First SPARK-STREAM Workshop on Livelihoods and Languages

Bangkok, Thailand
9-11 April 2003

Livelihoods and Languages – a SPARK-STREAM Learning and Communications Process

First SPARK-STREAM Workshop on
Livelihoods and Languages

Bangkok, Thailand
9-11 April 2003

Livelihoods and Languages – a SPARK-STREAM
Learning and Communications Process

Kath Copley and William Savage
Co-facilitators

Livelihoods and languages …

Stories,
Exchanges,
Listening and talking,
Discussing common things …

Tell me, sister,
Tell me, brother,
In your everyday life,
Where do you go?
What do you take with you?
What do you bring back?

I want to know who you are
I want to listen
I want to hear
I want to learn

Written by Kath Copley and shared with workshop participants on the afternoon of Day Two

Contents

Acknowledgements

We would like to express our appreciation to:

- All the SPARK and STREAM participants, for their willingness to ask and engage with some difficult questions, which will ultimately enable all of us to work with others in more useful ways

- Mariel de Jesus, Sem Viryak and Nguyen Song Ha, for sharing their own and colleagues' experiences with learning about, building capacity in, and carrying out participatory livelihoods analysis

- Nuchjaree Langkulsane and Panpilai Kitsudsaeng, for making the workshop possible through their before-and-behind-the-scenes efforts

- Duangkamol Sirisook, for being an English-Thai interpreter, and thus facilitating other participants' contributions

- Reby Cajilig, for making it possible for STREAM participants to attend and assisting in her usual invaluable manner

- Ronet Santos, for being committed to the idea that, to understand people's livelihoods, we need to explore definitions, meanings and connotations

- Susan Turnquist, for her assistance with the workshop and, in particular, for making it possible for Nguyen Song Ha to be an active "virtual participant" from Hanoi

- Graham Haylor of STREAM and Shaun Vincent of VSO, for sensing an opportunity

Acronyms

ADB	Asian Development Bank
CBNRM	Community-Based Natural Resources Management
CHM	Communications Hub Manager
DFID	Department for International Development
ESSC	Environmental Science for Social Change
FRMP	Fisheries Resource Management Project
LHA	Livelihoods Analysis
NRM	Natural Resources Management
PLA	Participatory Livelihoods Analysis
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
RRA	Rapid Rural Appraisal
SIAD	Sustainable Integrated Area Development
SL	Sustainable Livelihoods
SPARK	Sharing and Promotion of Awareness and Regional Knowledge
STREAM	Support to Regional Aquatic Resources Management
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats
VSO	Volunteer Service Overseas

The First Workshop

The First SPARK-STREAM Workshop on Livelihoods and Languages took place at the Royal Benja Hotel in Bangkok, Thailand, from 9-11 April 2003. It was the first activity in a SPARK-STREAM learning and communications process around livelihoods and languages. In Appendix 1 (Program) can be found descriptions of the:

- Concept
- Aims, outcomes and outputs
- Participants in the first workshop
- Process (including first workshop, between-workshops and second workshop), and
- Agenda (annotated draft) for the first workshop.

Day One

Opening Remarks

The workshop's first day opened with remarks by Ronet Santos on behalf of SPARK and VSO, and Bill Savage on behalf of STREAM and its director, Graham Haylor.

Introductions: Livelihoods and Languages

Working in pairs, participants got to know each other by responding to the task in the box. Their responses appear in the following two tables. After all the cards were displayed on a wall, each participant introduced their partner in their own language and in English.

Task
▪ Find someone you don't know (very well).
▪ Talk to each other about your livelihoods.
▪ On a piece of card, each of you write one word that describes your livelihood.
▪ Then tell each other all the languages you've had experience with (that you speak, studied, grew up with …).
▪ On other pieces of card, write the names of your "experience" languages, one per card.

Describe your livelihood …

- patient
- ability
- skills
- helping
- thinking
- learning
- mixed
- with social sensitivity
- participation for development (small farmer, gender-based analysis, civil society organization)

- worthwhile
- fortunate (2)
- gratifying
- fulfilling
- challenging (2)
- flow
- disrupted

- traveling
- employment
- welfare
- survive
- enough to survive

Languages we've had experience with – 32 of them

Arabic (2)	Isaan (3)	Nipongo
Bahasa Indonesia (7)	Italian	Russian (3)
Bengali	Japanese	Australian Sign Language
Cebuano (3)	Javanese (3)	Spanish (2)
English (18)	Kam Muang	Sundanese (2)
French (5)	Khmer (2)	Tagalog (6)
German (2)	Kinaray-a	Thai (7)
Hebrew	Korean	Urdu
Hindi	Malay	Vietnamese (2)
Ilocano	Marshallese	Waray (2)
Ilongo (3)	Nepali	

Review of Expectations and Overview of Process

Before the workshop, participants were asked to respond to a task about their expectations (box). For the first workshop, these were compiled, synthesized and linked to the workshop sessions through which they might be addressed. [Appendix 2 (Expectations and Sessions) contains the text of a PowerPoint presentation to review participants' expectations.] Following this, brief comments were made to draw everyone's attention to what was planned for the between-workshops phase and the second workshop.

> ***Task***
>
> What are your expectations about what can be achieved by:
>
> a) the first workshop
> b) the between-workshops period, and
> c) the second workshop?

Terms and Translations

Working in mixed groups – SPARK and STREAM, different countries and languages – participants considered the questions for the task in the box. Their responses can be read in Appendix 3 (Terms and Translations).

<table>
<tr><td align="center">***Task***</td></tr>
<tr><td>•   What word(s) is used for the English "livelihood(s)"?</td></tr>
<tr><td>•   What does this mean literally?</td></tr>
<tr><td>•   What are people's understandings of it?</td></tr>
</table>

Discussion Points

▫ Literal meanings of "livelihoods"
▫ Broader meanings and understandings included ways of working, standard of living, cycle of lives, ways of living, means of living, maintaining our lives, conditions of living, what you do for a living, how you live (conditions), feelings about the way you live
▫ Differences in words used from English to local languages, and from urban to rural areas – in urban areas it may be more "economic" and in rural areas, it may be more about culture, social life and relationships
▫ We need to understand the scope of people's relationships to understand how they live.
▫ There may be a broader meaning in rural areas – more whole. Work life may be more separated from social life in urban areas.
▫ Some terms for "livelihoods" may not be "popular" in rural communities, perhaps seen as ideas and words "invented" by outside researchers or development workers. People do not generally talk about their livelihoods – they are just living; we are the ones talking about it.
▫ In English, we talk about "livelihoods" when we talk of people who are poor, not those who are wealthy.
▫ If our understanding of livelihoods is just concerned with economic activities, then that will influence the way we talk with communities. If our understanding is broader, then we will deal with the whole range of people's experiences of their lives.
▫ Words can be thought of as having definitions (e.g., from a dictionary), meanings (derived from context and use) and connotations (with positive or negative perceptions attached).

With time running late, the follow-up parts of the task were not taken up, but rather fed into subsequent workshop discussions. These were:

▫ A follow-up task using the same questions [as in the task box above] with "livelihoods analysis", "participation-participatory" and "stakeholder"
▫ What other terms should be considered in the building of shared understandings about livelihoods (analysis) and participatory approaches?
▫ Building language glossaries

Self-reflection on Livelihoods and Ways of Thinking and Working

The purpose of this session was for people to consider that, before we can begin to understand other people's lives and livelihoods, we need to reflect on what we are asking people to experience and do when we work with them to carry out livelihoods analyses. To get this started, Kath used herself as an example:

Kath's Livelihood

What is my livelihood?
My livelihood involves doing a lot of thinking – analyzing development issues, collecting and sifting through a lot of information, deciding which groups to work with, determining what "development interventions" will work or are they necessary at all (are we really improving people's lives?), organizing events, writing reports, looking at budgets, learning a lot about lots of things.

What resources do I have to help me?
- College and post-graduate education, skills gained through lots of training, 20 years of experience working in development, a good understanding of general policies that relate to my work
- Contacts and networks of people, family, friends
- Some savings, a credit card, a bank account
- A car so I do not worry too much about public commuting
- Pension and social security so I worry less about retirement
- Health insurance

What influences or affects my livelihood?

Positive
- When there are lots of opportunities for work
- Lots of opportunities for sharing of skills and experience
- Poverty focus in the three areas where I work

Negative
- Security situation – therefore I cannot work in some places
- When the areas I am working in rank high on the Human Development Index (there is no need for "development workers")
- Short-term contract system (when a contract finishes, I am worried I cannot find another job)
- Accidents, floods and termites (which will eat up my books)
- Computer failure – I'll lose a lot of information
- A mortgage, so I need to make monthly payments

Participants then worked in a women's group and a men's group, in response to the task in the box. Their group self-reflections on their own livelihoods appear in Appendix 4 (Self-reflection on Livelihoods).

Discussion Points

- What makes people creative? – experiences, commitment, eagerness,

---

Task

- What is your livelihood?
- What are your resources to sustain your livelihood?
- What makes you vulnerable?
- What influences your livelihood (positive or negative)?

---

energy, my environment

- How are urban lifestyles "imposed" on other people, especially in rural areas? Where do the messages come from? When we go to communities, what messages are we taking?
- Look how people have said they "started out as a …" and then moved through different kinds of work.
- The question of the "opportunities" people have to carry out and improve their livelihoods is important.
- The way we talked about "livelihood" in the morning is different from what we say now, because we are now looking at livelihoods with all the influences around them.
- How does it feel to explain your livelihoods in front of other people? This may be the same way that people in communities feel when we ask them about their lives.
- How would you speak out about your livelihood in a group? Implications: what kind of information will we get when we ask people about their livelihoods? If among ourselves, we are embarrassed to speak about our livelihoods, it may be similar for people in rural communities.
- Power relationships within communities will also affect whether people want to speak up.
- It takes longer than 20 minutes to describe our livelihoods. In participatory livelihoods analysis, it takes longer than we think. It is not about going in, taking information, and then leaving.

Ways of Thinking and Working

Participatory livelihoods analysis is not just a different way of collecting and organizing information. It has implications for the ways we think and work. Why take this approach? Why the philosophical and methodological changes?

What are the principles involved? Principles are just words. Until you put them in practice they do not mean anything. They are ideals and we need to be aware whether our attitudes, behavior and speech are consistent with our stated principles.

Current Documents

Participants were asked to talk about any documents or other sources they are using to learn about, build capacity in or carry out participatory livelihoods analysis. One purpose of this session was to gain a sense of whether there was a need for language-specific "participatory livelihoods analysis resource books". The responses of each person follow.

- Arif – PRA, participatory mapping, *Kampung* information system, participatory resource planning (village level or many villages), encourage collaboration among stakeholders, conflict management (proceedings from VSO)

- Latifah – PRA, gender analysis, bio-regional approach (not just agriculture or upland), limited capacity, local capacity (one organization with 23 people with 80 volunteers), knowledge and experience, scientific background but not social science, books on philosophy, DFID, World Bank, most references are in English.

- Priyo – VSO Indonesia finished strategic plan, we work in three areas (livelihoods, health and disability), DFID and World Bank (in Indonesian and English) – not sure whether this is the best document because we still need to come to the same understanding of livelihoods. The translation is too narrow. There is a need to explore the idea of "livelihoods language guides".

- Tabitha – DFID, empowerment of the people and now it is sustainable livelihoods, what is the real meaning of livelihoods? If I do not know the meaning of it, how can I transfer?

- Christine – income generating for women, what people's needs are

- Jun – not a holistic framework, sub-sector analysis starts from assessment of resources in an area, then relates these to market opportunities, then start with particular skills, from the family to communities, sometimes we call them craft villages (e.g., weaving in the village)

- Malou – community resource maps and community plans, PRA, socio-cultural profile with partner communities, stakeholder dialogues, livelihoods is not just resource extraction

- Mariel – same as Malou: I feel the same way; livelihoods analysis is something new. We focus on NRM in ESSC. But this does not always equal sustainable livelihoods. I am expected to come back and tell my organization about the workshop, DFID Guidance Sheets

- Decha – rural system analysis, household mapping (a kind of social mapping), one tool that can be used to begin understanding livelihoods is wealth-ranking

- Oy – community mapping to analyze resources, but this is not a direct tool (does not analyze livelihoods directly), dialoguing, activity calendars, small group discussions

- Nuch – participatory, DFID Guidance Sheets more complicated for me

- Pim – strategic plan, exit strategy, participatory assessments, post-its, H-diagram, SWOT analysis, documents accumulated by staff

- Yak – we try to find out how people think, why did they say it (more details during tomorrow's presentation)

- Nil – problems are brought to the surface and ranking

- Bebet – no personal experience of livelihoods analysis, SIAD, participatory land use planning, orientation first and then PRA, FRMP funded by ADB (income diversification, community organizing and livelihoods); they already have a framework

- Ha – working with leaders of communes, seasonal calendars, Venn diagram, PRA, RRA, livelihoods analysis

Day Two

Review of Day One and Preview of Day Two

Bebet briefly reviewed the main events and discussion points from Day One on behalf of the STREAM group.

Experiences in Participatory Livelihoods Analysis – Presentations

SPARK Philippines

The first presentation by Mariel was entitled "Sustainable Livelihoods Analysis: The Case of Davao River Conservation Coordinating Committee".

The focus of this presentation was a community-based planning exercise done with three communities, the purpose of which was to feed into the Davao Catchment Management Plan. Although the data had already been collected, the team made a decision to revisit the study – this time viewing it through the "lens" of the DFID sustainable livelihoods framework. The text of Mariel's PowerPoint presentation can be found in Appendix 5 (SPARK Philippines Presentation).

STREAM Cambodia

The second presentation was entitled "Experiences in Participatory Livelihoods Analysis from Cambodia's Perspectives" and was given by Yak.

The focus of this presentation was a livelihoods analysis which was conducted in three provinces in Cambodia. One of the main points that Yak made in his presentation was that, although various tools can be used for this sort of analysis, the process could be seen as more like "conversation" than an analysis. He emphasized the need to start where people are in their thinking and livelihoods strategies, focus on finding out what people do, and try to understand why they do it. The text of Yak's presentation is in Appendix 6 (STREAM Cambodia Presentation).

STREAM Vietnam

The third presentation, "Experience from Livelihoods Analysis in Vietnam under SAPA-STREAM (2001-02)", was by Nguyen Song Ha. Since Ha was unable to join us, Bill delivered the presentation on his behalf.

The focus of Ha's presentation was livelihoods analysis work which has been done in three provinces in Vietnam. Ha noted significant changes that came out of the participatory livelihoods analysis approach: better understanding among partners, increased confidence, more pro-active involvement and participation. Participants were interested in hearing about perceptions of the communities themselves, in terms of significant change, since these were not included in Ha's presentation. Ha acknowledged certain constraints vis-à-vis presentation of data and results for validation within communities and the limited participation of communities in data analysis. The text of Ha's presentation can be found in Appendix 7 (STREAM Vietnam Presentation).

Livelihoods Language Guides

The aim of this session was to consider the purpose of a "Livelihoods Language Guide", how such a guide might be structured, and what its contents should be. We had also planned to start drafting guides in this session.

For this task, participants worked in three country groups (Indonesia, the Philippines and Thailand) and a STREAM group. The groups were asked to consider the main purpose of a "Livelihoods Language Guide". Ideas were then shared with the whole group, and noted down so that Bill and Kath could prepare a draft document, synthesizing and incorporating their ideas.

Day Three

Review of Day Two and Preview of Day Three

The Indonesia team prepared a PowerPoint presentation to highlight what they had experienced on Day Two, in particular from the three country presentations.

	Philippines	**Cambodia**	**Vietnam**
Approach	Research with structured questionnaire	Conversation, building trust, informal	Facilitation of dialogue among stakeholders
Tools	Community planning exercise	PRA techniques	Multi-stakeholder workshops
Process	Using DFID framework to analyze secondary data	Fieldwork with community	Workshops
Role	Researcher or "expert"	Facilitator	Facilitator
Emphasis	How to fit secondary data into the DFID framework	Tools and process	Capacity-building for stakeholders involved in the processes

From the discussions:

- Struggling with the "participation" concept
- Participatory analysis should start from where people are
- Participatory analysis is just a tool for facilitating people to talk and listen to each other, or open dialogue
- Capacity is not just skill but also role
- Government officer involvement as a facilitator in participatory livelihood analysis

Livelihoods Language Guides

On the morning of Day Three, a draft of a "Livelihoods Language Guide" was taken back to participants for comment and feedback. In their country and STREAM groups, participants were asked to read through the draft and discuss it. People had numerous questions and concerns about the draft and, in particular, questions about whether creating a "Livelihoods Language Guide" was a worthwhile undertaking.

In discussing the purpose of the "Livelihoods Language Guide", many difficult and important questions were raised:

- What do we mean by "language"? Language as in Cebuano or Sundanese? Or language as in "language use"?
- What do we mean by "livelihoods" in this context?
- Indeed, what would the purpose of a "Livelihoods Language Guide" be?

We needed to explore these concerns and questions before moving on to further discussion relating to the structure and contents of the guide.

The draft can be found in Appendix 8 (Livelihoods Language Guide Draft). Phrases in bold italic font are revisions based on participants' comments.

Reflection, Stakeholder Feedback, Review and Materials Development

Before proceeding with the workshop, it became clear that we needed to take a step back and familiarize participants with "how SPARK and STREAM got here", through explanations by Ronet and Bill.

Ronet for SPARK

Let's look at the processes … When VSO is thinking about who to work with, they use a strategic planning process – which is a way of thinking through things to do. Each of the countries that works with VSO has different plans and are at different places in their plans. Different organizations have different ways of planning, thinking and working.

SPARK, for example, agreed on general objectives, but we were all over the place in terms of objectives. So there was a need to streamline what we were doing and produce more specific desired outcomes. The tool that SPARK wanted to use was a framework for participatory livelihoods analysis (PLA). We set up a series of meetings to discuss this.

At one meeting, everyone was talking about livelihoods analysis, but there was a problem. Meeting participants were using English terms and concepts relating to PLA, but not everyone had the same understandings of those terms. As Mariel pointed out in her presentation, "We were on the same page, but we weren't on the same 'page'." The problem was, participants were speaking the same language, but not understanding what everyone else meant. So they had the idea of getting together to work it out.

One problem is the framework itself, but the language and different people's understandings of the language is a real problem. Anyone can get the information, make recommendations and leave, but is that what we want? It does not seem so from our discussions.

This is a process of dialogue, of looking at capacities as roles, and of looking at situations in their entirety. For example, we are weak at understanding government. These may be problems of language and understanding.

We have planned for a between-workshops phase and a second workshop. But what happens depends on us. We need to negotiate what to do.

Bill for STREAM

How did STREAM get here? Towards the "end" of the capacity-building processes in Cambodia and Vietnam, we realized a need to "step back" from the framework, and we understood that we had missed an opportunity to develop shared understandings of participatory livelihoods analysis. We need to go back and pick it up.

None of us had done a livelihoods analysis before, so we thought about how to initiate a process to carry one out. We realized that we had to build capacity to work with people in communities in different ways that could have an impact on their lives. We needed to change the way we worked.

We learnt a lot and when we saw the outcomes, we realized we had achieved a lot, but also that there were things we had not learnt. One of these was that a lot of time was spent in coming to common understandings of what was meant by certain terms. We wanted to share this experience.

Thus we need to decide whether and how to take this forward, and is it worthwhile?

Concerns about the Process → Towards a Workplan or Just the Next Step?

Following their discussions in country and STREAM groups, participants provided this feedback:

Thailand

Usefulness of guide – it would be useful but we want to suit it more for Thailand and to ensure that the activities and the guide serve the target groups. We will consult our networks on what would be useful. In terms of producing the guide, we conclude that we will not focus on the language, but rather the techniques of how to mediate and communicate with the community. Therefore, it is also facilitation skill that counts. In Thailand, local practitioners communicate with communities in the local language. However, we realize that when there is a miscommunication, it is not language alone, but the way thoughts are mediated.

The guide that we have in mind now is the one that should review current livelihoods analysis tools, both from experiences of local practitioners and from existing livelihoods and community analysis manuals that have been published and tested in the field. To gain some useful inputs, we will organize a workshop where experienced persons who have done a great deal of livelihoods analysis can come and share their experiences, and also invite some who are not so experienced and would like to learn. This is seen as knowledge-sharing and also capacity-building. During the workshop, we will review current tools, not necessarily from the sustainable livelihoods framework, but those that are being used – the most useful ones, why and how. At the end, experiences of both the tools and approach for communication will be consolidated. Time-wise, our concern is whether we will finish in time to have some valuable output to share with SPARK and STREAM colleagues at the second workshop in June, because to review the experiences, tools and other matters will obviously take longer than two months.

> It was suggested that the second workshop in June should be an opportunity to report progress, and that we would see how far we got.

Indonesia

We are still struggling with the Indonesian term for "livelihoods" and its various connotations. We will try to focus on exploring the meaning of "livelihoods". We will have workshops and discussions. In our discussion, after we tried to explore the word "livelihoods", we thought about the outline of the guide. Chapter one will be different understandings of the word "livelihoods". The second chapter would be what various components of livelihoods are. The third chapter might be the glossary itself. All chapters will have stories and experiences from Indonesia. We want to talk to other organizations, communities and other stakeholders about their understandings. Then, we will possibly hold a writing workshop to explore the results of the focus group discussions.

STREAM

We will proceed step-by-step to find out the importance of "livelihoods", and talk about why it is important to analyze. We will consider a number of people: for farmers we should write in a language they understand. They have to understand, otherwise there will be no communication. We will discuss with our colleagues and communities also and get their feedback. We will incorporate feedback from all levels and prepare "livelihoods language guides" including field experiences. This will be an input for the second workshop to share experiences.

The advance of the livelihoods analysis is different in each STREAM country. For example, for Cambodia, the tools are already there, but how to document the experiences and the concepts? A concern is that people use different terms with the same meaning. The concepts "from the outside" seem not to work well in local contexts, so how can we interpret these concepts so that they are understandable by practitioners? We have the material and can discuss with our partners, have workshops and discussions, combine documents, and work with communities so that they can comment.

Right now we can concentrate just on the next step: working with immediate stakeholders to find out what their understandings are.

Philippines

First we tried to decide whether we thought this was worthwhile. We think it is. We discussed the same as others. We are not comfortable with the framework. We need a framework, but we want to be able to be flexible about it. First we need more discussion with various groups. The next step is to discuss again the understandings of "livelihoods plus plus" with other people. We do not want to ask everyone, but we will focus on people who might be our partners. We also saw the need to develop some tools or criteria to choose the people we are going to work with.

From now until the second workshop, we will try to further flesh out these concepts, paying attention to language differences. We will be checking where we are and where our partners (including communities) are in the process. In doing this, we want to be conscious of the capacity-building needs of ourselves and our other partners.

"We don't really know, we have to go and find out what others think."

Expectations of Between-workshops and Second Workshop

At this point, we had intended to explore participants' expectations of the between-workshops period and the second workshop. In fact, in discussing participants' concerns about the process and deciding on "next steps", we did not need to go back to expectations written before the workshop. For reference, however, these expectations are located in Appendix 9 (Expectations of Between-workshops and Second Workshop).

Capacity-building Needs for Carrying Out Participatory Livelihoods Analysis

Each country and STREAM group then reported on what they considered capacity-building priorities – for themselves, colleagues and partners – to work effectively in the "livelihoods and languages process" and to carry out participatory livelihoods analysis.

STREAM

1. Education, communication and materials development, documenting, editing and publishing
2. Good questioning techniques
3. Negotiation and networking skills
4. Build knowledge of local terms → glossary

Indonesia

1. Skills and knowledge of facilitation
2. Writing skills
3. Information management skills
4. Skills of social analysis and sensitivity
5. Identify needs of ourselves and others

Thailand

1. Learning with existing networks of those who have done analysis and have experience, and disseminate learning to others to capacitate them
2. Learning how to do data analysis
3. Conducting participatory community planning
4. Learning how to use materials to communicate with local people, e.g., using local materials to make it easier to communicate
5. Facilitation skills, like the way we ask questions
6. Learn how to share the SL framework with others – it is not new but rather a different way of thinking about people's lives and livelihoods – what they have, rather than what they lack – and focuses on outside influences which contribute to people's poverty

Philippines

1. Defining or clarifying our roles after we have attended the workshop, in our own offices and organizations
2. Improve communication skills on articulating this among peers and colleagues
3. How to communicate the meaning of the framework with others
4. How to build our confidence in speaking in front of high-powered people
5. Going through the process of livelihoods analysis ourselves – how will we actually do this? – and reviewing current development interventions
6. How to do a stakeholder analysis
7. How to facilitate and review current interventions
8. How SPARK and STREAM can help us → provide guidance sheets, and other models of PLA, and building up our own glossaries
9. We would like to start with these nine words: livelihoods, participation, stakeholder, assets, outcomes, strategies, vulnerability, community, influences

Evaluation

Participants took time to respond to these evaluation questions (Appendix 10 Evaluation):

- □ How much have we achieved the purpose and outputs of the workshop, and met your own expectations?
- □ What do you think about the workshop sessions and methods?
- □ How do you feel about your own participation in and contributions to the workshop?
- □ What is the most important thing you learned this week?
- □ Anything else?

Livelihoods and Languages – a SPARK-STREAM Learning and Communications Process

Program

Concept

SPARK[1] is a five-year project of the international NGO Volunteer Service Overseas (VSO) to support learning and communications about Community Based Natural Resources Management in Indonesia, the Philippines and Thailand.

STREAM[2] is an initiative within the five-year work program of the intergovernmental organization, the Network of Aquaculture Centres in Asia-Pacific (NACA), to support learning and communications about aquatic resources management, currently working in Cambodia, India, Nepal, the Philippines and Vietnam.

SPARK and STREAM partners are interested to understand more about participatory livelihoods approaches to development and how to share understandings of these in languages additional to English. SPARK and STREAM have thus agreed to embark on a learning and communications process on livelihoods and languages.

Aims, Outcomes and Outputs

The aims of this SPARK-STREAM learning and communications process are to:

- Build understandings of participatory livelihoods concepts and approaches and their meanings in languages of regional countries[3]
- Generate awareness of issues related to language, participation and power

The intended outcomes would be:

- Shared understandings of participatory livelihoods concepts and approaches
- Exchanges of experiences between STREAM and SPARK on participatory livelihoods approaches, processes and practices
- An understanding of what is involved in developing language-specific "participatory livelihoods analysis handbooks"
- Identification of follow-up capacity-building needs for carrying out participatory livelihoods analysis

Outputs are intended to be:

- "Livelihoods Language Guides" in the thirteen languages relating understandings of participatory livelihoods concepts and approaches and terms commonly associated with them[4]
- Workplans for between-workshop reflection, stakeholder feedback, review and materials development of the "Livelihoods Language Guides"
- Plans for developing language-specific "participatory livelihoods analysis handbooks"
- Statements of capacity-building needs for carrying out participatory livelihoods analysis

---

1 Sharing and Promotion of Awareness and Regional Knowledge
2 Support to Regional Aquatic Resources Management
3 The thirteen languages are Bahasa Indonesia, Bangla, Cebuano, English, Hindi, Ilonggo, Khmer, Nepali, Oriya, Tagalog, Thai, Vietnamese and Waray.
4 This would not be a "DFID livelihoods framework" translated, but rather the meanings of "livelihoods (approaches)", "participation" and other terms, understood and described in suitable language for wider sharing and learning with colleagues in regional countries.

Participants

The SPARK-STREAM learning and communications process will link twenty-one people from seven countries: Cambodia, India, Indonesia, Nepal, Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam.

SPARK

1.   Mr Arif Aliadi (LATIN, SPARK Hub Organisation, Bogor, Indonesia)
2.   Ms Latifah (RMI, an NGO, member of SPARK advisory group, Indonesia)
3.   Mr Priyo Asmoro (Programme Area Manager, Livelihoods, VSO Indonesia)
4.   Ms Tabitha Yulita (Programme Assistant, SPARK Indonesia)
5.   Ms Christine Bantug (Programme Officer, VSO Philippines)
6.   Mr Ernesto Montes (Department of Trade and Industry, Tacloban City, Philippines)
7.   Ms Malou Salcedo (ESSC, Agusan del Sur, Mindanao, Philippines)
8.   Ms Mariel de Jesus (Project Manager, ESSC[5], SPARK Hub Organisation, Philippines)
9.   Mr Decha Phasuk (Director, Civil Society Organization, SPARK Thailand partner)
10.   Ms Duangkamol Sirisook (Sustainable Development Foundation, SPARK Hub Organisation, Thailand)
11.   Ms Nuchjaree Langkulsane (Programme Assistant, SPARK Thailand)
12.   Ms Panpilai Kitsudsaeng (Programme Officer, VSO Thailand)
13.   Mr Ronet Santos (Regional Programme Coordinator, VSO-SPARK, documenter)

STREAM

14.   Mr Sem Viryak (CHM[6] Cambodia)
15.   Mr Rubu Mukherjee (CHM India)
16.   Ms Elizabeth Gonzales (CHM Philippines)
17.   Mr Nilkanth Pokhrel (CHM Nepal)
18.   Mr Nguyen Song Ha[7] (CHM Vietnam) [virtual participant]
19.   Mr Bill Savage (Communications Specialist, Bangkok, Thailand, co-facilitator)
20.   Ms Kath Copley (Sydney, Australia, co-facilitator)
21.   Ms Susan Turnquist (Bangkok, Thailand, observer-assistant)

---

5 Environmental Science for Social Change, NGO based at Ateneo de Manila University
6 Communications Hub Manager
7 Nguyen Song Ha, STREAM Vietnam Communications Hub Manager, did not attend in person because of the SARS virus situation. He was a "virtual participant" whose involvement was facilitated by Susan Turnquist using the STREAM website chatroom.

Process

The process will involve two three-day workshops at the beginning and culmination of a two-month period of reflection, stakeholder feedback, review and materials development.

First Workshop

SPARK would organize the first three-day workshop in Bangkok from 9-11 April 2003 at the Royal Benja Hotel[8]. The "First SPARK-STREAM Workshop on Livelihoods and Languages" will be facilitated by STREAM, and attended by thirteen SPARK participants from Indonesia, the Philippines and Thailand (including VSO Programme Officers and concerned NGOs), and five STREAM participants (Communications Hub Managers from Cambodia, India, Nepal, the Philippines and Vietnam).

The purpose of the first workshop would be to build shared understandings of participatory livelihoods concepts and approaches, with emphases on the approaches as "ways of thinking and working", and on learning from concrete examples from the experiences of STREAM in Cambodia and Vietnam, and SPARK in the Philippines.

The outputs would be drafts of a "Livelihoods Language Guide" in twelve languages and English and a workplan for the between-workshops period.

Documents to be referred to in the first workshop would include:

- Each country's "current document serving as the basis for their organization's participatory livelihoods analysis work", for example:

  - Cambodia – "Tools for Participatory Rural Appraisal for Use in Livelihoods Analysis with Fisher and Farmer Communities" (English and Khmer)
  - Vietnam – "Handbook for Livelihoods Analysis (LHA) and Participatory Rural Appraisal" (English and Vietnamese)
  - Indonesia – "People, Poverty and Livelihoods: Links for Sustainable Poverty Reduction in Indonesia" (English and some sections in Bahasa Indonesia), World Bank and DFID, 2002

- Twelve language dictionaries
- A good English dictionary

Between-Workshops

Using the outputs from the first workshop, country representatives and teams will reflect on the outcomes, seek wider consultative feedback "at home", review their progress and further develop their "Livelihoods Language Guide", with the aim of making them practical and understandable by the full range of stakeholders, especially communities.

Second Workshop

From 12-14 June 2003 (tentative dates), STREAM would organize the second three-day workshop to follow up on the reflection, stakeholder feedback, review and materials development, and to finalize the "Livelihoods Language Guide". The same participants from the first workshop would be invited for the second workshop.

The purpose of the second workshop would be to turn the shared understandings of participatory livelihoods concepts and approaches into understandings of processes and practices, and a plan for developing language-specific "participatory livelihoods analysis handbooks".

---

8 39 Sukhumvit Road Soi 5, tel: 02-655-2920, fax: 02-6557370

First SPARK-STREAM Workshop on Livelihoods and Languages
Bangkok, Thailand, 9-11 April 2003

Agenda (annotated draft)

Pre-workshop Task

In the week of 24 March 2003, participants will be asked to describe their expectations of what can be achieved by the first workshop, the between-workshop period and the second workshop.

Day One: Wednesday, 9 April		
0830	Opening remarks	▪ Ronet Santos and Bill Savage
0845	Introductions	▪ An activity for everyone to get to know each other
0915	Review of expectations	▪ Presentation and discussion of the pre-workshop task
0940	Overview of the SPARK-STREAM process and first workshop	▪ With reference to the "process" and "agenda" sections of the program
1000	*Break*	
1030	Terms and translations	▪ What word(s) is used for the English "livelihood(s)"? What does this mean literally? What are people's understandings of it? ▪ Repeat with "livelihoods analysis", "participation-participatory", "stakeholder" ▪ What other terms should be considered in the building of shared understandings about livelihoods (analysis) and participatory approaches? ▪ Building language glossaries
1200	*Lunch*	
1300	Self-reflection on livelihoods	▪ Consider participants' own livelihoods as an entry point into understanding meanings of concepts
1400	Ways of thinking and working	▪ What "ways of thinking and working" are implied by participatory livelihoods approaches? Why take this approach to development work? What are the principles involved?
1500	*Break*	
1530	Current documents	▪ What is the current document serving as the basis for your organization's participatory livelihoods analysis work? (approach – process – methods and tools)
1630	*Finish*	

17

Day Two: Thursday, 10 April		
0830	Review of day one and preview of day two	▪ By co-facilitators
0900	Experiences in participatory livelihoods analysis (approach and practice) – introduction	▪ Presentations from STREAM Cambodia and Vietnam, and SPARK Philippines, using a suggested outline of:
0915	STREAM Cambodia	- Capacity-building, training and learning about participatory livelihoods analysis
0945	Discussion	- Description of how the participatory livelihoods analysis was carried out and why
1015	*Break*	
1030	STREAM Vietnam	- Lessons learnt in terms of significant changes, time, cost, staff capacity
1100	Discussion	- How the participatory livelihoods analysis results are used in follow-up activities with communities
1130	SPARK Philippines	
1200	Discussion	
1230	*Lunch*	
1330	Livelihoods Language Guides	▪ Discussion to consider the purpose of the guides, how they might be structured, and what their contents should be ▪ Begin drafting
1500	*Break*	
1530	Livelihoods Language Guides	▪ Continued
1700	*Finish*	

Day Three: Friday, 11 April		
0830	Review of day two and preview of day three	▪ By co-facilitators
0900	Livelihoods Language Guides	▪ Report progress, give and get feedback, begin revising
1000	Break	
1030	Livelihoods Language Guides	▪ Continued
1200	Lunch	
1300	Reflection, stakeholder feedback, review and materials development	▪ What should be involved in the between-workshops period?
1400	Workplans	▪ For the between-workshops period
1500	Break	
1530	Capacity-building needs for carrying out participatory livelihoods analysis	▪ In particular, discussing opportunities for capacity-building in the between-workshops period, second workshop and beyond
1630	Workshop evaluation	
1700	Closing remarks and finish	

Appendix 2 Expectations and Sessions

Day One	
■ Be able to define and understand the meaning of concepts related to livelihoods analysis in my language, explore whether there are any existing meanings and see how these differ from others' understandings of the same concepts	Terms and translations
■ Explore the meaning of "Sustainable Livelihoods", define a concrete meaning of "Sustainable Livelihoods" and come to a common agreement on what "Sustainable Livelihoods" and "participatory" actually means	Self-reflection on livelihoods
■ Build a mutual understanding of concepts such as 'livelihood', 'sustainable', 'participatory' in the various contexts and languages in which we work	
■ Clarify understanding of the relative advantages and disadvantages of participatory approaches to livelihoods analysis	Ways of thinking and working
■ Raise and explore important issues related to language use in the context of participatory approaches to livelihoods analysis	Current documents
■ Gain a clearer understanding of how to share meanings in livelihoods analysis rather than just translating	
■ Understand more clearly the connection between livelihoods and languages in the STREAM-SPARK context	
■ Understand what is meant by "participatory livelihoods" and how it differs from other livelihoods approaches or micro-finance programs	
■ Discuss and clarify misconceptions about participatory approaches to livelihoods analysis as an analytical "lens" or a "program package"	
■ Learn and understand the basic concept of sustainable livelihoods and how it fits into my context	

Day Two

■ Share concepts of "participatory approaches" and "livelihoods", see an overview of the framework and how it can be used, and maybe a sample case of using participatory approaches ■ Get an idea of how the sustainable livelihoods workshops for my country can be conducted	Experiences in participatory livelihoods analysis (approach and practice) – introduction
■ Explore the possibilities for using the framework of Sustainable Livelihoods in the field level (village to district level)	Presentation from STREAM Cambodia
■ Explore and clarify the framework and scope of the "Sustainable Livelihoods"	
■ Gain a clearer understanding of the framework and scope for participatory livelihoods analysis and the methods for gathering and analyzing information	Discussion
■ Clarify understanding of who the stakeholders are (who uses livelihoods analysis, who benefits, how are they involved) to clarify the process and role and responsibilities of NGOs who participate in the process (who to ask, what to ask, how to ask, who is involved in asking, who ask the analysis of the information, and what happens to the analysis)	Presentation from STREAM Vietnam
■ Learn about the practical experience of livelihoods analysis strategies, processes and practices in other STREAM/SPARK countries such as Cambodia, Vietnam and Indonesia in participatory livelihood analysis	Discussion
■ Understand how these related issues are concretely manifested in the experiences of SPARK regional partners or participants in implementing participatory livelihoods approaches and concepts	Presentation from SPARK Philippines
■ Clarify procedures in translating all concepts and idea of participatory and sustainable livelihoods into practices ■ Identify the way to assess/facilitate/analyze community's sustainable livelihoods -- appreciate that we are not starting from scratch when it comes to analytical "lenses" in development, appreciate previous participatory methodologies and how sustainable livelihoods builds on these	Discussion
■ Learn some guiding principles or processes that would better equip us in developing "Livelihoods Language Guides" ■ Explore what the benefits of language guides might be and gain an understanding of the scope of a "Livelihoods Language Guide" and to come to a shared understanding of the value or necessity of producing a "Livelihoods Language Guide" ■ Discuss ways of developing language guides ■ Produce a working draft of the "Livelihoods Language Guidebook" relating to key participatory livelihoods concepts and terms in the language that I use	Livelihoods Language Guides

Day Three

▪ Come up with a commonly agreed upon consultation and feedback system (e.g., who or which groups should be consulted, how extensive the process should be) for the language guide, including (possibly) a common system for documentation	Reflection, stakeholder feedback, review and materials development
▪ Development of feasible workplans for follow-up activities between workshops	
▪ Define roles and responsibilities for involvement in the follow up processes	Workplans
▪ Identify further capacity-building needs of specific stakeholders	Capacity-building needs for carrying out participatory livelihoods analysis

Other Expectations

▪ Gain a sense of the importance of livelihoods analysis and its techniques for development and poverty reduction	Throughout the whole workshop
▪ Network and learn from STREAM and SPARK staff on regional, country and personal levels	
▪ Gain more friends and to learn it with fun and relax I hope!	

Appendix 3 Terms and Translations

Group 1	Group 2
Tagalog: *kabuhayan* – life, alive Bahasa Indonesia: *mata pencaharian* – *mata* (eyes) – to find a resource for the day; *sumber penghidupan* – resources, live Waray: *pakabuhi* – *buhi* (life) English: source of income, occupation, economic activity, holistic Literal meaning: life, after life, *hidup* (life), *kehidupan* (economy) Thai: *karn damrong* (sustain) *cheewit* (life) *Panginabuhi* (life) *Kabuhayan* *Matapencaharian*, *penghidupan*, *kesejahteraan*	Livelihood(s) [written in Khmer] [written in Thai] Tagalog: *pagkabuhay*, *kabuhayan*, *ikinabubuhay* Bahasa Indonesia: *mata pencaharian*, *penghidupan*, *kesejahteraan* Literal meaning: Ways of living, standard of living, cycle of lives, ways of living, maintaining your lives, means of living, main activities, condition of living Broader meaning and people's understanding: What you do for a living How do you live – conditions Feelings about the way you live
Group 3	**Group 4**
Livelihood Ilongo: *palangabuhian*, *palangitan-an* Tagalog: *kabuhayan* Thai: *karn damrong cheewit* Bahasa Indonesia: *mata pencaharian* Nepali: *gujara* (life), *dhandha* (profession), *khayajiya* (sustain) Life: *buhi*, *buhay*, *cheewit*, *gujara* Sustain life: *damrong*, *khayajiya*; *mata* – eye; *cari* – look for *Mata pencaharian* – job, looking for money to survive *Damrong cheewit* – ways to make a living, jobs *Palangabuhian* – ways of making a living for sustenance or for extra income, improve well-being *Palangitan-an* – "income" source *Kabuhayan* – ways to make a living *Dhandha* – profession	Livelihood: source of income, occupation, economic activity, holistic (Thai) Literal meaning – Life – Afterlife *Kehidupan*, *hidup* (life) (connotation – economic) *Karn* (prefix) *damrong* (sustain) *cheewit* (life) *Panginabuhi* (*buhi* – life)

Appendix 4 Self-reflection on Livelihoods

Women	
Livelihood • Need to work to earn a living/help your family • Be independent, survive, challenge, new opportunities • From office worker to development worker, work for local community, now work for the big city • Consultant, comfortable life • NGO environmental education, community organizing • On-going learning process - personal not only a job	**Influences** • "Activist" background, progressive, builds personal commitment • Concern for family • Education • People who we work with
Resources • Skills • Education • Savings (some) • Support, friends, colleagues, mentors • Information • Good relationships • Experiences • Creativity • Empathy from local people supports me	**Help** • Experiences • Education background (share) • Single status (therefore mobile) • Support group • Family and friends • Good job - sustain your soul • Relationships • Adaptable - strength • More opportunities for women now
Vulnerabilities • Travel - difficult to sustain relationships, security risks • away from my family • War • Unemployment, job security • Lack of confidence in self • Health • Lack of skills • Single status • NGO work - financially vulnerable • Balance between consumerism and being modest	Making a difference in people's lives.

Men	
What is (my) livelihood? • Something that we do to sustain our lives • Something we choose to do to ENJOY life	**What influences?** • Enthusiasm • Opportunities (need for development) (policies in place) • Nature (floods, earthquakes) • Perceptions of other people • Soeharto policy (against NGOs) versus Megawati • Culture, values, beliefs
What resources do I have for my livelihood? • Education (knowledge, skills) • Experience • Friends, networks • Family • Freedom to think • Funding • Computers • House • Environment • Enthusiasm, commitment	**What makes me vulnerable?** • Nature (flood) • Security (peace) • Accidents • Disease • Job insecurity and welfare • Policy • Economic crisis (price instability) • Debt, no savings

Appendix 5 SPARK Philippines Presentation

Sustainable Livelihoods Analysis:
The Case of Davao River Conservation Coordinating Committee

Mariel de Jesus, Project Manager, ESSC[9], SPARK Hub Organisation, Philippines

The Original Study
- A community-based planning exercise was done with three communities
- Purpose: to feed into the Davao Catchment Management Plan
- Revisited the study – this time viewing it through the lens of Sustainable Livelihoods

Sustainable Livelihoods Analysis for DRCCC
- Chose an existing study – due to time constraints and ethics
- Results of the analysis will go back to DRCCC as part of a continuing assessment of needs in the area

SLA for DRCCC
- "Dispelling the myth of sustainable livelihoods analysis"
- Show how SLA can be easily applied

Community-Based Planning and Sustainable Livelihoods Analysis
- Focus is more methodologies and selection of tools
- SLA framework allows for more focus on the questions that need to be asked

Community-Based Planning and Sustainable Livelihoods Analysis
- Ask a question
- Design tools, methodology and community process
- Analysis tends to be more on refining the output for presentation purposes
- Ask a question
- Break down the question
- Resulting in a more efficient design for the methodology
- Allows for wider discussion

The Process
- Based on the framework, discussion of what data we needed to collect
- Discussion on what sources of data to use and what tools for data collection

Assets Spreadsheet
- In order to obtain information on the community's assets – list of questions and the methodology and tools to gather the data
- The spreadsheet also allows for scoring – useful for indicative values

The Process
- Identification of data gaps
- Selection of methodologies and tools
- Data collection
- Organizing the information according to the framework
- Discussion and Consensus
- Validation

Description of Study Area

---

9 Environmental Science for Social Change, NGO based at Ateneo de Manila University

- Barangay 2A -is located in the southeastern part of Davao City. Barangay 2-A has a total land area of 17.8 hectares. It has seven puroks or sitios.
- It is designated by the City Land Use Plan as an urban area

Results – Asset Pentagon Barangay 2A

Key Observations and Lessons
- PRA must be carefully designed to obtain best information for sustainable livelihoods analysis
- SLA – familiar tools used in a different way

Key Observations and Lessons
- Analysis may be restricted to "experts"
- One comment we had was that while the SLA framework gives a good picture of the current status of a community - the planning element is not always so clear
- The design and choice of interventions may be left to outsiders, which leaves the question of how participatory the process is

Key Observations and Lessons
- PRA sometimes not adequately designed
- SLA may be useful to design a better and more efficient PRA

Questions
- How accurate is the information we are getting from communities?
- Do communities really have ownership over this process?
- What is the role of "experts"?

Appendix 6 STREAM Cambodia Presentation

Experiences in Participatory Livelihoods Analysis
from Cambodia's Perspectives

Sem Viryak, STREAM Cambodia Communications Hub Manager

Opportunity
- Tensions among stakeholders have increased during the last decade in the fishing lots.
- There has been illegal and widespread destructive fishing within these lots.
- Fisheries policy reform
- Reducing the size of fishing lot and releasing substantial areas. New areas to be managed under (Community Fisheries)
- The fisheries Community cannot achieve the goal of Sustainable Management unless there is substantial external input.
- The major constraint fall for the poorest segment of society is that they cannot secure their livelihood due to inequality in access to aquatic resources.
- DOF & SCALE has a good working relationship.
- SCALE has experience in SLF approach.
- Moving towards capacity building of various stakeholders.
- Develop capacity of DOF staff in SL participatory approach will have a beneficial effect at the provincial level throughout Cambodia.

Role Playing
- The Government involvement (DOF, CFDO and DOWA) provide the central administration office. The provincial staff will form the SL team and run the study.
- DOF has a crucial role in networking and communication.
- SCALE plays a role as a training component.

(Note: In Yak's presentation there are two diagrams here: "Livelihoods learning process" and "Livelihoods process: capacity building".)

PRA Tool and Process
PRA could be seen as more like conversation than a questionnaire survey we have to start where people are in their thinking and their livelihoods strategy; our role is to find out what people do and also try to understand why they do it.

1. SOCIAL MAP

Purpose
- Build relationships with the community.
- Learn from the people
- Explain the meaning of a participatory approach and develop its use with the community.

Procedure
- The study team invites people from all different locations, parts or regions of the village to take part in developing a social map. This involves all people: old, young, male and female.
- The people draw the village layout on the ground starting with the road as the focal point.
- They can use locally available materials such as stones, leaves and sticks to represent the village resources.
- The map is discussed with the people for more information and to make corrections.
- In the study team, there should be a facilitator, note taker and observer. The observer can help with control, like indirectly taking aside aggressive or disruptive members for a brief discussion to ensure smooth running of the session.

Information Gathered
- Village geography, population and number of households
- Resources in the village, e.g., human, natural, social and physical assets
- Problems encountered
- Family status and requirements or needs of the village

Problems
- Being the first exercise, if there are too many people, this can be disruptive.
- It is time-consuming to do a village census by household.
- Drunk people disrupt normal running.
- It is difficult for people to understand the concept and purpose at first.

2. HISTORICAL TIMELINE

Purpose
- To know events that have happened in the village at different times.

Procedure
- Select and interview key informants (elderly people who were born in the village)
- Explain the purpose
- Develop a checklist with the informants of events and times
- Record the information and cross-check it with other people

Information gathered
- People's vulnerability to, for example, natural disasters and seasonal changes
- Availability of resources over time

Problems
- There may be few elderly people who can remember the times of events.
- The times of occurrence may not be correct.

3. TRANSECT WALK

Purpose
- Learn information about the village, and to observe the village situation and conditions.

Procedure
- Select around five adults who are actively involved in farming activities. Also ensure a gender balance.
- Explain the purpose of the exercise. The information required includes: land profile, soil types, crop types and yield, animals (domestic), wild vegetation, e.g., trees, resources per area and problems encountered
- With the villagers, select a direction for the transect walk.
- Walk along the transect, facilitating a build-up of information.
- The villagers then draw the information on paper using symbols and letters to represent their findings.
- The study team takes a photograph of the diagram.
- The diagram can be discussed with the informants for correction and additional information.

Information gathered
- Village profile, soil types, possibilities of improving soil quality
- Problems encountered in each area
- Possibilities for development of the areas

Problems
- Difficult for people to understand the transect concept; they always want to draw a map.
- Using symbols to assist illiterate people to understand is good, but it is sometimes difficult to find people to draw the symbols.

4. WEALTH RANKING

Purpose
- Helps us to know the levels and proportion of standards of living to enable the study team to learn about various groups' levels and facilitate appropriate action plans.

Procedure
- This tool involves a few people (4-5) as key informants and must include the village leader. Selection of the group is possible by using information from the social map.
- The team explains the purpose of the exercise.
- The study team develops a checklist with the informants for the wealth ranking criteria.
- The names and house numbers are written on separate pieces of paper and the informants are asked to group them into various categories. The villagers themselves determine the number of categories.
- Using the checklist, criteria are developed for each of the categories.
- The information is then cross-checked using the records from the social map. This may lead to further discussion and clarification.

Information gathered
- Proportion of standards of living in the village
- Assets of each group
- Livelihoods strategies
- Influences and access to different livelihoods strategies by different groups

Problems
- Concealing of information, especially by well-off families, as they do not want to be referred to as rich. They fear exposure of their status for security reasons or fear to be excluded from donations. (Many people perceive outside organizations as coming to make material or financial donations.)
- The well-off can be angry with neighbors who provide information about them.

5. TRENDLINE

Purpose
- The trendline shows changes in the village at certain times in terms of resources, activities, social settings and other important variables like traditions, wealth, education and economy.

Procedure
- Select elderly men and women to be key informants.
- Explain the purpose of the tool.
- Develop a checklist with the informants from information in the team's possession, from observations and from the informants' knowledge.
- The people draw diagrams showing various trends and mark their own dates. (The diagrams show trends but are not drawn to scale, nor do they need units other than time.)

Information gathered
- Social change
- Changes in human resources
- Effects of change on the community
- Vulnerabilities such as population growth, natural disasters and laws

Problems

- Lack of elderly people who can clearly remember the trends of past events and activities in the village over a long period of time.
- Villagers may be reluctant to draw trendlines by themselves.

6. VENN DIAGRAM

Purpose

- To learn about the institutions associated with the people and the relationships that exist with the village. It helps to know how the people feel about the institutions and key persons that relate to them and their importance to the community.

Procedure

- All people are encouraged to do this exercise: men, women and children.
- The team explains the purpose of the tool.
- First, the people are provided with a large sheet of paper with a circle drawn in the middle to represent the village.
- Provide many pieces of paper cut into three different sizes.
- Villagers draw symbols or write down names of institutions that are most important to them on the large papers and those least important on the small paper.
- Facilitate discussion and record reasons for institutions' distances from the village circle, that is, record reasons why they were placed there according to the farmer's feelings.
- Discuss the diagram for more information and corrections.
- Take a photograph of the diagram.

Information gathered

- Human resources
- Institutions or key persons for the village
- Social structure of the village (i.e., how people relate to each other)
- Skills needed in the village

Problems

- It is difficult to get people to think about all or most of the relevant institutions, as they tend to think along narrow lines of immediate institutions like village leader and commune or formal institutions.
- It difficult to find people able and willing to draw symbols.
- Most people put the village leaders near or close to the village because of bias or fear (their presence makes people not want to disappoint them, even when it is evident that they may not be as close to the people as they portray in the Venn diagram).
- Some institutions with sensitive relationships are difficult to discuss and people may want to omit them or may not bring out the actual scenario, e.g., police.

7. SEASONAL CALENDAR

Purpose

- Learn about people's activities at different times, the level of involvement (busy or not), the problems faced and the resources available.

Procedure

- The team selects adults directly involved in livelihood activities.
- They are separated into men and women groups.
- Explain the purpose of the tool.
- Develop a checklist with the villagers.
- The lunar calendar used in rural areas is applied.
- The study team draws the calendar with the names of the months.

- The villagers then use symbols or letters to represent different activities.
- They can use grains to score the level of involvement from 0-5.
- The seasonal calendar can be discussed for corrections and addition of more information.
- The team takes a picture of the calendar.

Information gathered
- Types of crop by season
- Different gender roles (men's and women's activities)
- Main crops, period of cultivation and fluctuation in prices of products
- Times for various requirements for activities, e.g., inputs like fertilizer and credit. This can contribute to the development of an action plan.
- Times of food shortage, higher income and extra expenditure
- Schedule for off-farm activities like business, paid work or finding firewood
- Trends of shocks, e.g., animal and human diseases, to be able to develop intervention or coping strategies
- Interest rates and accessibility of credit

Problems
- Tends to over focus on major activities
- Some information may be hidden, e.g., illegal activities like logging, cutting of timber and making of charcoal

8. MOBILITY MAP

Purpose
- Learn about people's movements, relationships of villagers with outsiders, inflow and outflow of resources and the economic situations of different groups.

Procedure
- Select at least two households from each wealth ranking group to draw their mobility maps.
- Explain the purpose of the mobility maps.
- Develop a checklist with the villagers related to:
- where they go
- why the journey is taken
- for what purpose
- what they take and what they bring back
- One member of the team observes while another takes notes.
- Provide a paper for the villagers to draw their houses in the centre and draw symbols of the places they go with direction arrows showing what they take and what they bring back.
- A symbol is depicted to indicate whether it is men or women who take the journey.
- The team edits to determine the types of activities, e.g. community, social, family or economic.

Information gathered
- Resources outflow and inflow
- Livelihood strategies
- Income and expenses
- Relationships to outside communities
- Opportunities for social activities such as entertainment and treatment
- Roles of men and women in society
- Strengths, weaknesses and vulnerabilities of people

Problems
- It is time-consuming.
- Many farmers are not able or are reluctant to draw.
- Sometimes this is confused with a daily activity schedule and difficult to capture major events within a period of time.

9. PROBLEM RANKING AND ANALYSIS

Purpose
- Find out major problems in the village and the possible solutions using the resources and strengths of the people.

Procedure
- This exercise involves all people: men, women and children.
- The problems are ranked by using either:
- Voting method if the problems are many, or
- Pair ranking when the problems are less than eight
- The selected problems are analyzed to find their causes and effects.
- Then options and opportunities are discussed for the selected problems.
- The facilitator helps to draw the roots (causes) and the branches (effects) of the problem tree as the discussion goes on.
- The diagram can be discussed for additional information and corrections.

Information gathered
- Kinds of intervention that can be applied in the village
- Major problems in the village and causes, which enables development of appropriate action plans
- Ways of solving problems using locally available resources

Problems
- Difficult for illiterate people to follow because writing (not symbols) is used to develop the problem tree.
- Many people may prefer the ideas of outsiders to their own ideas.
- It takes at least one day to complete the exercise. Therefore, the people who ranked the problems may be different from those analyzing them. This causes differences in understanding and may break continuity.

10. STRENGTH ANALYSIS

Purpose
- Learn about people's way of life, which activities are important for their livelihoods, and those that can be developed or improved.

Procedure
- Interview each of the wealth ranking groups to find out their livelihood strategies (separate men and women).
- Rank the livelihoods strategies by using pair-wise ranking to find out which one is most important.
- Analyze to find which activity can be developed or expanded based on the available resources and abilities of people.
- Discuss the findings with the villagers to add more ideas and for correction.

Information gathered
- Ideas or directions for the action plan.
- Strengths by wealth ranking groups to enable appropriate interventions.
- Effect of the action plan and which economic groups will benefit from it.
- Ideas for using available resources to improve livelihoods.

Problems
- Difficult to identify the strengths of the poorest because most of them are involved in off-farm activities (labor).
- Poor farmers usually do not have ideas to develop their lives compared to better-off families.

11. ACTION PLAN

Purpose
- Develop a simple action plan which involves and is initiated by the villagers, so that they will recognize and be satisfied with all activities towards the implementation.

Procedure
- An action plan is the result of problem analysis and strength analysis.
- All people participate together (men and women) but participation is by wealth ranking groups.
- Use the format prepared by the team, i.e., an outline of the steps, initiatives, participants, materials needed, problems encountered and the timetable for implementation. Step Initiative Participants Materials Problems Time
- The facilitators write down the ideas and steps of the action plan and encourage villagers to build on the ideas.
- Discuss the results with the villagers to get more information and corrections.

Problems
- Villagers may have never done action plans before.
- People may ask for help from outside and do not want to develop their own ideas.
- Villagers may want to start work immediately after completing the action plans, while the team may still be working on survey work and waiting for the action plan to be approved by the office.
- The team cannot respond to the demands or requests of the action plan immediately. They have to consult, while villagers are often sure of what they can do or offer immediately.

Lesson learnt from livelihoods study
- Conversation should be conducted at suitable time and time frame
- It was good for the team to write the report when they were in the village to avoid missing data and then it is easy to write the final report at the office. In the first village the team had not written the report in the village as they spent all their time consulting with villagers and collecting data so when they come back to write the report it was slow and some data was missing.
- It was recommended to spend more time in the village allowing the team to compile reports and verifying the data with villagers.
- Real and good data would come when villagers trust the team and have a good relationship with each other.
- To build trust amongst each other, the teams as well as villagers need to spend an appropriate time together. This trust would be built through the period of time that the team stays in the village, listening to the issues of villagers carefully and building relationships with villagers.
- Daily evaluation was very useful for the team to improve their capacities and adjust the plan in order to achieve the objective of the study.
- The team feels it was difficult to facilitate villagers to do action plans. It was new for villagers to think about each step of an action plan as normally they work without one.
- Women are more active than men in terms of sharing ideas and coming to the meeting.
- The team learnt that to encourage women to participate in PRA exercises the team needs to allocate the time that women are free from cooking. The cooking time varies depending on season and area.
- Teams find it difficult to facilitate villagers to do Venn diagrams.
- How did the Kampong Chhnang team do the transect walk exercise when the whole village was flooded? As the whole village was flooded the team did the transect walk by boat guided by villagers, while on the boat, the team ask villagers about the crop, soil type, problem etc.
- It is useful to work in groups that have different backgrounds as it can help the team to think wider in terms of livelihood apart from just the aquatic resources.

- Classifying rich or poor is not a good way to operate. However, we do wish to know the experiences of poor people and of richer people.
- The team manages to do a social map by dividing the village into two or three parts depending on the dimensions of the village and dividing the team into small groups, then combine them to make the map.
- Crosscheck the data when doing it.
- Building on lines of questioning can be good. It is good practice to use open questions, which elicit new information, rather than mostly closed questions which often elicit the answer yes or no.
- Researchers if invited should do what villagers do, go where they go and share their food.
- Framework for analyzing the significant changes of Knowledge, Attitude and Practice of staffs

How participatory livelihoods analysis results are used
- The outcome of PL analysis will benefit for poor aquatic resources user:
- Provide information on their villages, identify their strengths, develop appropriate aquatic management planning and practices and put into CF action plans.
- Reformulate the fisheries law, and article 15 and new sub-degree of establishment Communities Fisheries.
- Basic information for develop the pilot project.
- The study could help the villagers through the contribution of finding to government and organizations in order to help villagers solving their problems.

Appendix 7 STREAM Vietnam Presentation

Experience from Livelihoods Analysis in Vietnam under SAPA-STREAM (2001-02)

Nguyen Song Ha, STREAM Vietnam Communications Hub Manager

Introduction
- STREAM actually began its initial involvement in Vietnam in early 2001, before the Ministry of Fisheries activated a comprehensive strategy "Sustainable Aquaculture for Poverty Alleviation" (SAPA) in November of the same year.
- Support from DFID/STREAM enabled a number of institutions and local teams to conduct livelihoods analyses in three provinces of Thai Nguyen in the North, Quang Tri in the Central part and Long An in the South.
- The results of this process were reflected in the SAPA document and further fine-tuned through experience and learning with other organizations and projects.

Capacity building, training and learning about participatory livelihoods analysis
- Two training workshops in February and August 2001 gave opportunities for 27 participants from RIA-1, HCMC University of Agriculture and Forestry, provincial DARDs, district and commune level Women's Unions, and Commune People's Committees, to develop skills and understanding of PRA and livelihoods analysis.
- A handbook for PRA applications in Vietnam was an important output from these workshops. Accordingly, the field practice and experience-sharing with other agencies, organizations and individuals further strengthened their capacity.

Description of DFID-funded pilot livelihoods analysis
Process
Establishment of study teams =>Meeting/training =>Fieldwork => Data analysis => Reporting

Timeline of key events
February 2001: Training workshop in Thai Nguyen
August 2001: Training workshop in Quang Tri
October 2001: Actual practice in Thai Nguyen, Quang Tri and Long An
November 2001: SAPA inception workshop in Hanoi
February 2002: SAPA review workshop in Hanoi
November 2002: Learning workshop on LHA in Long An

Weaknesses/constraints
No actual presentation of results/data within communities for validation
Language problem (in Quang Tri): Difficult communication with ethnic minorities
Difference between information sources
Limited participation of grassroots people in data analysis. People with technical background tend to dominate the process
Monitoring, evaluation and feedback were not paid attention
Case studies were not carried out at some sites.

Lessons learnt in terms of significant changes, time, cost, staff capacity

Significant changes (from those who attended LHA workshop in Long An, including 2001 LHA team members and other groups who also learnt PRA/LHA independently):

To communities:
More confident
Better relationships
More understanding
Increased income
More opportunities
Less pressure
Better understanding and awareness
More self-determination
Stronger roles
More involvement and participation
More capacity
More co-operation
Greater voice

To organizations:
More sustainable methods
More effective policies
improved staff ability
More practical knowledge disseminated
More supportive
Stronger capacity
Improved collaboration
Better understanding
More confident
More two-way information exchange
Improved democracy and solidarity

Significant changes
To oneself:
More confident
More friendly
Improved capacity
More understanding and learning
More context specific
More appreciative of farmer experience and knowledge
More engaged in advocacy and policy influence
More respectful and hopeful
More pro-active

Time and cost
Travel to remote communes was affected by bad weather and road conditions

Use of participatory livelihoods analysis results in follow-up activities with communities

<u>Under SAPA</u>
- □ Sharing the experiences with other provinces during and after SAPA workshop in November 2002
- □ Negotiation with MPI is going on to formulate new projects for poverty reduction in poor communes based on participatory approaches and LHA (one of these will hopefully start in May 2003)

<u>Under STREAM</u>
- □ Supporting SAPA in capacity-building and networking at provincial, national and regional levels.
- □ Identifying key areas and approaches within STREAM CSP, which promote participatory planning, implementation, evaluation and monitoring of aquatic resources management and aquaculture development plans
- □ Workshop in 2002 as a follow-up activity to reflect on the experience and identifying lessons, hear from more experienced practitioners of PRA/LHA.

Thank you!

Appendix 8 Livelihoods Language Guide Draft

Livelihoods Language Guide for *"Language Name"* (draft)

written by *"your name(s)"*
published by SPARK and STREAM

Purpose

What is a "livelihoods language guide"?

This document is a guide to the language used – and how language is used – in carrying out participatory livelihoods analysis. Readers will be guided in developing their approach to livelihoods analysis so that their ways of thinking about and working with communities allow them to learn from, communicate with and understand people's experiences of livelihoods analysis in a variety of contexts. The "livelihoods language guide" also aims to generate awareness of issues related to language, participation and power.

The guide should be dynamic, taking on new terms and meanings as they emerge within the field. Thus the guide should be revised periodically.

Should there be one English guide or a guide in each English "variety"?

What isn't it?

It's not a handbook and it's not lengthy.

Why has this guide been written?

It has been said that "good" livelihoods analysis practice is about having "conversations" with people in communities to learn and understand about their livelihoods. It is about establishing trusting relationships and working together to plan and implement activities which will improve the lives of communities. It has also been realized that we experience "communication gaps" in our roles as people who often find ourselves "in the middle". There are differences in the ways that we, and people in communities, use language; between the ways that government and NGO people talk, between people who live in rural and urban areas, and among different languages.

The purpose of the "livelihoods language guide" is to build common understandings – across different levels and contexts – of participatory livelihoods concepts, approaches, processes and practices, and meanings of the words commonly associated with them. In particular, this document will invite readers to consider how participatory and inclusive they are in working with people in communities, and can guide our community colleagues to a clearer understanding of why we are taking a livelihoods approach to development.

We need to say something about the importance of "understanding". What understandings are there? What are the local understandings and what are the dominant understandings, and how are these related to power?

How was the guide developed?

The "livelihoods language guide" began with the coming together of 18 SPARK and STREAM colleagues who represent seven countries and the 13 languages in which the guide is being published.[10] In their first workshop, these colleagues considered terms and translations used in

---

[10] The thirteen languages are Bahasa Indonesia, Bangla, Cebuano, English, Hindi, Ilonggo, Khmer, Nepali, Oriya, Tagalog, Thai, Vietnamese and Waray.

livelihoods analysis work, reflected on their own livelihoods, and thought about livelihoods approaches as ways of thinking and working – not just ways of getting information and data. In the workshop, the authors of the "livelihoods language guides" also learned from the experiences of livelihoods practitioners in Cambodia, the Philippines and Vietnam, and gained an understanding of the scope and challenge of actually carrying out livelihoods analyses.

Following the first workshop, the authors reflected on its outcomes and outputs, and then got wider consultative feedback "at home", in other words, comments on and recommendations about the language guide from local practitioners. They then reviewed their progress and further developed the "livelihoods language guide". This provided a way to make the guide practical and understandable by a full range of stakeholders, especially communities, their own colleagues, other NGOs and government organizations. It also gave the authors experience in the sharing of understandings and meanings with others.

In a second workshop, the authors turned their shared understandings of participatory livelihoods concepts and approaches into understandings of processes and practices for carrying out livelihoods analysis. They were able to validate the importance of the language guide, particularly in the context of implementing participatory livelihoods approaches, and the value of reaching common understandings.

Who could use the guide?

This "livelihoods language guide" will be an essential reference for anyone working through a participatory livelihoods approach, especially practitioners who work directly with communities, and members of communities themselves. Such colleagues may work with NGOs, local government units and inter-government organizations.

Where, when and how might the guide be used?

The guide could be used anywhere and any time people are together to discuss what participatory approaches to livelihoods analysis are, and how they will be carried out with communities, including their methods and tools. These discussions may include clarification of various actors' understandings of the meanings of concepts, and of their own roles and responsibilities.

What is in the guide?

The "livelihoods language guide" contains:

- Explanations of the meanings of terms and translations, including the elements of livelihoods frameworks, methods and tools *(including what is meant by "language")*
- "Real-life" examples about livelihoods concepts, approaches, processes and practices *(Whose examples and stories should we use? local? country specific? What anecdotes do you have? An example was given from a Cambodia workshop and a village's experience of making a "social map".*
- Stories of experiences which highlight the importance of language and communication in participatory livelihoods approaches
- Activities which readers can use on their own and with colleagues to broaden their understanding of livelihoods and language *(What kinds of process might stakeholders engage in?)*
- A glossary with local language meanings of terms used in livelihoods analysis

Structure

Contents

Appendix 9 Expectations of Between-workshops and Second Workshop

Between-Workshops Expectations

Development of Livelihoods Language Guide
- Understand how this handbook could be used as a tool in supporting community-based activities in their country
- Development of draft Livelihoods Language Guide in the languages we use
- A draft participatory livelihoods analysis handbook
- Produce an easy-to-understand livelihoods handbook with a user's guide
- Agree on the translation of this handbook into the relevant languages, with a view to sharing knowledge with partners
- Process how this guide/handbook can be used to support Sustainable Livelihoods forums in each country
- Consolidate documentation that can facilitate the improvement of the local language guide

Feedback for Livelihoods Language Guide
- Solicit comments and feedback, including recommendations, on the language guide from local practitioners or important stakeholders
- Consult with a wide range of stakeholders on the Livelihoods Language Guide and reach some common terms and meanings
- Get feedback from stakeholders on the Livelihoods Language Guides and integrate this into a revised guide
- Identify more stakeholders who can participate in the process in transferring this to their networks and participating of the language guide development
- Explore issues around translation and sharing of meanings with groups doing livelihoods analysis

Building capacity and gaining experience in participatory livelihoods analysis
- Gain experience in sharing of meaning with the identified stakeholders and document this experience
- Learn techniques and methodology of the participatory approach for working with communities and thus, explore the participatory process for community development
- Confirm capacity-building needs of specific stakeholders and reflect on how we assessed capacity of stakeholders
- Be conscious of other issues or factors related to language and participatory livelihoods approaches and concepts that may have been previously overlooked or undetected
- Reflect on how we choose stakeholders who would be involved in livelihoods analysis
- Conduct an evaluation process by community participation such as action research
- Clarify role and responsibilities of the community organizations in participating in the sustainable livelihood process
- Conduct activities spelled out in the workplan prepared during the first workshop
- Support the practical understanding of wider stakeholders on "sustainable livelihoods" concepts and approaches in the local context

Sharing ideas from the workshop
- Share the ideas and experience of the workshop with partners, colleagues, senior officers, advisory group members, communities and/or NGOs and other stakeholders

Expectations for the Second Workshop

Sharing between-workshops experiences
▫ Experiences gained in the between-workshops period
▫ Reflection on experience in between workshops are shared, synthesized and these feed into the plans for developing a language specific guides
▫ Sharing of the feed back from each country
▫ Sharing of experiences in the feedback process of the language guide

Development of Livelihoods Language Guide
▫ Second edition of the livelihoods language guide
▫ Review the work done so far
▫ Hope to finalize the Thai language guide as much as possible
▫ Prepare final participatory livelihoods analysis handbook
▫ Developing language specific "participatory livelihoods analysis handbook"
▫ Easy to understand and applicable livelihoods language guide
▫ Share practical experience of livelihood language guide preparation in each country
▫ Livelihood Language Guide will be finalized and a plan for language-specific "participatory livelihoods analysis handbooks" will be developed and implementable
▫ Validate the importance or value of the language guide, particularly in the context of implementing participatory livelihoods approaches
▫ Process how this guide or handbook can be used to support the forums related to Sustainable Livelihoods in each country and how it can support activities at the community level

Development of participatory livelihoods analysis handbook
▫ Level-off on the value of developing language-specific "participatory livelihoods analysis handbooks"
▫ Understand the meaning of the participatory livelihoods analysis handbooks

Understanding of concepts related to livelihoods and languages and their relation to our work
▫ Level-off on the understanding of participatory livelihood practices and processes
▫ Gain a better understanding of the processes and practices involved in participatory livelihoods development
▫ Understand fully the concepts, processes and practices of participatory livelihoods analysis and their applicability in each country
▫ Clarify the link of these Sustainable Livelihoods workshops to the rest of SPARK activities
▫ Validate the (common and shared) understanding of livelihoods concepts and approaches

Supportive networking
▫ Learn techniques on how to develop networks, strengthen capacity of community leader, CSO staffs for the efficient networks.
▫ Broaden the community networks and strengthen the network
▫ Plan for gathering stakeholders' feedback, review, and publications of the LHA handbook

Decisions on future directions
▫ Plan of action for language specific guides formulated by each group, and plans for sharing results later among participants agreed
▫ See what we should do next or will the process end?
▫ Plan for responding to capacity-building needs initially formulated
▫ Clarify links between the outcomes of the livelihoods workshops at the Regional Workshop to be held in October
▫ Formulate an annual activity "Sustainable Livelihoods and Language" to assist each country to understand and be able to organize their national activities (SPARK)
▫ Utilize the livelihoods language guide as a tool to support community-based initiatives

Appendix 10 Evaluation

[Note: Responses with the same number came from the same person.]

How much have we achieved the purpose and outputs of the workshop, and met your own expectations?

1. 95%
2. Actually, I have a different expectation with regards to this workshop. Maybe it's the way I understand the communication (for me to attend) was different. However, I honestly believe that the workshop achieved its purpose and outputs since I'm beginning to understand things more clearly.
3. Quite surprised that we have covered the intended outputs at the workshop and ended the last day session not as late as I anticipated, the understanding about livelihoods and approaches I've gained from the workshop would somehow guide me in developing the "Guide" that we hope to produce.
4. I feel I am getting there. At least I can see clearer what I (we) need to do relates to the "Livelihoods". This workshop facilitates me to think about what I can do to explore the meaning of "Livelihoods".
5. In terms of awareness of issues related to language and livelihood, I feel we achieved the purpose. But I did not get my expectation especially learning new techniques of sustainable livelihoods analysis
6. Almost 100%
7. I think I have achieved so many things from this workshop.
8. I think I can grade on "very good", since most of the intended purpose and outputs have been achieved.
9. We achieved about 95% of workshop purpose and output. It meet about 90% my expectation
10. Fairly achieved.
11. My own expectations were met: mainly clarity on communication issues around livelihoods analysis. But regarding the purpose and the outputs of the workshop, I think people are still stuck in focusing on the SL framework, rather than "ways of thinking and working". But the "first nine words", I think are a great first step.
12. Maybe we haven't really achieved an actual draft of the livelihoods and language guide, but I think the process we took to get where we are is more valuable. Why? Because I now have more of a sense of how to proceed, and the activities for the future (e.g., SPARK plans) much clearer. I also think we were able to get a better understanding of what we mean when we say livelihoods. I expected a DFID framework and how it can be used. This didn't happen and in a way, I guess, this is good because it didn't "box" us in or force us to think of livelihoods in exactly that way. So through the self-reflection, I was able to experience a livelihoods analysis and understand it without any framework imposed on me.
13. Purpose and outputs of the workshop: though we did not achieve the maximum (or all the stated objectives and outputs, e.g., draft language guide). Being more sensitive, conscious and mindful of reaching a shared understanding among participants, for me is far more important/valuable. Own expectations: basic expectation of understanding the crucial link between livelihoods and language has been achieved.
14. Not enough clear to explore the possibilities for using the framework of SL in the field level.
15. Some expectations were met, e.g., the working plan and how to relate SL with the existing tools that have been used. Relationship between language and livelihood is difficult when apply to Thailand, but we have got some feedback on this which makes us know how to approach the activity next.
16. Better understanding on the framework was achieved and learn about the experience from STREAM which is even better.
17. Half-way through. Some expectations were met. I realized that the rest of my expectations would have to be found from my own practice.
18. Achieved in the way that be able to analysis the "livelihood" in both local and other language context now. Besides, it is a good chance to learn the new process, both its advantage and disadvantage as well as its confusion. The process of SL is still not clear. However, I learn it with fun and in the interactive way.

What do you think about the workshop sessions and methods?

1. Excellent. Facilitators worked very hard and in responsible way.
2. Although it may be a bit heavy because it allows us to think and think deeper, the sessions and methods are more relax in general. It means that they allow us to be ourselves and what we mean and say here means a lot to the facilitators.
3. Quite good! Not much pressure, but the outputs were reasonable good.
4. Very good sessions and methods. It perhaps will be better (not sure) if we also mention the outputs of this each workshop.
5. It's great I learned a lot about how is the role of "team facilitator".
6. ☺ Great!! Through sharing session and group discussion, I can learn about the topics and techniques of facilitation as well.
7. It's great.
8. I think the workshop sessions is rather short and methods is OK.
9. It is good, more interesting, more participatory, more brainstorming type.
10. A new experience which open up new perspectives by doing my job at different perspective and perhaps coming up with different results.
11. The methods are flexible and it's good that we always look/review the purpose and I like the feedback mechanisms where we try to ensure we are on the same page. I think that it is also good that participants came forward to perform roles, such as energizer (leading this).
12. Workshop session well run and managed; time to discuss in our groups was helpful. The schedule wasn't too draining. Input and questions asked helped to focus on the task at hand.
13. Flexible, simple but stimulating, "participatory".
14. Facilitators – good; methods – good (but needed more icebreakers).
15. The facilitation was excellent and the sessions were relaxing, rather than draining. The methods of allowing us to analyze our livelihoods is very interesting.
16. A great consistency and coherent. Arrangement of small tables is particularly helpful in terms of convenience.
17. The methods used in the workshop is good to facilitate the self-learning and sharing of experience: group seating (local (national) language discussion). But the time allocation to session on Day 2 was not enough for learning and discussion across languages and cultures.
18. The session is not too bored. Good time management. Good facilitated even the content is difficult. The facilitators have done well in convincing people to participate, think rather than lecture.

How do you feel about your own participation in and contributions to the workshop?

1. Although I am the only virtual participant, but I've been well informed and able to contribute to 80% of my capacity to the workshop.
2. I feel that I was able to participate fairly well during the discussion. The points I raised were properly taken down which means that what I say really matters to the group.
3. Reasonably fine but I think we could have come up with better discussions if there's some "facilitator" assisting/guiding to start up the group discussion.
4. I think its OK.
5. I really want to learn, to share or contribute to the workshop, and I did it.
6. I felt my contribution was not optimum, due to I was not well prepare before attending/participate this workshop ☹ And also with the limitation of my English I cannot express all my idea and opinion during the workshop.
7. I fully participate in the workshop. I also contribute many things to develop the Livelihood Handbook/Guide.
8. I feel I shared something interesting and I have something new in my mind.
9. I participate fully and contribute how much I can. Due to less knowledge and field experiences my contribution is I think a little bit lower than experienced participants.
10. It was a good experience.
11. Towards the end I deliberately encouraged the others in my group to participate, but I think I could play a more regional role, although this is difficult because I have a rational "hat" as well.
12. I feel good about my participation – even just within the country group discussions. I feel that comments and suggestions I made were well received.
13. Tentative at times (esp. at times when I felt unsure of my role) but otherwise okay.

43

14. Not 100% participate because this is the first things to me. I'll try to share what I've been got to other people but also I expect to get feedback from others about their livelihood concepts to make create of mine and themselves.
15. Satisfactory, I think because everyone was so friendly, therefore I feel comfortable and confidence to speak out. Also because we have allow to express our concerns therefore we could release our frustration and found resolution to solve problem.
16. I could only participate during the small group discussion because of the language barrier.
17. It was satisfied to a certain extent. Even though I got frustrated at certain point, the facilitators and friends were generous enough to give opportunities for me to speak out the concerns.
18. I feel comfortable to speak even I did not present anything at least I feel I can follow even I don't understand some point.

What is the most important thing you learned this week?

1. Consensus on the way of working to attain targeted outcomes/outputs of the process.
2. This is not an easy task – but I guess we need to start something if we want to change the ways of thinking and working of other people particularly in the word livelihoods. For many, this may mean only economic activity, but now I have come to realize that it is more than that – it encompasses all aspects of our lives and other people's lives.
3. That how awesome the tasks may look, it becomes less 'threatening' if you break them down into certain/several exercises whose outputs will eventually feed into the final overall outputs of the workshop.
4. The importance of a common understanding of "livelihoods".
5. Facilitation works when it involves real life experiences. That's what I feel when we discussed in self-reflection on livelihoods session.
6. I realize that livelihood analysis is a holistic analysis, I should improve and learn more… and more from others.
7. Well, I learn many things but the important thing I learn is "how to work in a team" and "how to share knowledge".
8. Sharing "lessons learned" (SLA) and way of thinking and working.
9. Livelihood concept; livelihood language guide; importance of livelihood analysis; livelihood framework.
10. Role of communication (using the language of your target communities) in conducting good livelihood analysis.
11. The difference between definition, meaning and connotation. The definition of capacity as a role. This is key for me, as it helps in determining whose capacities need to improve and why.
12. I do have an understanding of livelihoods analysis. I can actually explain/communicate my learnings about livelihoods analysis to others.
13. Learning never stops.
14. I feel more understanding about participatory livelihood concepts, terms and approaches according to my experience and other participants from different places.
15. Analyze one's own livelihood is extremely difficult therefore I should put myself in the community's shoes to understand how they feel when being asked question.
16. Holistic perception is the key to sustainability.
17. It's difficult to speak or reflect on yourself.
18. The well known framework, sometime, does not suit with the local situation. The practitioner should observe and adopt it with analytical ways.

Anything else?

1. No
2. Now I know that the journey to a thousand miles is not only through a single step but through the first nine words at least for this Livelihoods and Language Workshop. Way to go, Pal!!
3. Thanks. I guess I'm not only learning the things that the workshop aimed to give but also some tips for how to facilitate workshops by observing what and how Bill and Kath did things in every session. Again, thank you very much.
4. I feel I was lost when we had to write our concerns. It perhaps will be better if we always make sure that we are in the same understanding/levels, same focus.
5. Thanks a lot for Bill, Kath and Susan who facilitate us and VSO Thailand for arranging the workshop and SPARK and STREAM as well.
6. None
7. We need to organize these type of workshops more.
8. None
9. Learn how to laugh making fun with friends in dinner and other time too, to make fresh and energetic one's self. I learn some computer technique too.
10. None
11. Looking forward to the second workshop. I will consciously, focus on supporting Indonesia and Thailand between the 2 workshops as I am always based in the Philippines.
12. Thank you! I think the workshop was very helpful and enjoyable. Good discussions among colleagues and good opportunity to learn.
13. I appreciate the workshop very much! Thank you!! ☺
14. Facilitation: no matter how many tools I use or what tools I use, but the important thing is how to make people talk and listening each other. Good data would come when communities/people trust me and have a good relationship with each other. (I agree with this phrase based on my experience)
15. None
16. None
17. None
18. None