

**REPORT OF PARTICIPATORY MONITORING AND EVALUATION  
CONSULTANCY VISIT TO DCA-HERAT**

**A REPORT PREPARED FOR  
DUTCH COMMITTEE FOR AFGHANISTAN**

**NOVEMBER / DECEMBER 1998**

by

**Stephen Blakeway  
Vetwork UK**

This report was prepared with financial assistance from the Commission of the European Communities. The views expressed herein are those of the author (or members of the mission team) and do not represent any official view of the Dutch Committee for Afghanistan or of the Commission of the European Communities.

The author apologises for any errors in this report.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am very grateful, once again, to the Dutch Committee for Afghanistan for asking me to undertake this mission, and for the help of DCA during its implementation and while travelling to and from Herat. Like last year, the work was rewarding and enjoyable largely because of the friendliness and hospitality of all the DCA staff. While passing through Peshawar, I was lucky to meet Dr Bashir and Omar from DCA Kabul who were able to tell me something of the work in Kabul over the last year.

The 'mission team' were a pleasure to work with. I enjoyed our discussions and field trips. We worked as a team, and I learned at least as much as the other members.

The villagers in Mizra Bahar and Korpe were also extremely friendly, hospitable and tolerant of our extended visits to their villages while we tested our methods on them.

I am grateful to the European Communities for their financial assistance.

For further information, or for comments about this report, please contact either:

Dutch Committee for Afghanistan  
Rozengaard 13-10  
8212 DE Lelystad  
The Netherlands

tel: 31 320 238385  
31 320 248636  
fax: 31 320 238050

or

Stephen Blakeway  
Vetwork  
35D Beach Lane  
Musselburgh  
EH21 6JX  
UK

tel: 44 (0) 131 665 2417  
e-mail: [stephen@vetwork.abel.co.uk](mailto:stephen@vetwork.abel.co.uk)

## CONTENTS

Abbreviations	3
1 Introduction	4
1.1 Mission team	4
2 Terms of Reference	4
3 Background	4
3.1 Programme	4
3.2 Programme objectives	5
3.3 Monitoring and evaluation	5
4 Workshop	6
5 Evaluation system as developed during the workshop and field visits	7
5.1 Objectives of the mini-evaluation	7
5.2 Methodology	7
5.3 Report writing	8
6 Discussion	8
6.1 Differences between monitoring, evaluation and extension	8
6.2 Geographical focus of evaluation	8
6.3 Methodology	9
6.4 Social and gender analysis	9
6.5 Other monitoring considerations	10
6.6 Local specialists, local knowledge	10
6.7 Flexibility	10
Appendix 1: The Evaluation System	11
Appendix 2: Detailed report of workshop / field trip process	15
Appendix 3: Workshop evaluation	25
Appendix 4: Itinerary	26

## ABBREVIATIONS

BVW	basic veterinary worker
DCA	Dutch Committee for Afghanistan
E	Evaluation
EU	European Union
EVK	Ethno-Veterinary Knowledge
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations
M	Monitoring
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
PLA	Participative Learning and Action
PM&E	Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation
PRA	Participative Rural Appraisal
VFU	Veterinary field unit
VTSC	Veterinary Training and Support Centre

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This report is of a short consultancy to develop the monitoring and evaluation system for and with the DCA programme based in Herat. DCA wishes to monitor and evaluate the impact of its programme on the lives of the people it serves. To supplement monitoring and evaluation activities to date, DCA intends to collect data which is richer in social analysis and which measures impact from the point of view of the programme's intended beneficiaries. DCA sees that 'participatory' exercises can help to achieve this.

In order to fulfil the terms of reference, the consultant worked with a team from DCA-Herat for the 13 working days of his visit. The work was structured as a workshop with field visits. A system of evaluation developed out of this process which will be used over the next two months in order to produce a mini-evaluation by March 1999.

As the consultant does not speak Farsi, and most members of DCA Herat do not speak fluent English, the mission was conducted using translators (sometimes Dr Qader, though it was recognised that this compromised his ability to participate properly in discussions as himself).

### 1.1 MISSION TEAM

Dr Qader	Field Co-ordinator
Dr Wazir	Extensionist
M. Haidar	Extensionist
Fakhruddin	Extensionist
Abdul Laitif	Extensionist
Faridahmad	Extensionist
(ie all the DCA Herat monitoring and evaluation team)	
Dr Amin	BVW trainer (part time from Kabul so able to share the outcomes with the Kabul team)
Alexander Ross	Project Director
Dr Najibullah	Project Manager and Training Co-ordinator (workshop only)

## 2. TERMS OF REFERENCE

**for consultant in veterinary epidemiology, experienced in evaluation, monitoring, rural appraisal techniques:**

1. To develop together with the programme (extension and monitoring) staff a method to evaluate the overall impact of the paravet programme in Herat.
2. This method should be implemented in the field and should reveal:
  - a. accessibility of services of the programme for different economic (wealth) groups in the farming society;
  - b. accessibility and impact of the programme on different social groups;
  - c. programme activities and impact as perceived by the community;
  - d. the impact of the programme on livelihoods of DCA trained veterinary staff;
  - e. if the programme addresses the (veterinary) needs of the community and the paravets perception of these community needs.

## 3. BACKGROUND

### 3.1 PROGRAMME

DCA have been working in the animal health sector in Afghanistan for ten years (since 1988). The work has had two parts, the training of veterinary staff and the support of field activities in specific areas.

Paravets (PVs, initial courses lasting 6 months) are the main group of veterinary staff trained. In 1992, after a review of the three existing programmes training paravets (Dutch Committee for Afghanistan, German Afghan Foundation and Experiment in International Living), the latter two closed and DCA became the only organisation training paravets for Afghanistan. It continues to train the PVs needed by all the animal health programmes in the country. Paravet training takes place at DCA Veterinary Training and Support Centres (VTSC) in Kabul and Herat. In addition, DCA trains basic veterinary workers (BVWs, initial courses lasting 2 weeks).

Originally supporting field work mainly in the east and centre of Afghanistan, DCA handed the responsibility for supporting these areas to other organisations at the time that FAO superseded UNDP as the lead United Nations agency working in animal health in Afghanistan. DCA now concentrates its field support work in the west of the country, based at its VTSC in Herat and covering some of the most important livestock rangeland in Afghanistan.

### 3.2 PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES (AS STATED IN PROGRAMME DOCUMENTATION)

To provide basic veterinary services to the Afghan livestock owner by establishing a self-sustaining, community-based, veterinary infrastructure, in order to increase the capacity for food production and to enhance the productivity of the current livestock.

Specifically:

1. To train intermediate and lower level veterinary auxiliary personnel.
2. To provide refresher courses and in service training to veterinary field workers.
3. Establish extension service to provide relevant information to farmers and to intensify relation between farming community and field staff.
4. To improve animal health and livestock productivity through the implementation of district based veterinary field units (VFUs).
5. To protect livestock in VFU working areas against the most prevailing diseases.
6. To control parasitic diseases in livestock in the project working area by providing anthelmintics on a 100% cost recovery basis.
7. To provide curative treatments for animals on demand.
8. To provide veterinary equipment to VFUs.
9. To facilitate travelling in the working areas of the VFU.
10. To monitor and evaluate all field activities.
11. To establish in the Herat VTSC an organisational structure, capable to organise, manage and control the programme.

### 3.3 MONITORING AND EVALUATION

DCA has been committed to monitoring its work from the beginning (see sub-objective 10 above). Monitoring of the work based at the Herat VTSC continues. Monitoring of the work based at the Kabul VTSC continued up until the time FAO centralised monitoring for the areas it co-ordinates.

DCA conducted a study, published in 1996<sup>1</sup>, which indicated that its work had reduced livestock mortality in comparison with similar areas in which no support was being given to veterinary services; and that the cost-benefit ratio of the service (including all paravet training costs) was between 1.8 and 4.8 (depending on which values were used for variables). This study is one of the few cost-benefit analysis studies undertaken for such a programme, anywhere in the world.

At the end of 1997, DCA commissioned a review of its paravet training programme<sup>2</sup>.

Monitoring work from the Herat VTSC has been the responsibility of the Monitoring and Extension team. Since early 1997 this team has grown to six employees. These have visited over 700 villages. Work has included identifying areas that need further paravets; helping villages with the process of selecting PVs and BVWs for training; introduction of these staff to other villages in their area of work; delivery of extension messages; and the collection of baseline data about livestock, agriculture and animal health services (using a questionnaire).

In 1997, one of the field vets employed by DCA was trained in the FAO 'PIHAM' programme for monitoring livestock production throughout Afghanistan.

Since 1997, DCA Herat has realised the need for enriching its monitoring information in order to understand better the impact of its work on beneficiary communities. In 1998, the Monitoring and Extension team were trained in Participative Rural Appraisal (PRA) and also given further training in extension.

<sup>1</sup>Livestock mortality in Afghanistan in districts with and without a veterinary programme. B.E.C.Shreuder, N.Noorman, M.Halimi, and G.Wassink. *Tropical Animal Health and Production* (1996) 28: 129-136.

A benefit-cost analysis of veterinary interventions in Afghanistan based on a livestock mortality study. B.E.C.Shreuder, H.A.J.Moll, N.Noorman, M.Halimi, A.H.Kroese, and G.Wassink. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine* (1996) 26: 303-314.

<sup>2</sup>A review of the DCA paravet training programme; A report prepared for Dutch Committee for Afghanistan; December 1997. Stephen Blakeway.

This consultancy is part of the process of refining the monitoring and evaluation system.

#### 4. WORKSHOP

See Appendix 2 for full details of the workshop / field visit process followed during this consultancy. In summary, the timetable for the workshop was as follows:

<b>Day1</b>	Introduction Hopes and Fears Definitions of Monitoring and Evaluation
<b>Day 2</b>	Revision and personal examples of monitoring and evaluation Definitions of participation Stakeholder analysis of the DCA Herat animal health programme Day summary
<b>Day 3</b>	Revision of participation and levels of participation, from PRA course Information needs of stakeholders in the DCA Herat animal health project Objectives - participant perceptions and stated programme objectives Current monitoring system and information already collected through the extension workers Summary of day
<b>Day 4</b>	Development of monitoring and evaluation plans Case study of an 'holistic approach' to monitoring a community development project Further development of field plans
<b>Day 5</b>	Field visit to Pushtun Zarghun to learn more about progress of PIHAM programme
<b>Day 6</b>	Field trip to Mizrabahar
<b>Day 7</b>	Review of field visits
<b>Days 8 &amp; 9</b>	Field visits to Korpe
<b>Day 10</b>	Review of field visits Interviewing paravets on paravet refresher course
<b>Day 11</b>	Field visit to Mizrabahar
<b>Day 12</b>	Review of field visit Planning of work for January / February
<b>Day 13</b>	Development of report writing structure Evaluation of workshop

The workshop process involved open discussion, brainstorming and hum groups, with a few analytical exercises. An independent translator was employed for the first few days to smooth the process.

## 5. EVALUATION SYSTEM AS DEVELOPED DURING THE WORKSHOP AND FIELD VISITS

See Appendix 1 for full details of the system to be used in order to complete a mini-evaluation by March 1999. The following is a summary.

### 5.1 OBJECTIVES OF THE MINI-EVALUATION

In addition to the objectives in the terms of reference for the consultancy, an additional objective (6, below) is added for the mini-evaluation. The objectives of the evaluation are:

To address the following questions:

1. What is the accessibility of the services of the programme for different economic (wealth) groups in the farming society?
2. What is the accessibility and impact of the programme on different social groups?
3. How are programme activities and impact perceived by the community?
4. What is the impact of the programme on livelihoods of DCA trained veterinary staff?
5. How does the programme address the (veterinary) needs of the community and how is the paravets' perception of these community needs?
6. Are the objectives of the programme still up to date?

### 5.2 METHODOLOGY

In order to address the above questions, the evaluation team will meet with two groups of informants:

1. Villagers; and
2. Paravets or BVWs.

These two groups should be met separately. Paravets and BVWs should not accompany the evaluation team to the villages (except in their own villages). This is so that villagers can answer questions about veterinary services privately and without bias.

The information collected during these meetings can also be checked with the information that has already been collected with the current monitoring system. This was done for Mizrabahar and Korpe and was found to be consistent.

#### 1. VILLAGE MEETINGS

3 groups of meetings that follow each other in order; also other possible exercises and lines of enquiry that can be fitted in as appropriate:

##### **First meeting: Community representatives**

Introductions; explanation of visit and how you hope to work; general discussions; introduction to members of different flocks.

##### **Second meeting: 3 or 4 members of different village flocks**

Again introductions and explanation of the visit. Then more focused discussion including problem and disease ranking. At this point it may be possible to discuss livestock mortality over the last few years. Finally do the social stratification exercise.

##### **Third meetings: members of different social 'wealth' groups**

Again introductions and explanation of the visit. Then more focused discussion including problem and disease ranking. Then questions directed towards animal health services. Finally household analysis to understand the different roles of different family members in relation to livestock (looking after them, working with them, or using their by-products) and also possibly the different sources of income for the household.

##### **Other exercises and activities**

Other exercises, for example social and natural resource mapping, transect walks, Venn diagramming of animal health services, seasonal calendars for problems, diseases and/or labour, matrixes on roles of livestock, and meetings with local specialists, are also possible while in the village.

## **2. PARAVETS AND BVWs**

Paravets and BVWs are interviewed to find out the following things:

- how well they understand the communities they serve;
- who in their communities they do most of their work with;
- how becoming a paravet or BVW has changed their life;
- and to check their technical knowledge and understanding.

These are investigated using a modified version of the social stratification exercise described above, problem and disease ranking (either for the whole village or for particular groups in it), by direct questioning (for example when asking what effect becoming a paravet or BVW has had on his life), and by looking at records (for paravets only).

Paravet refresher training courses provide an ideal opportunity to obtain information.

## **5.3 REPORT WRITING**

The design and details required for reports of the above process in each village needs to be finalised within the programme. A brief discussion on report writing concentrated on thinking about needed what information, and the need to summarise findings in a clearly accessible format.

It was suggested that:

1. A reports should be prepared for each village and for each paravet and BVW.
2. The report should be a brief summary of the above exercises.
3. Each report should follow the same order.
4. All problem rankings should be brought together in the same table with the social group it came from clearly indicated at the top of the column.
5. Similarly all disease rankings should be brought together in one table.

## **6. DISCUSSION**

### **6.1 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MONITORING, EVALUATION AND EXTENSION**

Evaluation differs from monitoring in that it is an event rather than a continuous process, and includes assessment or judgement of findings. It should also lead into planning for future correction or refinement of work. However monitoring is pointless if it does not lead to a process of evaluation and future refinement. Monitoring and evaluation are therefore closely integrated activities; and the methods used to collect information for the two activities can be the same.

The DCA-Herat monitoring and extension team already has a questionnaire based monitoring system. The questionnaire (though often used quite informally, more like a semi-structured interview) is administered during village meetings. The experience of using the methodology developed for this mini-evaluation may, if positive, lead to changes in long term monitoring activities.

The consultant gained the impression that the currently used monitoring questionnaire is being administered at meetings which also serve for the dissemination of extension messages, the introduction of PVs (or BVWs) and other business. The team recognises that monitoring and extension, though possibly sharing similar methods for analysis, are different things.

Of the objectives of the DCA programme in Herat, the mini-evaluation is designed to investigate those relating to specific animal health services (vaccination, de-worming and treatments; sub-objectives 4-7). It is not designed to assess the effectiveness of the 'extension' activities as stated in sub-objective 3. The consultant feels that sub-objective 3 needs to be defined more specifically before it would be possible to monitor its effectiveness.

### **6.2 GEOGRAPHICAL FOCUS OF EVALUATION**

This consultancy specified the development of a process to evaluate the overall impact of the programme. The team decided during the mission that the activities over the next two months would be based in Karukh District of Herat Province in order to do a thorough piece of work in the time available, particularly in winter with possible transportation constraints. Karukh district is representative in that it is covered by PVs and BVWs, some of whom

have been trained recently and some at the start of the programme. However there are other reasons (such as proximity to Herat) why this district may not be representative of the whole programme area. The evaluation is thus referred to as a mini-evaluation in recognition of the fact that findings over the next two months should be checked over a wider sample area in the future for a more thorough evaluation.

### **6.3 METHODOLOGY**

When conducting the meetings and methods outlined above (and described more fully in Appendix 1) there is deliberate duplication of information collection. For example problem ranking exercises are repeated with different groups within the village, and with paravets or BVWs. This duplication is an important part of the evaluation process. In any evaluation it is important to cross check the information collected.

It is also important to note that all exercises used are part of a process, not ends in themselves. In some case they will be used at the start of a meeting, in other cases they may be used during a discussion to clarify a line of enquiry. In all cases, discussion of the results of an exercise is usually the most important part, particularly where this allows cross checking of information collected at other times or from other groups of people.

### **6.4 SOCIAL AND GENDER ANALYSIS**

The development of the social analysis methodology is worth recording because it raised some interesting points.

The monitoring and extension team had learnt and tried 'classical wealth ranking' (in which a list of all village households or families is drawn up and then ranked in terms of 'wealth' by a few key informants) during a PRA training exercise in June 1998. It was therefore initially assumed that this method would form the basis of the social analysis.

However it was not until we were about to use it in Mizrabahar, that it became apparent that neither the team, nor the consultant, were feeling comfortable about the social intrusiveness of the method. An alternative, more abstract method of analysis was provided by the 'tree map' (or 'difference tree') model. Informants for this method were selected through asking about the flock structure in the village at the first meeting in the village, then meeting with 3 or 4 members of different flocks. Informants are asked the numbers of families in the village, then asked to identify differences between these families from the point of view of well-being or wealth (food-security has also been used effectively<sup>3</sup>). Only after this analysis is a request made for introductions to representatives of the different wealth groups. The disadvantage of this method is that it produces a less random sample.

There is potentially a similar problem of cultural sensitivity in household analysis. Classical household analysis relies on detailed lists of household members and what they do. Some members of the team indicated that this was also intrusive, particularly when asking about female members of the household. The team will continue to try the method but will change if there are problems.

It is debatable how much the feelings of the interviewers should guide the method of investigation because it is possible that the interviewer and informants may feel differently about a process. However, under the circumstances, caution should prevail if there is any doubt.

There is a further reasons for caution. Analytical monitoring and evaluation exercises can raise expectations about future work. The information gained from monitoring and evaluation is of interest to two different groups. 'Outsiders' seek a better understanding of the social impact of projects particularly with respect to 'poverty focus' and 'gender', especially if as donors they are funding the work. Beneficiaries are interested mainly in improved livelihood. The interests of these two groups have to be balanced. It is reasonable to ask people to give time and personal information where there is genuine hope that this information will lead to some improvement in their lives but a programme (and its donors) needs to think very carefully about its capacity to effect change before deciding how far it can ask community members to expose themselves to investigation and analysis.

DCA is seeking to provide specific technical assistance over an enormous geographical area, in a country with considerable social constraints both because it is still in the middle of a civil war, and because of the prevailing regulations about working with women. DCA is not a 'general community development agency'.

Social analysis is needed in the mini-evaluation to check the distribution of any positive or negative effects of the programme within the community. Conducted sensitively, it can also suggest possible avenues for the programme to go down in the future. The level of social analysis should proceed step by step, as ideas surface and

<sup>3</sup> Rick Davies, personal communication; see also 'MandE news' on the internet at <<http://www.mande.co.uk/news.htm>>.

possibilities need to be explored. If it were feasible to work directly with women (for example by employing a married couple with the right qualifications, experience and commitment for extension work), then it would be necessary to conduct more detailed gender analysis. However, if this is not feasible for political, practical or financial reasons, it would be better to limit the degree of household and gender analysis.

It is hoped that the present methodology will provide the necessary level of information to check positive, negative or unexpected effects of the programme on any groups within the community, and to check if there are any major differences in level of benefit between different groups within the community. It is also hoped that the information collected will help the programme to consider possible changes in its work for the future. It may be that the results of this mini-evaluation will highlight the need for further information collection in the future, or indicate possible directions that could be taken by an animal health programme once the current war and its attendant restrictions are over.

## **6.5 OTHER MONITORING CONSIDERATIONS**

The mission team is aware that the above evaluation system will not provide answers to all the questions that could be asked during an evaluation. It does provide a process which can be developed further. Level of analysis could be deepened and extended if, for example, the extension team decided to work in more detail with a few selected farmers or villages across the programme area. In this way farmers could identify specific locally appropriate indicators of programme success against which to measure improvements in, for example, husbandry or feeding.

Programmes with a technical focus, such as animal health, may wish for 'quantitative' information about some specific technical things, such as 'animal production' or disease incidence / prevalence. The relative merits and complementarities of 'participatory' and 'technical' monitoring systems in real, extensive animal keeping systems are currently being investigated. FAO's PIHAM programme is collecting information on animal production from targeted farmers using a few key indicators (eg animal numbers, births). Under the present circumstances in Afghanistan, more technical monitoring processes, such as sero-surveillance, are anyway not feasible. 'Participatory' monitoring processes can reveal epidemiological information, for example through changes in disease importance over time or by developing a relationship which allows more accurate reporting of direct farmer observation.

Some agencies have taken their monitoring into a less programme specific direction using 'quality of life indicators' such as 'life, knowledge, excellence in work and play, gender, inner voice, empowerment, relationships, beauty/environment, religion' under an 'holistic impact assessment'<sup>4</sup>. While this may not be suitable for DCA's needs, it is a useful reminder that programmes should think as widely as possible about the underlying reasons why they are doing what they are doing.

## **6.6 LOCAL SPECIALISTS, LOCAL KNOWLEDGE**

There was not enough time during the consultancy to properly investigate this subject. Local specialists and local knowledge do not have a very high profile, yet the information about local treatments already collected by DCA supports the idea that there are some useful local remedies<sup>5</sup>. There are also reported to be local herbalists, local castrators, and local bone-setters. The programme is almost certainly affecting these people in some way and this should be investigated at some stage.

## **6.7 FLEXIBILITY**

The methodology developed should not be seen as rigid by the monitoring and extension team. If some exercises don't work well, they should be modified or dropped. If others seem appropriate, they should be tried. Individuals may prefer different exercises and find them easier to work with. The main thing is that the process is understood and that the information is comparable at the end.

<sup>4</sup> see 'Impact Assessment: Oxfam vs Poverty' by Sabina Alkire <sabina.alkire@some.ox.ac.uk

<sup>5</sup> see also 'Oxfam's Hazarajat Rural Development Programme, An evaluation of veterinary work, May 1997 by Deborah Storie.

## APPENDIX 1: THE EVALUATION SYSTEM

(As developed in the workshop, and to be used until March 1999)

### OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

To address the following questions:

1. What is the accessibility of the services of the programme for different economic (wealth) groups in the farming society?
2. What is the accessibility and impact of the programme on different social groups?
3. How are programme activities and impact perceived by the community?
4. What is the impact of the programme on livelihoods of DCA trained veterinary staff?
5. How does the programme address the (veterinary) needs of the community and how is the paravets' perception of these community needs?
6. Are the objectives of the programme still up to date?

### METHODOLOGY

In order to achieve these objectives, there will be meetings in villages, and meeting with paravets and BVWs. It is best if the paravet or BVW does not take part in the village meeting. You will be asking villagers about the veterinary service and you want them to be able to answer honestly.

#### 1. VILLAGE MEETINGS

3 groups of meetings that follow each other in order; also other possible exercises and lines of enquiry that can be fitted in as appropriate:

##### **First meeting: Community representatives**

Introductions; explanation of visit and how you hope to work; general discussions; introductions to members of different flocks.

##### **Second meeting: 3 or 4 members of different village flocks**

Again introductions and explanation of the visit. Then more focused discussion leading to problem and disease ranking. At this point it may be possible to discuss livestock mortality over the last few years. Finally do the social stratification exercise.

##### ***Problem and disease ranking***

1. Get a list of 'livestock related problems' or 'diseases' (of one specific species) affecting the village.
2. Write each problem (or disease) on a separate piece of paper.
3. Give the pile of papers to one of the informants.
4. Ask the informants to compare the first two problems, putting them in order of importance.
5. Then compare each following paper with those already ranked.
6. Equally important problems can be placed together in the same rank.
7. The informants can discuss as they go, and can change the order of the papers at any time.
8. When they have finished, check that they mean what they have presented; allow them to change the order if they want.
9. Discuss the result: why they have ordered them as they have and anything you want to know about the specific problems.
10. Record the result and make notes of anything interesting that comes out of the discussion.

Season of the year may have an effect on the ranking. It is therefore important to explain that you want the informants to think over the whole year, not just the current season. Alternatively you could do a four season matrix ranking, comparing how the importance of the problems (or diseases) changes with the seasons. (This could be done with papers or with stones in the matrix). Matrix ranking will take more time and is probably more important for later extension visits, for example when analysing the best time for vaccination or de-worming.

Remember that one reason for doing this exercise is to check if DCA's specific objectives (a) vaccination, b) deworming and c) other treatments) are in line with people's problems. If other problems are ranked highly, could DCA look for solutions to these also, through its extension work or some other way?

### **Livestock mortality**

Information about livestock mortality over the last few years may be available through discussion. However this may not be very reliable without detailed questioning. Strange answers should be cross examined. It is usually best to ask people only about their own animals, and to follow up details. For example, if an animal got sick, did it get better or die? did all pregnant ewes give birth or did some abort? what happened to all the animals born? There are exercises such as 'progeny histories' (described in PLA notes number 20) which might be useful at this point, especially for cattle.

### **Social Stratification**

1. Define 'family' and 'household' so the informants understand what you are asking them to talk about.
2. Ask the number of families in the village.
3. Ask if this number can be divided into two groups based on 'wealth' or well-being'. At this stage, the informants may voluntarily divide the village into more than 2 groups - this is OK.
4. For each division, ask for further differences until you are told there are none. The result should be a branching tree with smaller and smaller sub-divisions of the village.
5. When finished, check with the informants that they agree with the final result.
6. At this point it is possible to ask further questions about the different groups.

Explain you would like to talk individually to members of at least some of these groups, and ask for introductions to representative families.

### **Third meetings: members of different 'wealth' groups**

Again introductions and explanation of the visit. Then more focused discussion leading to problem and disease ranking. Then questions directed towards animal health services. Finally household analysis to understand the different roles of different family members in relation to livestock (looking after them, working with them, or using their by-products) and also possibly the different sources of income for the household.

### **Problem and disease ranking**

as above

### **Animal health services**

1. Start with an open question that allows informants to talk about local specialists, local remedies, prayers etc. For example: 'What do you do if an animal becomes sick?'
2. Explore traditional practices first.
3. Then ask more detailed questions about the veterinary service.
4. Find out if people use the service and what they think of the service. Use open questions. Follow stories based on real experience. If an animal was treated, did it get better? If the flock was vaccinated, did any of them subsequently become sick? If so, what disease did they have?

Venn diagrams can also be used during this exercise to visualise the various sources of animal health assistance.

### **Household Analysis**

Household analysis has two parts - work responsibilities, and income. Household analysis aims to understand who does what in the household, the financial constraints on the household, and the impact of the programme on different family members.

There has already been the example quoted from Ghor or the women who complained that increase in flock size gave them too many animals to milk.

Also this information can be used in planning extension work. For example, if neo-natal mortality is a problem and if women are responsible for care of new born or sick animals, perhaps DCA should consider employing a female extension worker.

### **Work analysis**

1. Get a list of the members of the household, or if this is too sensitive, get the groups of people in the household.
2. Puts the names of the individuals or groups along the top of a matrix table.
3. Ask for all the household tasks that relate to animals - either looking after them (at different ages, seasons, sick or healthy), using them (plowing), or using their by-products.
4. List these down the side of the matrix.
5. Ask the householder to use stones to indicate who in the household has greatest responsibility for that task.
6. Discuss the results.

### **Income analysis**

There are various ways of doing this, including open discussion. The following exercise is included as an idea.

1. Draw a circle that represents the household.
2. Ask the householder to tell you all the things the household does or produces that bring in money (eg labour, handicrafts, wool, milk etc).
3. Write these on pieces of paper and put them inside the circle.
4. Ask the householder to tell you all the things they have to spend money on.
5. Write these on pieces of paper and put them outside the circle.
6. Ask the householder to indicate with stones which of the things inside the circle bring in the most money, and which of the things outside the circle cost most money.
7. Discuss the result from the point of view of paying for veterinary services compared to the cost of losing an animal to injury or disease.

### **Other exercises and activities**

Mapping, Transect Walks and meetings with local specialists are also possible while in the village.

#### **Mapping**

Village members draw their own map on paper or on the ground, marking what they think is important as well as what they are questioned about.

Remember this exercise is specifically related to livestock. If possible, ask questions that link the map to livestock. For example, where animals are grazed? which crops produce by-products for the animals? are the animals allowed to graze in these fields, or are by-products stored for winter? where are the animals watered? etc.

It is also important to let each wealth group make their own map. For example, if people do not have land but do have animals, where do they graze their animals? where do they get their winter feeds? where do they get water? where do they get the wood needed to build barns? etc.

#### **Transect walks**

Again remember this exercise should focus on animal related subjects. It should therefore go beyond the built up area of the village to get a view of grazing areas.

#### **Local specialists and local knowledge**

If there is an indication that there are local specialists (castrators, bone-setters, herbalists) in a village, an effort should be made to talk to people to find out what they do (and know) and how the DCA programme has affected their lives.

## 2. PARAVETS AND BVWs

Paravets and BVWs are interviewed to find out the following things:

- how well they understand the communities they serve;
- who in their communities they do most of their work with;
- how becoming a paravet or BVW has changed their life;
- and to check their technical knowledge and understanding.

These are investigated using a modified version of the social stratification exercise described above, problem and disease ranking (either for the whole village or for particular groups in it), by direct questioning (for example when asking what effect becoming a paravet or BVW has had on his life), and by looking at records (for paravets only).

### ***Social stratification***

This exercise is conducted as above. However:

1. Ask the paravet / BVW to think initially only of his own village.
2. When the exercise is finished as far as it goes above, ask the paravet / BVW to indicate, using stones, which how much work he does with each group.
3. When this is finished and discussed, ask him to think about the whole of his area of work and tell you if the answers for his village apply also to the whole area.
4. If not, ask him to re-arrange things to indicate the situation for his whole area.

Check his answers, and the answers received from villagers, against his records, using names, if names of individual villagers are known, or number of animals treated / flock sizes as an indicator of wealth group.

### ***Problem / Disease Ranking***

Again, this exercise is done as above.

The paravet / BVW can be asked to rank problems or diseases for the whole village, or for one wealth group only. The idea of this is to see how in tune he is to the communities he serves.

### ***How has becoming a paravet / BVW changed his life?***

This information is probably best obtained through discussion, as the paravets and BVWs seem happy to talk about this subject. An understanding of sources of household income before and after becoming a paravet / BVW can add usefully to the discussion.

### ***Records and technical knowledge and understanding***

In addition to the procedure followed previously when visiting paravets and BVWs, paravet records should be checked to see if possible which groups in the community are being served. It may be possible to use a key informant from the village to indicate which wealth group the farmers in the records belong to. However it may be that this would not be an appropriate way to behave (as the key informant would then have access to all the information about other people's animal health records). The size of the group of animals vaccinated or treated could give an indication of owner wealth.

## REPORT WRITING

1. A reports should be prepared for each village and for each paravet and BVW.
2. The report should be a brief summary of the above exercises.
3. Each report should follow the same order.
4. All problem rankings should be brought together in the same table with the social group it came from clearly indicated at the top of the column.
5. Similarly all disease rankings should be brought together in one table.

## APPENDIX 2: DETAILED REPORT OF WORKSHOP / FIELD TRIP PROCESS

---

### INTRODUCTION

This appendix is a detailed record of the process used during the consultancy described in the report. The consultant worked with a team from DCA-Herat for the 13 working days of his visit. The work was structured as a workshop with field visits.

The objectives of the workshop were:

- to ensure a common understanding of participatory monitoring and evaluation,
- to clarify the specific monitoring and evaluation needs of DCA Herat, and
- to develop a monitoring and evaluation methodology.

The objectives of the field visits were:

- to test and refine the methodology developed in the workshop and arrive at a practical monitoring and evaluation system.

The evaluation system developed out of this process will be used over the next two months in order to produce a mini-evaluation by March 1999.

As the consultant does not speak Farsi, and most members of DCA Herat do not speak fluent English, the work was conducted using translators (sometimes Dr Qader, though it was recognised that this compromised his ability to participate properly in discussions as himself).

### WORKSHOP REPORT

#### DAY 1

##### INTRODUCTION

The consultant introduced himself to those he had not met on the 1997 consultancy, introduced the Terms of Reference, the plan for the mission and the structure of the workshop. Participants were prepared and aware of the reason for the consultant's visit.

##### HOPES AND FEARS

Participants divided into pairs. Each pair discussed and wrote down 3 things they hoped to get out of the work, and 3 things they feared might not be achieved.

##### *Hopes*

1. To see development and progress of livestock husbandry related to extension by PM&E.
2. To realise the meaning of PM&E process with its techniques.
3. Will know the difference between M&E and PM&E.
4. We will learn about E&M.
5. Making clear the minds of farmers about animal husbandry.
6. We can consider the work in a better way.
7. It will help us to improve field work quantitatively and qualitatively.
8. That what we learn can be used in the field.
9. Evaluation of vaccination and treatments of animals by paravets to reduce the diseases of animals.
10. Learn the difference between M&E.
11. This workshop will help us improve our practice when working in the field.
12. We hope it will support workshop participants to think more broadly in M&E possibilities.

##### *Fears*

1. Preparing free treatment for animals.

2. Won't be able to do what people in the field want.
3. The workshop will not teach us how to improve.
4. Fear what we learn cannot be practised in the field.
5. We won't be able to work in areas where there is lots of husbandry.
6. We won't realise the condition of our community.
7. We won't be able to do these PM&E techniques in the field.
8. Changes will not be practical.
9. We won't be able to prepare good health food for animals in winter.
10. We won't be able to use PM&E in a short time in a large area.
11. We won't be able to remove constraints in the field.
12. The participants are not willing to have a different behaviour because they are not used to this kind of thing.

Similarities between some of these were noted. It was also noted that some points related to extension, not monitoring and evaluation, and that the workshop would not be able to address these points.

Participants discussed how they could ensure that hopes are realised, and fears avoided. Ideas included an agreement to ask questions whenever things were not clear and to keep minds open to possibilities. It was stressed that there was no intention to force the adoption of participatory exercises, but that where they seemed to offer a suitable method for collecting relevant information, they could be tested during field trips.

It was also pointed out that PM&E was not a new process but a way of refining existing M&E by trying to ensure greater consideration is given to the perceptions and interests of a wider range of 'stakeholders'.

## **DEFINITIONS OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

Before proceeding further it was considered important to ensure a common understanding of the terms 'monitoring' and 'evaluation'. Again participants divided into pairs (different from those for hopes and fears) to define these terms.

### ***Monitoring***

1. is to evaluate and see the works which are done and to remove the wrong activities.
2. is to check a project; and collection of information by the persons in the project; the project manager is responsible.
3. is following the process of a project according to your set objectives.
4. is a tool between organisation and field that brings the organisation to field workers and improves the field workers and reflects their activities to the office or organisation.
5. is control and gathering the information and the way to solve the problems of the field and to transmit the problems to the office.
6. is the continuing process of checking the progress of a piece of work (often against objectives).

### ***Evaluation***

1. is to see and inspect the things done.
2. is gathering the information or studying the project at the end by the persons who are in charge or who give funds.
3. is inspecting the result of the plan and getting the whole profit of the plan or work.
4. is to inspect the work or plan from the field and accumulating information.
5. is an assessment of the impact or result of certain acts in the past.
6. is the time-bound process of checking the value of a piece of work (often against objectives).

These definitions were discussed to give a common understanding. It was not considered necessary to arrive at a definitive statement for each term, particularly as two languages were being used.

This exercise started the process of thinking about why DCA needs to monitor and evaluate.

At the end of the session, participants were asked to think of occasions when they have used monitoring or evaluation in their own lives - personal, social or professional - that they can explain to the group at the start of the next session (which would be after the weekend).

## DAY 2

### REVISION AND PERSONAL EXAMPLES OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION

After a brief revision of the content of the first day of the workshop, participants gave examples of monitoring and evaluation from their own experience.

*Dr Qader* gave a detailed account, complete with suitable PRA exercises, of how he would evaluate the teaching at a local private school.

*Dr Amin* explained how he monitors his son's reading and learning.

*Dr Wazir* explained the monitoring of a veterinary clinic run by paravets.

*Farid* told us how he had assessed the success of a resolve made when he was in the 2<sup>nd</sup> year of the faculty to become more widely read in works of literature and poetry by reviewing, with the help of a friend, a sample of his books to see how many he could remember.

*M. Haidar* told the story of a shop he had once run.

*Fakhruddin* explained how he was monitoring the effectiveness of his work in teaching his daughters; and that he was using this information to understand how he might improve the success of his endeavours.

*Abdul Laitif* explained the process he had used when looking at his work in a previous job, and thinking about how he might improve it.

*Stephen Blakeway* gave a brief description of his work in Scotland and the challenges he faced in developing a system of monitoring and evaluation there.

*Dr Najibullah* gave a detailed account of how he monitors his work over a typical week.

*Lex Ross* explained how he had once cooked a fine meal for a long lost friend, constantly tasting to ensure the increasing deliciousness of the food's flavours, only to discover that his friend could not eat even a single mouthful of this feast because he was allergic to everything in it. From this Lex had learned the importance of consultation.

After these examples, monitoring and evaluation were left while we considered the subject of participation.

### DEFINITIONS OF PARTICIPATION

Participants were divided into pairs to discuss the meaning of participation.

#### **Participation**

1. is to take part related to one specific matter according to a determined plan, to feel the responsibility of the job or activity.
2. is doing a specified job according to a plan which is planned in the past by the beneficiaries of that job.
3. is taking part in a matter, means to accept the responsibility of one project, to set the objectives.
4. is taking part in a job or a project in order to take ownership of that work, to take part in the positions and getting independence, self-sufficiency, self-reliance and self-confidence.
5. is some degree of involvement of more than one person in an act, happening or process. 'Level of participation' refers to the degree of involvement of the different stakeholders in the decision making process.

These definitions were discussed. Reference was also made to the notes of a Participatory Rural Appraisal course that the workshop participants had attended in June 1998. These notes explained in Farsi the concept of participation and levels of participation.

### STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS OF THE DCA HERAT ANIMAL HEALTH PROGRAMME

Once a common understanding of participation had been reached, the concept of a 'stakeholder' was introduced. The team brainstormed on 'Stakeholders in the DCA Herat animal health programme'. Once a list had been made, with groups of stakeholders subdivided as necessary, the different groups and sub-groups of stakeholders were grouped according to common areas of interest.

## Stakeholder analysis

		animals		
farmers	vets	carcass carriers	donors	men
land-owners	paravets	slaughterers	Dr Bram	women
shepherds	BVWs	butchers	NGOs	children
koochis	monitors			
	extension workers		trainers	
	vet medicine sellers			
government		local castrators		animal dealers
shurahs		local bone setters	consumers	
mullahs		local 'Greek' doctors		artisans
		other local specialists		smugglers

Working in pairs, team members then considered two sets of questions for each of the above 'groups' of stakeholders, each pair adding their ideas to a piece of paper for each 'group'.

1. What information does each group need, and what information can each group provide?
2. How should the monitors work with these groups (including what level of participation is desirable)?

This process took till the end of the day. Analysis of the results was left till the following day.

## DAY SUMMARY

The day finished with a summary of the days progress, and a check on the understanding of what distinguished PM&E from M&E.

## DAY 3

### REVISION OF PARTICIPATION

Workshop participants revised the PRA course notes on 'levels of participation', relating the levels to the DCA Herat project. They decided that the levels varied in different activities, but that local communities were always involved in selection of paravets and BVWs (with the DCA extension staff also involved in the process of they had time). In some cases communities sent someone for training as a paravet entirely on their own initiative, without being contacted by the project, which constituted a higher level of participation.

It is apparent that much of the literature on participatory processes (PRA, PLA, PM&E etc) is written about 'general community development' projects which often aim to do a wide range of things in a limited area. DCA (and other similar animal health projects around the world) are trying to do a limited thing in a wide ranging area. Such projects are usually in areas where livestock rearing is a main stay of household food security and livelihood. Such livestock rearing communities readily identify and express their desire for improved animal health services and willingness to pay for them. This in itself is highly 'participative'. In fulfilling the technical need, participation is needed to identify the animal health problems locally perceived as important. Participation is also needed to identify suitable local people for training (though there is often gender bias in training). Participatory training practices are widely used in the training of paravets and BVWs. Higher levels of participation are needed when attempting to find solutions to animal health problems for which there are no simple technical solutions (compared, for example, to vaccination or de-worming). Participation is also needed to understand project impact on different groups within 'the community'.

## **INFORMATION NEEDS OF STAKEHOLDERS IN THE DCA HERAT ANIMAL HEALTH PROJECT**

After the translators had translated the results of yesterday afternoon's exercise, these were analysed in both Farsi and English to give summaries of the monitoring information opportunities or needs of the different groups. These were:

### **'Outsiders'**

#### **Donors**

want:  
focus on poverty and gender;  
project implementation as in the proposal;  
monitoring against objectives;  
evidence of a good monitoring system;  
information as reports and outputs;  
? cost benefit analysis.

#### **Other NGOs**

not much involved in project;  
requirements as donors;  
project effective or not and progressing according to objectives.

#### **DCA Board**

wants: information about progress of programme against objectives;  
we want: the needs of the project prepared on time.

#### **Government, Mullahs, Shurahs**

want:  
general project information - purpose, general benefits etc;  
to check cultural and religious sensitivity;  
level of community participation;  
can give:  
security information;  
government policy / planning permission;  
background community information;  
can assist with information dissemination (eg for vaccination campaigns) - especially mullahs;  
communication via official channels, official meetings, letters, reports.

### **'Technical'**

#### **Vets, Paravets, BVWs**

disease information - type, numbers, time of year, new diseases;  
numbers of treatments and change over time;  
technical knowledge and competence;  
problems with work;  
relationship with farmers;  
vets, PVs & BVWs also want feed back from monitoring and extension work with farmers;  
cross check with farmers etc.

#### **Animal Medicine Sellers**

check technical knowledge;  
quality of drugs / use by dates;  
records as indicators for information on diseases;  
cross check with farmers.

**'DCA'****Extension Workers**

want:  
to monitor effectiveness of their extension work with farmers;  
to record which villages visited;  
numbers of meetings and details of who attended;  
to use PRA/PM&E.

**Trainers**

want:  
feedback from field to see if training is appropriate;  
to know difference between Paravets and BVWs.

**'Community members - Beneficiaries'****Farmers**

want:  
positive changes in their livelihoods;  
to improve animal husbandry and agriculture;  
free help or financial assistance;  
we want:  
information about their livestock;  
information about their way of life;  
to know if they think vet service is useful;  
to see that the project implementation has a positive impact on their lives;  
to give information to them about livestock keeping etc.

**Koochis and Shepherds**

we want:  
information about animal nutrition - amount, quality, summer, winter etc;  
husbandry information - eg colostrum;  
information about disease outbreaks;  
their perceptions of the animal health service;  
their indicators of project success or improvement in their livelihoods.

**Men, Women & Children**

we want:  
wealth ranking;  
different roles of men, women and children in livestock husbandry (in different wealth ranks or other groups);  
how they keep animals;  
what do different groups do when they have sick animals;  
if they think services are appropriate;  
impact of the project on their livelihood and well-being;  
local indicators of success;  
to give technical information about diseases and zoonoses.

**Animals**

want good food, water and management;  
improved health and welfare;  
information from clinical examination and production data.

**Local Specialists, Herbalists, Castrators, Bone-Setters, 'Greek' doctors**

are any now paravets or BVWs?  
 what impact has the programme had on their lives?  
 how big or relevant is this group in reality?  
 how do their treatments compare to modern?  
 details about their work;  
 verification of their treatments;  
 need to work respectfully, supportively, constructively?

**Butchers, Slaughterers & Carcass Carriers**

(this group are not considered to be a priority)  
 meat hygiene information;  
 pathology of disease;  
 are slaughtered animals pregnant or not;  
 market values.

**Discussion**

There was heated debate from one participant who thought it incorrect to include 'men, women and children' as a group. This debate raised some useful points. Extension and monitoring staff mentioned different attitudes to women's involvement in village discussion between ethnic groups (koochi women take part in group discussion) and contrasting viewpoints between men and women (one group of women mentioned that increased animal numbers increased the amount of time they had to spend milking). Some NGOs employ couples in extension so that men and women can be contacted equally. Some NGOs are working more closely with children, particularly on health matters and schools can be good places to plant the seeds of good animal husbandry practice for coming generations of livestock keepers. The conclusion was that it was useful to keep this group in. It was also concluded that further analysis of communities, for example by wealth ranking, was desirable so that there could be greater sensitivity in understanding the impact of the project on the lives of different groups of people.

There was also discussion about local animal health knowledge with respect to local specialists, castrators, bone-setters and herbalists ('Greek' doctors).

**OBJECTIVES**

A session on objectives followed. Monitoring and evaluation need to consider the initial objectives of a project, even if it is later considered necessary as a result of the M&E process to modify the initial objectives. This session was therefore a reminder of project objectives and an indicator of whether the project objectives are still in line with the work being done by the programme.

Before discussing the stated objectives of the project, participants in pairs discussed their own perceptions of the overall objective of the project:

**Participants perceptions of the objectives of project**

1. Increase in animal products for men, women and children and finally to the country.
2. To increase the knowledge of the farmers and provide vet services among them, making clear their minds about knowing medicines and vaccines to increase food and animal products.
3. To protect and help the farmers of Afghanistan by distributing vet services to increase the level of food and animal products.
4. Development of veterinary services in Afghanistan to increase the economic level of Afghanistan, and train personnel specialised in treatment and vaccination in the areas where there are many farmers.
5. To improve livelihoods of farming community through vet services.
6. To improve the quality of life for people and animals in Afghanistan through improvements in animal health. To develop an animal health service appropriate to the conditions currently prevailing in the country.

### **Programme Objectives (as stated in programme documentation)**

To provide basic veterinary services to the Afghan livestock owner by establishing a self-sustaining, community-based, veterinary infrastructure, in order to increase the capacity for food production and to enhance the productivity of the current livestock.

Specifically:

1. To train intermediate and lower level veterinary auxiliary personnel.
2. To provide refresher courses and in service training to veterinary field workers.
3. Establish extension service to provide relevant information to farmers and to intensify relation between farming community and field staff.
4. To improve animal health and livestock productivity through the implementation of district based veterinary field units (VFUs).
5. To protect livestock in VFU working areas against the most prevailing diseases.
6. To control parasitic diseases in livestock in the project working area by providing anthelmintics on a 100% cost recovery basis.
7. To provide curative treatments for animals on demand.
8. To provide veterinary equipment to VFUs.
9. To facilitate travelling in the working areas of the VFU.
10. To monitor and evaluate all field activities.
11. To establish in the Herat VTSC an organisational structure, capable to organise, manage and control the programme.

### **CURRENT MONITORING SYSTEM AND INFORMATION ALREADY COLLECTED THROUGH THE EXTENSION WORKERS**

The current monitoring questionnaire and results collected using it were then discussed. The questionnaire was devised for monitoring at village level, not at individual farmer level. Information on over 700 villages has already been recorded in a 'relational database' computer programme (Epi Info 6) which can be questioned (for example to see if villages where animal numbers are reported to have increased are the villages frequented by paravets).

While this is a useful tool, the importance of enriching the information with more detailed farmer level information was noted. The example above of women reporting an increase in their milking work load with increased herd size is one example.

### **SUMMARY OF DAY**

There was final discussion to introduce the next stage of the workshop. This will involve developing specific plans to fill gaps in the monitoring information. These should be along the lines of the exercise carried out by Dr Qader in thinking how he would monitor the effectiveness of his local school. These are the plans which will be field tested. Participants were asked to bring the notes from their PRA course to tomorrow's sessions as a resource.

## **DAY 4**

### **DEVELOPMENT OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLANS**

The mission team, working individually or in pairs, wrote monitoring and development outlines. Some were more comprehensive than others but each added something valuable to the following whole, which is compiled from all groups.

#### ***Draft Outline***

1. The project up till now has used a village questionnaire completed at one off meetings with farmers available at the time. The village meetings have been lively and useful, but it is now recognised that detail is being lost, and the information collected is rough. A separate questionnaire is used for VFUs.
2. So far about 750 of over 3,000 villages in the project area have been visited.
3. In order to get richer monitoring information, the mission team all agree that participatory exercises need to be used with a cross section of the demographic spectrum in each village, eliciting local indicators of project success.
4. Because these participatory exercises will take more time, there will have to be a process of village sampling.

5. Initially at least, the villages sampled should be those where there is already a relationship with the local people, to avoid the community feeling that their time is being wasted.
6. After introductory meetings, seasonal calendars will help suitable timing for further monitoring visits, and social and natural resource mapping, combined with transect walks will give a good understanding of the social structure of the village. Wealth ranking can also be used. Through these processes it will be possible to identify individuals or small groups from across the spectrum for more detailed work.
7. In addition to semi-structured interviews, household work analyses, livestock matrixes, input-output analyses, rankings, problem trees, progeny histories are all tools to be tried. These will give valuable background information and should allow the discussion necessary for farmers and koochis to identify appropriate local indicators of success.
8. Indicators can cover husbandry, specific technical interventions or general feelings of well-being.
9. The tools used will vary according to the specific purpose of the monitoring visit. The initial visit will inevitably involve more time and a wider range of tools.
10. The importance of starting with an approach that invites openness to local knowledge is recognised.

## CASE STUDY: 'HOLISTIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT'

Dr Qader presented as a case study, Oxfam's 'holistic impact assessment' which measures project impact by using 'quality of life indicators' such as 'life, knowledge, excellence in work and play, gender, inner voice, empowerment, relationships, beauty/environment, religion'<sup>6</sup>. While this may not be suitable for DCA's needs, it is a useful reminder that programmes should think as widely as possible about the underlying reasons why they are doing what they are doing.

## DAY 5

Day 5 was spent visiting Pushtun Zarghun to learn more about the progress of the PIHAM programme from Dr Ibrahim. Dr Ibrahim explained about the PIHAM training course, the information collected by the farmers, and the method of using this information.

## DAYS 6 - 12

<b>Day 6</b>	Field trip to Mizrabahar
<b>Day 7</b>	Review of field visits
<b>Days 8 &amp; 9</b>	Field visits to Korpe
<b>Day 10</b>	Review of field visits Interviewing paravets on paravet refresher course
<b>Day 11</b>	Field visit to Mizrabahar
<b>Day 12</b>	Review of field visit Planning of work for January / February

The field trips provided an opportunity to test and develop a provisional evaluation plan.

Lessons learnt early on included:

- a need to clarify the specific objectives of each village visit so that all discussions can be brought round to the subject in hand;
- the value of going to a place where you are already known to be providing a service when testing methodologies;
- that PRA exercises work best with smaller groups;
- that exercises work best when they fit in with a story and are not presented 'out of the blue';
- that PRA exercises should not be done if you are not comfortable with the process or do not understand the point of the exercise;
- that it is important to think about the practical details of an exercise in order to prepare properly.

The team considered the benefits of using exercises and decided they:

- help analysis;
- encourage thoroughness;
- allows informant to see how s/he is progressing through interview in case of boredom;
- allows participation of many people;

<sup>6</sup> see 'Impact Assessment: Oxfam vs Poverty' by Sabina Alkire <sabina.alkire@some.ox.ac.uk

- allows records to be kept for future reference.

It soon became clear that the team was not happy with 'wealth ranking'. The interviews with the paravets on the refresher training course gave an opportunity to test an alternative using 'difference trees'. This was then adopted, tried out and refined in the villages.

There was also a discussion about Farsi words for 'wealth' (dowlat, dunyor, sermoye, puldene all being words that imply wealth though also having other very different meanings) so that all members of the team were consistent. Similarly time was spent discussing 'family' and household' as a result of differences in findings between different interviewing pairs within the team.

In a discussion about the work of women, the following activities were identified as some livestock related activities commonly done by women:

midwives for animals, especially cattle  
milking  
processing milk  
de-ticking  
removing thorns  
cleaning and treating wounds  
clean stables  
using manure  
giving water  
sheering sheep  
cutting hooves  
tending poultry

### **DAYS 12 - 13**

The last days of the workshop was spent planning the work over the next two months and thinking about report writing. It was decided that:

1. A reports should be prepared for each village and for each paravet and BVW.
2. The report should be a brief summary of the above exercises.
3. Each report should follow the same order.
4. All problem rankings should be brought together in the same table with the social group it came from clearly indicated at the top of the column.
5. Similarly all disease rankings should be brought together in one table.

The final activity of the workshop was a workshop evaluation (see Appendix 3)

## APPENDIX 3: WORKSHOP EVALUATION

---

### Workshop evaluation methodology

The workshop evaluation had three parts:

- re-examination of the terms of reference for the consultancy by the whole team;
- re-examination of the 'hopes and fears' from the start of the workshop by the whole team;
- each participant was then asked to write three things they liked about the workshop, and three things that could have been improved; these were then collected and handed to the consultant anonymously, and translated later.

### Workshop evaluation results

The mission team agreed that the workshop process had developed a methodology that satisfies the requirements of the Terms of Reference for the consultancy. The use of the methodology over the next two months will probably lead to its gradual improvement.

The team were also satisfied that the 'hopes' had been realised and the 'fears' had been allayed. Some 'fears' were not answered by the workshop but this was because they related to extension activities. Those who had expressed these particular fears understood this.

Participants liked the 'participatory' nature of the workshop and that there were opportunities for everyone to join in discussion and clarification. One person specifically liked the alternation between field and classroom discussion sessions. Several participants were happy that the terms 'participation', 'monitoring' and 'evaluation' had been further clarified. Several also expressed satisfaction with the methodology that had been developed, and the way that it had worked in the field.

Several participants were unhappy with workshop time management. One felt the workshop had been too short. Others thought day to day time keeping should have been improved (eg returning late from the field). Some said that field visits to villages nearer Herat would have been more sensible. One person thought paravets should have accompanied the team to the villages. One person thought the team should have split up and worked separately. Two people felt more field work would have been better; one person also felt that the evaluation would gain from covering more districts than just Karukh. Two said the use of film and video in villages (presumably for extension) would be better. One person hoped a full copy of the workshop proceedings would be put in the library.

### Comments on the workshop evaluation

The consultant appreciates the positive comments about the workshop, and agrees with many of the criticisms. The field work time was constrained by the length of the consultancy (with travelling time between Europe and Herat eating into workshop time), but the consultant feels that the team has a good enough understanding of the process they have developed that they will be able to 'fine tune' it themselves.

The consultant understands the concern about limiting the 'mini-evaluation' over the next two months to Karukh district. The advantage is that it will be possible to gain a thorough understanding of the one district. The main concern is that, being so close to Herat, it is not typical of the majority of the country which is very remote and has fewer marketing opportunities.

Although splitting the team up for field trips was considered, it was considered more important for everyone to be able to discuss the same experiences, and to observe common meetings. The consultant also feels that taking the paravet or BVW to a village might stop the villagers being so honest about his work. For this reason, the consultant recommends that paravets and BVWs are not taken to villages during the rest of the evaluation.

For the time being at least, the consultant feels that solutions to many village problems will not be 'high-tech'. Instead, they will require building good working relationships with individual, innovative farmers. As well as being impractical, the use of 'high-tech' extension aids could give the misleading impression that high-tech is best.

It was agreed that the workshop proceedings should be translated into Farsi. Copies of both language versions should be available in the library.

## APPENDIX 4: ITINERARY

---

### November

Sat 21	<b>depart UK</b>
Sun 22	<b>arrive Peshawar</b>
Mon 23	Get Afghan visa; in DCA office, meet Dr Samsor, Dr Bashir, & other DCA Peshawar staff
Tue 24	ICRC flight to Herat cancelled; in Peshawar
Wed 25	<b>fly Peshawar - Herat;</b> preliminary meeting with DCA Herat staff
Thu 26	Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation Workshop starts
Fri 27	(weekend)
Sat 28	Workshop
Sun 29	Workshop
Mon 30	Workshop

### December

Tue 1	To Pushtun Zarghun to learn progress of PIHAM from Dr Ibrahim
Wed 2	Field visit to Mizrabahar
Thu 3	Workshop
Fri 4	(weekend)
Sat 5	Field visit to Korpe
Sun 6	Field visit to Korpe
Mon 7	Workshop; interview paravets doing refresher training
Tue 8	Field visit to Mizrabahar
Wed 9	Workshop; session with paravet refreshers on problem analysis
Thu 10	End of workshop - report writing and workshop evaluation
Fri 11	(weekend)
Sat 12	<b>fly Herat - Peshawar</b>
Sun 13	In Peshawar, report writing
Mon 14	To DCA office, Peshawar; <b>fly Peshawar - Islamabad</b>
Tue 15	<b>fly Islamabad - UK</b>