in the workshop. The networks should create opportunities for such skill enhancement. The “school without walls” approach, that draws preferentially on national and regional sources of expertise through a variety of means (practitioner workshops, exchange visits, secondments, etc.) has been discussed in the networks and should now be put into practice.

Governance of RENEWAL and national networks

- The RENEWAL coordinator and the two national coordinators should consult and develop proposals for putting in place governance mechanisms for the regional network. Such mechanisms should mesh with and draw on those being put into place at the national level. These proposals should be then taken up by and agreed with the national steering committees, international partners and donors.

Concluding Remarks (Hon. Dr. W. Kisamba Mugerwa, Minister of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries)

The Minister welcomed the participants from Malawi, Mozambique, Europe and America and observed that in the past it was difficult for people to come to Uganda for a meeting like this even if air tickets, full board and subsistence allowances were provided. This was because of insecurity, which has improved tremendously in the last 15 years.

He reiterated that he has personal interest in RENEWAL because HIV/AIDS is not only a health problem but also a developmental one. In this regard, he observed that 80% of the 24 million Ugandans live in rural areas and that 90% of these draw their livelihood from agriculture. Hence, this is a collective problem.

Government came with the Plan for Modernization of Agriculture (PMA) as a strategy for fighting poverty. However, HIV/AIDS is adversely affecting the labour force in the sector

and the rural people who are the main investors in agriculture. Hence, there is need to create awareness to stop the spread of HIV/AIDS and mitigate its impact in the sector.

He recognized that the world over, and in Uganda in particular, environmental impact assessment has already been mainstreamed as a cross-cutting concern in agriculture. Similarly, gender has been mainstreamed in all sectoral programmes and activities of government including politics. In this regard, the Minister urged RENEWAL to help develop basic criteria for vetting projects and projects in the agriculture sector so that they are not only PMA compliant but are also HIV sensitive. He also stated that agricultural policies that are formulated should take cognizance of HIV/AIDS. Finally, HASNET should accelerate the mainstreaming of HIV/AIDS in the sector so that the process can be quickly communicated to the cabinet and parliament in addition to being integrated in the planning cycle of the ministry.

Appendix I: PROGRAMME FOR THE WORKSHOP

Regional Workshop on Methods and Indicators Sunset Hotel, Jinja: November 26-28, 2002

**Facilitator:
Dr. Larry Adupa**

Date /Time	Activity	Person responsible
Tuesday 26 Nov. 8:00-9:00	Participant registration	
	SESSION 1 : Introduction	
9:00	Welcoming remarks	Dr. Joseph Kagimba, Senior Presidential Advisor on HIV/AIDS
9:10	Self-introduction	Participants
9:25	HIV/AIDS as a personal issue	Dr. Larry Adupa
9:40	HIV/AIDS, rural livelihoods and food security: Key methodological issues	Dr. Michael Loevinsohn
10:00	Workshop process, outputs and outcomes	Mrs. Catherine Barasa
10:10	Questions for clarification	
10:20	COFFEE/TEA	
	SESSION 2: Assessing impacts and local responses	CN – Concept note author. R – Resource person
10:40	Farming systems and resilience to HIV/AIDS in Malawi	Dr. Naomi Ngwira (CN)
11:00	Characterizing local epidemics: sources of HIV infection and the experience of AIDS-linked chronic illness and death	Mr. Lucas Owuor-Omondi (R)
11:20	Long term and aggregate effects of HIV/AIDS on rural society and the agricultural economy	Dr. Teo Rutagwenda (CN)
11:40	Facilitating reflection on susceptibility/resistance to HIV and vulnerability/resilience to AIDS'-impacts	Mr. Baron Oron (R)
12:00	Assessing HIV/AIDS impacts in the Lake Victoria Crescent	Dr. Chris Laker (CN)
12:20	Ensuring that the perspectives of women and other social groups figure at all stages	Dr. Carolyn Baylies (R)
12:40	Effects of AIDS on labour availability and capital accumulation in crop and livestock systems in Uganda	Mr. Tobias Angura (CN)
13:00	LUNCH	
14:00	Using an HIV/AIDS "lens"	Ms. Suneetha Kadiyala (R)
14:20	Assessing HIV/AIDS impacts in southern Zambia	Mr. Mukelebai Ndiyoi (CN)
14:40	Ensuring research is ethically sound	Lucy K. Ndyomugenyi (R)
15:00	COFFEE/TEA	
	SESSION 3: Working Groups on Assessing impacts and local responses	
15:20	Break into topical working groups (TOR to follow)	
16:50	Working group presentations	
17:30	CLOSE DAY 1	

Wednesday Nov. 27 8:30	Working group presentations (cont'd)	
9:00	Plenary discussion	
	SESSION 4: Implementing and assessing actions	
10:00	Impact of food-based strategies on the nutrition & food security of rural households living with HIV/AIDS	Dr. Florence Muranga (CN)
10:20	Participatory research with people particularly susceptible to HIV or vulnerable to AIDS' impacts	Dr. Sam Page (R)
10:40	COFFEE/TEA	
11:00	Enhancing livelihoods and food security options to mitigate AIDS impacts through Farmer Life Schools in Busia District	Mr. James Okoth (CN)
11:20	Participatory monitoring and evaluation	Mr. Lucas Owuor-Omondi (R)
11:40	Mitigating the impact of HIV/AIDS in Agriculture: What can agroforestry contribute?	Dr. J.F.O. Esegu (CN)
12:00	Preventing HIV infection and mitigating impact of HIV/AIDS through livelihood and food security interventions in S. Malawi	Mr. Mac Bain Mkandawire (CN)
12:20	A farmer-based goat breeding and dairy program for sustainable livelihoods, food security and AIDS mitigation in rural Malawi	Dr. W.Mfitlodze (CN)
12:40	LUNCH	
	SESSION 5: Working groups on implementing and assessing actions	
13:45	Break into topical working groups (TOR to follow)	
15:15	Coffee/tea	
15:35	Working group presentations	
16:35	Plenary discussion	
17:35	CLOSE DAY 2	
	SESSION 6: Enhancing project concepts and developing collaborations	
Thursday Nov. 28 8:30	Plenary discussion on the guidelines for proposals	
9:00	Interaction time for one-to-one and small group discussion	
13:00	LUNCH	
14:00	Next steps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • workshop document • Proposal preparation and review • Collaborations among initiatives on methods and indicators • On-going support on methods and the skills to use them (e.g. "school without walls") 	
15:30	Workshop evaluation	Dr. Larry Adupa
16:00	Concluding remarks	Hon. Dr. W. Kisamba Mugerwa, Minister of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries
16:15	WORKSHOP CLOSES	

Appendix II: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS 26 – 28 November, 2002.

Name	Name	Name
<p>1. Jonathan Odwee (PhD) Lecturer, ISAE Makerere University P. O. Box 7062, Kampala – Uganda Rev. Nsubuga Road Tel : 256-41541588 /256-77505738 Jodwee@isac.mak.ac.ug jonathanodwe@yahoo.com</p>	<p>2. Anni Fjord HIV/AIDs Coordinator Concern Worldwide P. O. Box 6599, KAMPALA. Cape Town Road Tel : 041-501907/8 Fax : 041-501906 concern@africaonline.co.ug fjord@infocom.co.ug</p>	<p>3. Mr. Mwanja Edwin Chairman CARD – Community Rural Dev Association STRONGO P O Box 544 IGANDA 28.8km Jinja – Iganda Highway – Bambo Hse Baitambogwe Tel: 256 77 384159 E-mail: cardiganga@yahoo.com</p>
<p>4. Birungi Julius District Economist / M&EO/HIV AIDS Focal Point Officer Kibaale District Local Government P O Box 2 Kibaale Tel : 077-623928</p>	<p>5. Dr. Denis .K. Byarugaba Lecturer, Faculty of Vet Medicine, Makerere University P. O. Box 7062 Kampala Te: 256 71 881464 Fax: 256 41 554685 E-mail: byarugabdk@yahoo.com</p>	<p>6. Mr. Jude Maginot Mulumba Chairman, Youth Action for Renewal of Firewood Energies and Natural Wells in Uganda P O Box 4474 Kampala Suite 9, 6th Floor, Uganda House, Kampala Rd. Tel : 077-681055, 077310842, 071-845904 yarfew@yahoo.com</p>
<p>7. Ekongot Robert Director Katakwi Urafiki Foundation (KAUFO) P. O. Box 83, Katakwi Katakwi Town Tel: 077-406505 ekongot@yahoo.co.uk</p>	<p>8. Dr Teo Rutagwenda Senior Lecturer Makerere Univeristy P O Box 7062 Kampala Uganda Tel: 256 077 393001 E-mail: rutagwendat@vetmed.mak.ac.ug</p>	<p>9. Lucas Owuor-Omondi Lutheran World Federation P.O. Box 1133, Maputo Mozambique Tel 258-1-491185 cellphone: 082 84 9335; 082 317738 Fax 258-1-491612 Email: lucas@iwtmoz.uem.mz</p>
<p>10. Kuzemba Mlenga Executive Director, Community Health and Environmental Care Trust, c/o. Sat Office</p>	<p>11. Muhumuza Didas Lobby and Advocacy Officer Uganda National Farmers Federation P O Box 6213 Kampala</p>	<p>12. Dr Christopher Laker Economist FITCA Project P O Box 2 Entebbe</p>

<p>P. O. Box B325 Lilongwe, MALAWI Nathenje In Lilongwe 20 km from Lilongwe, Blantyre Road Tel : 774422 Cel: 09205853 hkasiya@malawi.net</p>	<p>Plot 27, Nakasero Road Tel: 256 41 230705 E-mail: unfa@starcom.co.ug</p>	<p>MAAIF Premises Tel: 256 77 361163 cdl.fitca@utlonline.co.ug</p>
<p>13. Daniel Lubowa Executive Director Foundation for Sus Liv Hours (FSH) P. O. Box 11994, Kampala Bukoto Tel : 077427953</p>	<p>14. Mr. Mukelabai Ndiyoi FASAZ-Farming Systems Asn of Zambia P/B 7 Chilanga Lusaka Zambia Tel: 260 97849468 Or 260 1278313 E-mail: mndiyoi@zamnet.zm</p>	<p>15. Dr John Okorio Scientist Forestry Resources Research Insitute (FORRI) P O Box 1752 Kampala Plot 13 Spring Road Tel: 256 41 255164/ 256 77 731 611 Fax: 256 41 255164 E-mail: okorio@africaonline.co.ug</p>
<p>16. Mr. Albert Chalabesa Deputy director, SCRB Mount Makulu, P/B7 Chilanga Zambia e-mail: chala@zamnet.zm e-mail: albertchalabesa@hotmail.com</p>	<p>17. Dr. Joyce Kikafunda Head of department Department of food Sc. & technology Dept. of food Science & Technology Makerere University, P. O. Box 7062, Kampala Makerere Campus Tel : 533865 / 077-484136 foodtech@infocom.co.ug</p>	<p>18. Mr. Baron Oron Trainer – IEC AIM - JSI P O Box 12522 Kampala Kawalya-Kaggwa Close Tel: 256 41 346 292 E-mail: baron1968@yahoo.com</p>
<p>19. Dr. Carolyn Baylies Department of Sociology and Social Policy University of Leeds Leeds LS2 9JT United Kingdom Tel: +44 (0)113 2334423 e-mail: c.l.baylies@leeds.ac.uk</p>	<p>20. Dr. Lucy N. Korukiiko Resource Person Uganda Aids Commission P. O. Box 10779, Kampala Plot 213 Sentema Road, Mengo, Kampala. Tel : 273538 E-mail: uacnadic@imul.com</p>	<p>21. Dr Florence Isabirye Muranga Makerere Univeristy P O Box 7062 Kampala Kasubi View 1865 Makerere Univeristy Campus Tel: 256 77 363 271 E-mail: floriemura@yahoo.com</p>
<p>22. Dr Francis Ejobi Lecture Makerere Univeristy P O Box 11444 Kampala Uganda</p>	<p>23. Catherine Barasa Interim Coordinator HASNET/IP P O Box 3447 Kampala</p>	<p>24. Renaud De Plaen Specialiste de Programme Principal/Senior Program Specialist CRDI/IDRC</p>

<p>Dept of Vet Public Health Tel: 256 77 492236 E-mail: ejobifrancis@yahoo.com</p>	<p>Uganda Tel: 256 77 412716 E-mail: barasa@infocom.co.ug</p>	<p>250 Albert Street P.O. Box 8500 Ottawa Canada K1G 3H9 Tel: 1 613 236 6163 ext. 2545 Fax: 1 613 567 7748 e-mail: rdeplaen@idrc.ca</p>
<p>25. Mr. Gimbo Brenda Jinja Press Kiira) C/O Box 216 Jinja Plot 21 Clive Road West Jinja Town Tel: 256 77 395320 E-mail: amukose@yahoo.com</p>	<p>26. Suneetha Kadiyala International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) 2033 K Street, NW Washington DC 20006-1002 USA Tel: 1 202 862 5638 Fax: 1 202 467 4439 e-mail: S.KADIYALA@CGIAR.ORG</p>	<p>27. Michael Loevinsohn Senior Research Officer ISNAR P.O. Box 93375 2509 AJ The Hague Holland Tel: 31 70 349 6183 Fax: 31 70 381 9677 M.Loevinsohn@cgiar.org</p>
<p>28. Nyanzi Abdul Press Free Lance Reporter P O Box 720 Jinja Uganda Tel: 256 77 485 473 / 71 485 217 E-mail:</p>	<p>29. Jeremy Stickings Senior Adviser (Multilateral Agencies) Rural Livelihoods Dept Department for International Development (DFID) 1 Palace Street London SW1E 5HE e-mail: j-stickings@dfid.gov.uk Tel: +44 (0)20 7023 1667 Fax: +44 (0)20 7023 0624</p>	<p>30 Dr . Sam Page CABI <i>Bioscience</i> UK Centre (Egham) Bakeham Lane Egham Surrey TW20 9TY United Kingdom Tel: +44(0) 1491 829100 Fax: +44(0) 1491 829100 e-mail: sampage_zim@yahoo.co.uk</p>
<p>31. Dr John R W Aluma Deputy Director General-Research National Agricultural Research Organisation P O Box 295 Entebbe Lugard Road Tel; 256 41 320 472 /320512 Fax: 256 41 321070</p>	<p>32. Marcela Villarreal FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 Roma Italy Tel: +39 06 57051 Fax: +39 06 5705 3152</p>	<p>33. Dr. Naomi Ngwira Director, IPRAD P.O. Box 2090 Blantyre Malawi Tel: +265-9 959337 Fax: +265-8 839057 +265-1 524085 E-mail: naomingwira@yahoo.com</p>

E-mail: ddgr@infocom.co.ug	e-mail: Marcela.Villarreal@fao.org	
<p>34. Mr. Sam Bota Natural Resources College P.O. Box 143 Lilongwe Malawi Tel: +265 8828045 +265 1766657 e-mail: Samuelbota@excite.com or nrcdpt@malawi.net</p>	<p>35. Mr. Robert White Advocacy Coordinator OXFAM P/B 213 Blantyre Malawi Plot No.147 Laws Road Blantyre Tel: 265 1 622 558/08 842 991 Fax: 265 1 620 024 E-mail: rwhite@oxfam.org.uk</p>	<p>36. Dr Grace M Malindi Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation P.O. Box 30134 Capital City, Lilongwe 1 Malawi Tel: +26501789265 (Direct) +265 1525560 Mobile: +265 843743 Fax: +265 1788168 Email: Gmalindi@hotmail.com gadunit@sdpn.org.mw</p>
<p>37. Mrs. Esther Mede Institutional Consultant P.O. Box 30301 Capital City, Lilongwe 3 Malawi Tel: 265 1795332 ejmede@eomw.net</p>	<p>38. Dr. M.W Mfifilodze Bunda College of Agriculture PO Box 219 Lilongwe, Malawi Voice: 265-1 277222 / 265 1 277250 Fax: 265-1 277 364 / +265 1 277251 Email: bmfitilodze@bunda.sdpn.org.mw</p>	<p>39. Mr. Mac Bain Mkandawire Director Yoneco Kazembe Location, near Likangala Sec School, P.O. Box 471, Zomba Malawi Tel: 265 1 525560 / 265 8 815267 Fax: 265 1 525560 e-mail: mhjmkanawire@sdpn.org.mw</p>
<p>40. Dr. Romano Larry Adupa Consultant P.O. Box 27514 Kampala, Uganda Tel: 256 77-409-802 / 71-409-802 Fax: 256 41-540874 Email: larryadupa@yahoo.com</p>		

Filename: Methods.doc
Directory: T:\Website\contents_website\renewal\Papers for Conversion to PDF
Template: C:\Documents and Settings\libguest2\Application Data\Microsoft\Templates\Normal.dot
Title: KEY CHALLENGES IN IMPLEMENTATION OF CURRENT GOVERNMENT POLICY AND STRATEGIES IN
PMA
Subject:
Author: Dr Adupa
Keywords:
Comments:
Creation Date: 3/24/2003 12:55 PM
Change Number: 3
Last Saved On: 3/24/2003 2:33 PM
Last Saved By: Astrid Oosterling
Total Editing Time: 2 Minutes
Last Printed On: 3/24/2003 3:21 PM
As of Last Complete Printing
Number of Pages: 43
Number of Words: 17,537 (approx.)
Number of Characters: 99,965 (approx.)