

STREAM



Support to Regional Aquatic Resources Management



**DFID NRSP Project R8363
Enhancing Development Impact of Process Tools Piloted in Eastern India**

Better-Practice Guidelines Workshop

*Hanoi, Vietnam
17-18 June 2005*

About the Cover Photograph

The workshop participants reviewed and assessed Better-Practice Guidelines they had produced in Bahasa Indonesia, Bengali, English, Hindi, Ilongo, Khmer, Myanmar, Nepali, Oriya, Sinhala, Urdu and Vietnamese.

Enhancing Development Impact of Process Tools Piloted in Eastern India

Better-Practice Guidelines Workshop

Hanoi, Vietnam
17-18 June 2005

DFID NRSP Project R8363
February 2004 – August 2005

Kath Copley, Graham Haylor, Supawan Ponglumyai and William Savage

Contents

Figures, Boxes and Tables	ii
Acronyms	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Executive Summary	v
Background	1
Purpose and Objectives	1
Day One	2
Overview of the Workshop	2
History of Better-Practice Guidelines in STREAM	2
Workshop Kit and CD	3
Poster Session	4
Review of R8363 Better-Practice Guidelines	4
Group Feedback	5
Review of Other Better-Practice Guidelines	7
Western Orissa Rural Livelihoods Project (WORLP)	7
Authored by Local Practitioners	8
Day Two	9
Review of Day One	9
Feedback on Policy Briefs	9
Other Policy Briefs to Consider	10
Other Better-Practice Guidelines to Consider	11
Group Feedback	11
Promoting and Using Better-Practice Guidelines and Policy Briefs	13
Evaluation	14
Appendices	
1. Participants	16
2. Workshop Agenda	17
3. Workshop CD Contents	18
4. Project Logical Framework	20

Figures, Boxes and Tables

Figure 1	A History of Better-Practice Guidelines	2
Box 1	Workshop Kit	3
Figure 2	Workshop Host Song Ha and Reby Review BPG Posters	4
Box 2	Some Points on Translation	5
Box 3	A Point on Formatting	5
Box 4	Comments on “Self-Help Groups”	6
Box 5	Comments on “Consensus-Building Process”	7
Box 6	Comments on “Information Access Surveys”	7
Box 7	Comments on Photographic Content	7
Box 8	Comments on “Buying Fish Seed”	8
Box 9	Comments on “Setting Up an OAS”	8
Box 10	Comments on “Building Consensus” Policy Brief	10
Box 11	Comments on “Livelihoods Approaches” Policy Brief	10
Table 1	Promoting and Using BPGs and PBs	13

Acronyms

ADB	Asian Development Bank
BFAR	Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (Philippines)
BPG	Better-Practice Guidelines
CBNRM	Community-Based Natural Resources Management
CBO	Community-Based Organization
CBP	Consensus-Building Process
CFDD	Community Fisheries Development Division (Cambodia)
CHM	Communications Hub Manager
CSP	Country Strategy Paper
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DFID	Department for International Development (UK)
DGA	Directorate General of Aquaculture (Indonesia)
DOF	Department of Fisheries
DOFD	Department of Fisheries Development (Nepal)
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FRMP	Fisheries Resources Management Project (Philippines)
GO	Government Organization
IAS	Information Access Survey
IEC	Information, Education and Communication
INGO	International Non-governmental Organization
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
Lao PDR	Lao People's Democratic Republic
LGU	Local Government Unit (Philippines)
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
NACA	Network of Aquaculture Centres in Asia-Pacific
NAFEC	National Fisheries Extension Centre (Vietnam)
NAQDA	National Aquaculture Development Authority (Sri Lanka)
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NRSP	Natural Resource Systems Programme
OAS	One-stop Aqua Shop
OASIS	One-stop Aqua Shop Information Service
PB	Policy Brief
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
R8100	DFID NRSP Project "Investigating Improved Policy on Aquaculture Service Provision to Poor People"
R8334	DFID NRSP Project "Promoting the Pro-Poor Policy Lessons of R8100 with Key Policy Actors in India"
R8363	DFID NRSP Project "Enhancing Development Impact of Process Tools Piloted in Eastern India"
RO	Regional Office
SHG	Self-Help Group
STREAM	Support to Regional Aquatic Resources Management
SUFA	Support for Freshwater Aquaculture (DANIDA)
SUMA	Support for Marine and Brackishwater Aquaculture (DANIDA)
TCP	Technical Cooperation Program (FAO)
UK	United Kingdom
WWF	World Wildlife Fund
WORLP	Western Orissa Rural Livelihoods Project

Acknowledgements

- We are grateful to DFID NRSP for responding positively in providing funds to this extra uptake promotion activity associated with project R8363, as proposed by the STREAM Initiative.
- STREAM would like to thank the Ministry of Fisheries in Hanoi, especially the newly established National Aquaculture and Fisheries Extension Centre, for hosting and contributing to the cost of this regional workshop to promote the uptake of Better-Practice Guidelines (BPGs) and Policy Briefs (PBs).
- Thanks to the senior government officials and STREAM regional and national staff from ten Asia-Pacific countries for participating in this workshop. The discussions of the BPGs and PBs developed by R8363 and R8334 – and the concept of these communications tools for local service providers – were valuable as we continue to share good ideas among countries and regions. Their efforts will promote the documents produced, improve prospects for their sharing and – we hope – will grow into a network for the future development and sharing of this first collection of BPGs and PBs in twelve languages of the region.
- Specifically, we would like to thank Nguyen Song Ha, STREAM Vietnam Communications Hub Manager, and Rebecca Cajilig, STREAM Regional Program Officer, for their organization and smooth running of the logistics, accommodation and other arrangements for the workshop.
- Thank you to Kath Copley and Bill Savage for their excellent facilitation and help in documenting the workshop.
- We are grateful to Supawan Ponglumyai, our Information Technology Associate, for her assistance in developing a CD for distribution to participants before they left.
- STREAM values greatly the dedicated efforts of all the workshop participants, for their face-to-face and virtual contributions and the opinions they shared during this process, and their continuing efforts in the production and promotion of Better-Practice Guidelines and Policy Briefs.

Executive Summary

This workshop report is an output from an additional uptake and promotion activity of the DFID NRSP Project R8363 “Enhancing Development Impact of Process Tools Piloted in Eastern India”, which was extended to the end of August 2005. It describes a Better-Practice Guidelines (BPG) Workshop which was the latest project activity to share process tools for Building Social Capital (Self-Help Groups), Consensus-Building and Information Access Surveys. Since the project began, the BPG genre has expanded from the original three concepts shared, to currently twenty-five BPGs prepared not only by STREAM but also by farmers and fish producers. The genre has also been adopted by other organizations, including the DFID-funded Western Orissa Rural Livelihoods Project (WORLP) to share rural aquaculture techniques, and Stirling University to support the uptake and promotion of their work on Self-Recruiting Species and Local Resource User Groups.

The workshop was attended by STREAM National Coordinators and Communications Hub Managers from Cambodia, India, Indonesia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Sri Lanka and Vietnam, and STREAM Regional Office colleagues based in Thailand, Australia and India. The participants reviewed and assessed the BPGs and Policy Briefs (PB) in Bahasa Indonesia, Bengali, English, Hindi, Ilongo, Khmer, Myanmar, Nepali, Oriya, Sinhala, Urdu and Vietnamese. They also began to plan how the uptake and promotion of these tools may be specifically supported in each national context as well as planning the development of further BPG and PB topics.

Background

This workshop is part of the DFID NRSP Project R8363 “Enhancing development impact of process tools piloted in Eastern India”, which follows on from two previous NRSP projects: R6759 “Integrating aquaculture into farming systems of the eastern plateau of India” and R8100 “Investigating improved pro-poor policy on aquaculture service provision”. The first project worked with farmers to develop and document a means whereby farmers of scheduled castes and tribes in Self-Help Groups in India could engage in aquaculture in seasonal ponds. The second project enabled disadvantaged groups to influence policy changes to improve their livelihood opportunities associated with small-scale aquaculture development. These projects developed three “process tools” as research products which may be valuable for planning and implementing service provision for groups of poor people.

NRSP recognize that improved communication and dialogue among development stakeholders is important in facilitating the scaling-up of livelihoods approaches. This workshop is a component of R8363, an “uptake promotion” project on the role that these tools might play in resolving aquatic resources management issues. Previous project activity has included representatives from seven countries¹ coming together to develop Better-Practice Guidelines for these three tools. This workshop builds on existing relationships among the project team developed through the STREAM Initiative. It was held in Hanoi in response to a request of the Vietnam Ministry of Fisheries to contribute to and host a regional workshop to promote the uptake of Better-Practice Guidelines and Policy Briefs in Vietnam and more widely in the region.

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this workshop is to support a range of *target institutes*² in the region to provide more quality benefits to *ultimate beneficiaries* located in *non-project sites* in [NRSP] *target and non-target countries* through the *enhanced uptake and promotion* of *process tools* from R6759 and R8100 for the delivery of improved rural services. [See the Project Logical Framework in Appendix 4.]

Specifically, the objectives of the workshop were to:

- Review and develop STREAM Better-Practice Guidelines and Policy Briefs and the process to generate them
- Support service providers to better use the knowledge that these projects have generated in ways that can benefit poor people, specifically, the BPGs on Self-Help Groups (SHG), Consensus-Building Process (CBP) and Information Access Surveys (IAS)
- Update on existing Better-Practice Guidelines and Policy Briefs
- Brainstorm ways to promote and use Better-Practice Guidelines and Policy Briefs in STREAM countries
- Discuss and prioritize ideas for additional Better-Practice Guidelines and Policy Briefs
- Decide on next steps and a timeframe for further Better-Practice Guidelines and Policy Briefs

¹ Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Nepal, Philippines, Sri Lanka and Vietnam

² Italicized terms are those of NRSP

Rubu did something interesting with regard to the Discussion Forum. He translated the three draft versions into Bengali and got some feedback from farmers. He posted the comments on the Discussion Forum, which was useful because we were able to make them more accessible to communities. As well as developing the BPGs, we were developing a process where people without access to the Internet could contribute.

It was also from Rubu's feedback that we got the first signs that there was a need for other BPGs, and that community members could take the lead on writing them. They also expressed a need for technical guidelines.

One of the most important things about this process is that it has taken a long time, but it has been useful. It has also spread into other areas, and there are now within STREAM about 25 BPGs. Some of these have been commissioned from STREAM and funded by DFID at the request of the Orissa State Government for sharing ideas about aquaculture with farmers and fishers in rural areas.

Another interesting thing that happened is that through our work with farmers we began to encourage them to contribute BPGs of their own within this genre. The first ones were drawn from a research project which STREAM was coordinating, but further down the history of the BPGs, our role changed from being authors to being distributors and facilitators to share learning.

Seeing the emerging new genre (on our website), another uptake and promotion activity (being conducted by the University of Stirling in Scotland) have emulated the approach, producing a Better-Practice Guideline and Policy Brief of their own. They have commissioned the STREAM Vietnam Communications Hub Manager to translate these into Vietnamese and have sent their English drafts to this workshop requesting our feedback.

Song Ha then described the Stirling University contract with STREAM Vietnam to help with sharing research products they had generated. The Stirling University project outputs had drawn on the STREAM PB and BPG genres for sharing about "Self-recruiting Species from Farmer Managed Aquatic Systems" (PB) and "Local Resource User Groups" (BPG). Song Ha invited participants to review the work of "STREAM Vietnam and Stirling".

Workshop Kit and CD

Everyone was guided through the workshop kit contents (Box 1). A CD containing the most recent versions of all BPGs and PBs accompanies this report (see the contents in Appendix 3).

Box 1 Workshop Kit

- Program
- BPG cover sheet (English)
- R8363 BPGs (English – 3)
- R8334 PB (CBP, English – 1)
- WORLP BPGs (English – 18) [five on posters only]
- FAO TCP PB (English – 1)
- FAO TCP BPGs (English – 1)
- Farmer-authored BPGs (2)

Poster Session

The participants were then invited to develop posters from their current versions of Better-Practice Guidelines in Bahasa Indonesia, Bengali, English, Hindi, Ilongo, Khmer, Myanmar, Nepali, Oriya, Sinhala, Urdu and Vietnamese.



Figure 2 Workshop Host Song Ha and Reby Review BPG Posters

Review of R8363 Better-Practice Guidelines

In groups we critiqued our work around the issues of:

- Translation
- Format
- Audience and Content

Group Feedback

Translation

- We considered that the language used in the BPGs is still somewhat complicated and might be made even simpler in future versions, perhaps with fewer words and more instances where pictures are used. Long sentences are complex to translate. We also need to consider priorities and resources when considering further versions. It is important, however, to portray meaning accurately. In Indonesia, we have added explanatory content. The content is meaningful to our audience.

- The translation need not be literal but the meaning should be captured and translated. Literal translation is not necessary and unlikely to be meaningful outside its own language context.

For example, when translating the Self-Help Group BPG (on page 2), where it says “start small: small groups are less likely to be dominated by a minority or lead to arguments” we have written “some few influential people” in place of “a minority”. So we have changed the words to share the meaning. “Building networks and connectedness” is difficult to translate. Maybe we should integrate some definitions into single meanings or make it clearer for translation.

- The references to “making mistakes” (and that this is OK) need to also make it clearer that the point is to learn from mistakes, as Robert Chamber says “to fail forwards”.
- As a matter of process, could we decide collectively about the title so that it is easy to translate into each language and not derive it first in English?

Box 2 Some Points on Translation

- We need to translate the meaning, not text literally.
- Simple words and short sentences are best.
- Some English words and phrases are difficult to translate.

Format

- The formatting is attractive with the photographs, but the pictures should illustrate the text. Some might benefit from captions. Also some of the picture quality could be improved; some picture resolutions appear to be too low. The “other language” translations of “Support to Aquatic Resources Management” are a picture. Can we revise this for translation?
- Dialogue boxes are good but we need to address formatting problems. We may need to simplify formats to address these. Photos move around when we share files or when we paste text in. One option might be a template to which portions of the document are fixed, with locked-position text boxes that can also grow or shrink (for different language fonts). There may be desk-top publishing packages that can help us, but we would need to learn how to use these.
- Some fonts are difficult to use in Microsoft Word and others take up more room. For example, with Urdu, Oriya and Hindi the translation is done using a package that is not Word and is imported into a document as a picture. This has been a problem also in Bengali, which has been solved by the use of Unicode fonts available in Bengali.

Box 3 A Point on Formatting

- Most colleagues agreed that they would like to have new skills in desk-top publishing, which will be a learning experience, if they would overcome formatting problems.

Audience and Content

- We must know the audience to decide on the specifics of the content. BPG 1 (Self-Help Groups) is perhaps for farmers and those who work with them. BPG 2 (Consensus-Building Process) is perhaps for a wide range of stakeholders and may need some guidance within it about its range of applications. BPG 3 (Information Access Surveys) is for GOs and NGOs dealing with communications issues and knowledge sharing.
- People show interest in the BPGs because of the attractive content and format. The “getting started” section is good. Diagrams could be used more in the BPGs, for example the outlines of how to set up a SHG and the CBP process might be better as diagrams. Terms such as ‘anonymity’ are somewhat complex. For organizations and people who work with farmers and fishers the content currently is fine. However, it would be good if these BPGs could be used directly by farmers and those who work with them, as extension services have limited capacity.
- Everything in the content should relate to the message. It may be good to use single definitions for clarity; we need to validate this with stakeholders. In any one BPG there is some need to say what it is for, when to use it and why we are doing it. We might remember, however, that we have taken out the “what, why, who and where” text into a single-page supplement to all BPGs and not a component of each.
- Do BPGs need to be general or country-specific? Including photographs? Do users only want to see people from their own country pictured in BPGs? We might remember that sharing lessons from one country to another is a good thing and can motivate people in other countries. Perhaps we don’t need everything to be country-specific.
- As in any group, there are conflicting views on the design and content, in relation to pictures and text and their meanings to individuals, as well as the look of the published products. Boxes 4, 5, 6 and 7 highlight some comments on each BPG in turn, and on photographs. There are some good pictures already but as other countries undertake work with STREAM, pictures will also be available from other countries to improve the BPGs.
- Finally, where are the NACA and NRSP logos; should they be there?

Box 4 Comments on “Self-Help Groups”

- On page 3 of the SHG BPG, the example meeting minutes may be reconsidered and made clearer.
- In the SHG BPG the title has a footnote but this is confusing.
- Should we put the target audience in the BPGs? Or would this classify out some groups from the beginning?
- In this BPG it seems that children are offering information to adults.

Box 5 Comments on “Consensus-Building Process”

- Could there be a section for further reading?
- This BPG is considered especially valuable for use by Pakistan and Nepal. Both governments are thinking to change policy and also making progress to a new way of policy-making to include people, so that people do not think of policy as a government thing but as coming from them. We wish to investigate this process.
- There is a picture of a seated woman next to a man’s foot in this BPG (page 2) which makes some people uncomfortable.
- The CBP BPG shows young people facilitating and older people in groups – does this reflect reality?
- The borders may need cropping. Maybe changing the package we use will change this.

Box 6 Comments on “Information Access Surveys”

- The picture on page 4 is excellent and on the front is a little dull and not relevant to the text. The step-wise diagram in the IAS BPG is clear.
- The IAS BPG was difficult to translate. Song Ha and Malene Felsing conducted an IAS in Vietnam two years ago and this would be useful to read before starting. But is this BPG targeted at farmers or others?
- The IAS BPG is difficult to convert into Vietnamese. Could it also convey more about the value of the IAS?
- The IAS BPG is highly valuable to countries undertaking these.

Box 7 Comments on Photographic Content

- Pictures might well reflect national contexts.
- Care should be taken using alternative country-specific pictures which might convey different meanings.
- A picture is also a story; we should keep in mind that pictures are important and make efforts to collect these.
- The Nepalese BPGs presented at this workshop changed the pictures they used for technical reasons to do with formatting.
- If pictures liven up the text they can be in the background. If they “tell the story” of the text they should be up front.
- It is sometimes necessary to go out and take more photos that illustrate the text well.

Review of Other Better-Practice Guidelines

Western Orissa Rural Livelihoods Project (WORLP)

Kath guided us through the current digital versions of the ‘more-technical’ BPGs that were commissioned by WORLP, after that project saw the NRSP-supported STREAM BPGs. The WORLP BPGs are all aimed at farmers and fishers who are going to do aquaculture and the Project Implementing Agencies who work with them. In training sessions with project staff in Nuapara and Bolangir districts of the Indian state of Orissa, the BPGs were used to help to give non-specialists an opportunity to learn about aquaculture.

The other way in which STREAM will be using BPGs in western Orissa and other states in eastern India is to make them available through the One-stop Aqua Shop (OAS) Information Service (OASIS) at five locations in western Orissa, and one each in neighboring Jharkhand and West Bengal states.

Authored by Local Practitioners

Workshop participants then reviewed and made suggestions regarding BPGs authored by colleagues who are local practitioners in aquaculture. So far there are two: one from Ras Behari Baraik of Silli Block in Jharkhand about “Buying Fish Seed”, and one from Kuddus Ansary of Kaipara Village, Purulia District, West Bengal, about “Setting Up an OAS”. Two general questions were posed by the group:

- In many areas we have new practices and extension workers; why do we need to stick to traditional practices?
- Do we need to mention that these BPGs come from farmers? They are of a different nature than those which come from, e.g., scientists, and this needs to be made clear.

Specific comments on the these two BPGs appear in Boxes 8 and 9.

Box 8 Comments on “Buying Fish Seed”

- Can we add what size fish seed should be?
- Maybe we need to add where to buy fish seed?
- Perhaps there can be some comments on the size of container and stocking density.
- There may be a danger of putting fish into one’s mouth; people can choke.
- Are the children too young in the picture?
- The second and third pages are not ‘scientific’. Are they useful?
- Should we have scientific methods?
- Can we have a recommendations table in the BPG?
- The picture is broodstock, not seed.
- A good picture to identify fish seed is needed.
- On the last page, can there be something about transportation?
- We are discussing the identification of fish fry, not fingerlings, because fingerlings can be identified by eye.
- The gulping of air by the Catla fry makes this noise. Do we need to have only a scientific explanation?
- Farmers have put red soil in pots for transport even from Calcutta to Madras as they would say it is “for food for their journey”. This, however, has a scientific explanation. The transportation works better as fish which die under way are smothered by the soil and do not putrefy the water, making transport for the remaining fish more successful.

Box 9 Comments on “Setting Up an OAS”

- Can it be better explained what is OASIS and what is its objective?
- Fourth objective: Who will sponsor the travels?
- “Provide fisheries materials” – Is this the correct term?
- Is it ‘criterion’ or ‘criteria’?
- Is it ‘minimum’ or ‘maximum’ knowledge of aquaculture?
- OAS should regularly interact with STREAM.

Day Two

Review of Day One

Chatura gave us a review of Day One:

The day's proceedings commenced with Kath's brief review of the history of the NRSP project R8363 and how various tools were developed into Better-Practice Guidelines (BPGs).

Each country then displayed the translations of the BPGs in a poster session. There were 12 different language versions for each of the three BPGs. Working in groups, we reviewed the various BPGs around issues of translation, format, audience and content. Other BPGs have subsequently been developed by a DFID-funded Orissa government project, by an FAO-funded livelihoods approach project – both of these coordinated by STREAM – and by farmers with whom STREAM works and who have special expertise to share. Finally, a BPG and a Policy Brief developed by Stirling University were introduced for written feedback from this group.

Comments included:

- The contents should be easy to understand as a stand-alone document.
- Easy words should be used.
- In translation it is better to translate the meaning rather than word-for-word.
- Pictures should clearly match the text.
- The correct audience was defined: BPG1 is for grassroots stakeholders, BPG2 is for a wide range of stakeholders and BPG3 is for organizations that do communications work.

Feedback on Policy Briefs

- Format and contents seem to be placed correctly for quick reading.
- This PB as presented is really helpful for senior executives. The first section is already enough for a busy person. The second portion, which is still brief, may attract attention, and the links then allow access to other information.
- Someone commented that they were not clear if these guidelines have been applied in the work that gave rise to them. A discussion ensued about the NRSP R8100 project, its process and the impacts it has had on people's lives. Government policy-makers saw useful results rapidly from their decisions and that was helpful.
- For both documents, a discussion took place on where the second box called "where has this come from" should be: at the start or at the end. The first statement is linked to the second but the box 'disjoins' the text.
- PBs could be discussed within the NACA Governing Council meeting to give policy-makers more confidence to introduce them at home.
- Should Policy Briefs follow impact assessments of practice?

Specific comments on the Policy Briefs follow in Boxes 10 and 11.

Box 10 Comments on “Building Consensus” Policy Brief

- The message about the value of including people in policy change comes through strongly in the Policy Brief.
- This PB helps to add detail to the policy change process and builds on the STREAM theme of Policy Development. It is something which policy-makers will read once translated.
- The format looks fine but what does it mean to “work separately” within a CBP. Is this fully explained in this brief document?
- Could we consider a diagram to make the steps even clearer?
- In the CBP we use the term *livelihoods*. Is that a term that policy-makers are familiar with?
- More links to other documents and information would be good.
- In Vietnam, with its administrative structure, the voices at district, provincial and national levels may be included. This process would be good at local level but in practice including voices of people to change policy at national level is complex. Many ministries and the Prime Minister are involved and after this they make decisions and this is more or less a different system.
- One question is “who will be responsible for supporting community consultations?”. Another is “who will be a member of the anonymous policy-making group?” Are these perhaps country-specific questions?
- In this PB, the left-hand summary box includes speech bubbles. It was felt that the text was well brought out but there were differences of opinion about this style change.
- We can give ideas about the process and then leave it open for policy-makers to interpret.

Box 11 Comments on “Livelihoods Approaches” Policy Brief

- The title of this Policy Brief says “Livelihoods Approaches” but is this livelihoods approaches in fisheries and aquaculture?
- Policies are formulated through experience, socio-economic surveys, and consultants. The needs of communities have rarely been used except perhaps by questionnaire. This livelihoods approach is important and a better method.
- There is an interesting point about implementation, that if people affected by policy are not happy with it then it is difficult to implement, and participatory policy processes may help with this.
- Implementation is often the problem more than policy-making. Could we support this with a Policy Brief on implementation?

Other Policy Briefs to Consider

Everyone considered what might be some priorities for other Policy Briefs, including:

- The next in a series of PBs might be on understanding impact.
- There are many issues around development and implementation of policy.
- Achieving better policy results?
- It would be good (in the Philippines context) to have a Policy Brief relating STREAM with a livelihoods approach. We want that link to be made clearly, so that when something comes from STREAM, then the STREAM meaning of livelihoods is clear, especially in the Philippines where the word ‘livelihoods’ has a different meaning.
- Could we have a PB on ‘Advocacy’ and how it might be conducted.

- Could we have a PB on “Lesson Learning”, especially on feedback from target groups.
- Could we have a PB on “Responsible Aquaculture”, which is not focused on increases in production? Perhaps a PB drawing on the FAO Code of Conduct?
- Are there Policy Briefs on, or within, all four of the STREAM themes, e.g., Livelihoods, Institutions, Policy Development and Communications?
- Let us look at the relationship between PBs and BPGs as we talk about “policy and practice.” Is there a PB that can support each BPG and vice-versa?

Other Better-Practice Guidelines to Consider

Over the year within STREAM there have also been suggestions about new BPGs, including on:

- Advocacy
- Changing Attitudes
- Cross-learning
- Policy Development
- Stakeholder Relations
- Story-telling

These were further discussed in groups, using the questions:

- Will this BPG be useful?
- What would this BPGs include?
- What might be a PB related to this theme?
- Are there any other BPGs we might consider?

Group Feedback

Advocacy

- This would be important and necessary. Advocacy would need to be defined. What might the title be? Advocating Advocacy? There might be a starting point in identifying the issues and message. Who can do this? How could it be done? Include suitable media and communications options (links to other BPGs, e.g., IAS). Include tip boxes, success stories, and advantages of its use. A PB might be related to this BPG.

Changing Attitudes and Cross-learning

- There was a long debate on whether these are necessary. Maybe they are outcomes of all BPGs, and not BPGs themselves.

For example, from eastern India, attitude changes include banks giving loans to poor people in groups, people building groups, and using seasonal ponds. We might look at what attitudes need to change. Attitude change is a third-person activity depending on wider actions. The audience for these might be STREAM itself. We might use this process to show what we think as an organization.

- Cross-learning is something done in STREAM. There are many examples and modes, e.g., plays, videos, visits and demonstrations.
- A PB related to this would be good to show how cross-learning can happen. There are good examples of extension workers and NGOs.

Policy Development

- We need to consider what policy, what needs, and which stakeholders. We also need to think of links to livelihoods and resources of stakeholders, consensus-building, case studies and stories. Policy-makers, scientists and farmers might all be stakeholders.
- We already have a suitable PB on this.

Stakeholder Relations

- This would be useful, especially for service providers. We need to consider how to build interest by engaging stakeholders, getting feedback from successes, and including contacts, links and suggested reading.
- A PB would also be useful on this.

Story-telling

- We would like to call it “Listening to Voices” and it could include definitions, descriptions, the importance of learning how to gather stories, uses of stories, and success stories.

Other BPGs

For topics of other BPGs, groups suggested:

- Technical aquaculture BPGs (perhaps based on the WORLP BPGs)
- Access to (micro)credit (country-specific)
- How to set up ways to manage funds
- Co-management of natural resources
- Coordinated approaches to extension
- Changing behavior (along with changing attitudes)
- Livelihoods options

At this point, it was suggested that perhaps NACA and DANIDA would like to collaborate with STREAM on technical guidelines. SUMA and SUFA might be potential collaborators on BPGs on micro-credit. There might be support for this from DANIDA funds and these could be co-authored. A meeting between the STREAM Vietnam CHM and SUMA was planned for 21 June 2005 to discuss how to carry this forward.

The ideas for new BPGs were prioritized by ballots of three favorites. The result was:

1. Access to (micro)credit
2. Advocacy, listening to voices
3. Cross-learning, co-management

To decide who could do these BPGs, a session was facilitated where people agreed to join email discussion groups to work on them. It was agreed that the following email list groups would be led by those in **bold**.

1. Access to (micro)credit (**Song Ha**, Flavio [SUMA] , Bebet, Kath)
2. Advocacy (Aniza, **Junaid**, Graham, Paul, Kath)
3. Listening to voices (**Bebet, Kath**, Graham, Chris, Erwin)
4. Cross-learning (**Rubu**, Erwin, Bebet, Kath, Dr Tripathi)
5. Co-management (Chatura, Khin Muang Soe, **Sophat**, Flavio)

Promoting and Using Better-Practice Guidelines and Policy Briefs

The next-to-last session of the workshop was devoted to each country team, and the Regional Office, talking about how they had used the BPGs and PBs so far and how they would be able to promote and use them in future. Their responses are in Table 1.

Table 1 Promoting and Using BPGs and PBs

Country	Have you used the three tools?	How can your national system make use of the BPGs and PBs?
Cambodia	Not used in national context. We have used PRA. The BPGs will bring more guidance to modify and find a better way to build more consensus.	We will use these as we see them as important. We will try to put them also in our country context. We will share with the CBNRM Learning Institute and other NGOs in Cambodia. CBP and IAS are new to Cambodia. ADB are looking at guidelines and developing new projects. We will share with them.
India	We have used the CBP and SHG tools and IAS to some extent.	There is a great demand from government and NGOs. We will share these through OASIS.
Indonesia	Not yet used	We will use in sites highlighted in the STREAM CSP where we will have stakeholder meetings and there is a need for self-help group building. These requests have come in. On the IAS, we will work with the Technical Implementing Unit of DGA. We will use the CBP with SHGs.
Myanmar	These have not yet been used.	We will consult with the director-general and get a framework agreed as to how to take these forward. The CBP can be used in the ways we are finding to develop rural and coastal areas. For SHGs, we often try to learn from India. We are investigating SHG in economic contexts. We have already shared these with an economics forum.
Nepal	DOFD Extension Officers and INGOs use these SHGs.	We would provide these to ministry policy-makers. The CBP PB and BPGs can help them with their policy change agenda. District levels will make use of these in conflict management.

Table 1 Promoting and Using BPGs and PBs (continued)

Country	Have you used the three tools?	How can your national system make use of the BPGs and PBs?
Pakistan	These systems have not been implemented. CBP, IAS and SHGs are used by NGOs. CBOs are being constituted, not by the government, but by IUCN, WWF and the Aga Khan Rural Development Support Program.	STREAM Pakistan will distribute to its stakeholder network.
Philippines	We used IAS in an IEC activity with another project called FRMP.	IAS is used with extension staff of BFAR to influence their ways of working, e.g., in Sapijan Bay and Banate Bay. We promote them with Bay Management Councils and NGOs. For the CBP, it can be used with the Fisheries Resource Management Division for regulatory function conflicts on resource use policy implications, and also with LGU councils and NGOs.
Sri Lanka	No, but in formulating big projects we have used tools like these.	We intend to use these in NAQDA. We will discuss with the ADB fisheries project (the largest in Sri Lanka).
Vietnam	We have used the CBP and SHG tools.	The Ministry will use these in a good format developed for the Vietnamese context. We will organize their launch into several development projects as pilots and we will assess it, improve it and then request NAFEC to extend it through the country with national and district units. We envisage this process will take two years.
STREAM RO		We have web distribution through STREAM and NACA, and also trade fairs and other events planned.

Evaluation

Each participant made a statement about their impressions of the workshop:

- I learnt more about BPGs.
- We would want to take this forwards.
- We appreciate where the BPGs have originated: in India.
- Exciting new ideas and improvements can be effected.
- It was useful, and I got new ideas about how to write these. I got a lot of good experience.
- Thank you, Kath, for being a nice facilitator.
- Really useful and got many ideas to implement in my work
- Good to be back in the STREAM loop. I taste the spirit of these guidelines.
- I will apply this in my CFDD in Cambodia.
- I learnt a lot from others.
- This is my first time with STREAM. This was a beautiful event.
- These BPGs are applicable and feasible.
- When I saw the BPGs translated into 12 languages, I felt proud.
- The group is good at self reflection.
- Congratulations! This workshop fully applied a participatory approach which was effective and useful. This was a great experience for Vietnam.
- Useful and now I understand what should be done next.

- The design of the workshop was excellent.
- The workshop was funny and you were generous to a newcomer.
- This workshop has been useful and effective. We will use the BPGs.
- There will be many productive activities everywhere we will develop and promote BPGs.
- STREAM never has a final draft but the sessions and facilitation were excellent as always.
- BPGs are fun and a capability cheers to the STREAM family!
- The BPG workshop shows us the way. Let's move on to "best practices".
- The workshop was knowledgeable and everyone fully participated.
- We thank NACA-STREAM and the Government of Vietnam.
- The BPGs will flourish in time. The impacts will surely be positive.
- It's fantastic to see it all up on the walls – a fantastic job!
- This was an opportunity to meet friends. It was a learning workshop.
- This workshop will be remembered for a long time.
- A useful learning process. BPGs should be implemented in all countries.
- Thanks STREAM, the Government of Vietnam and Song Ha.
- We understand their applicability and we will develop these in new areas that we have agreed. I can use this experience to develop BPGs in other areas in Nepal, such as the livestock sector.
- Thanks to STREAM and NRSP.
- It's good we had a chance for everyone to come together to work on this. Like everything in STREAM, this bounces from person to person.
- Thanks for the CD and the report and thanks to NRSP for extending the project.
- A great activity with all the countries developing materials together.
- This was my first strong interaction with STREAM. I will put effort into making sure this happens more.
- I have learned about BPGs. They are simple, attractive and easily implemented, and they are useful.
- These two days were exciting and useful. I learned how to analyze content and materials and think of their audience.
- While we achieved our purpose successfully, it has been so satisfying to see how much knowledge is collected here and how we can harness this.
- Thanks to Reby for consistent care of your STREAM family.
- Thanks to Min and Ha for support.
- And thanks to Supawan who has produced a CD for us during the course of the workshop itself.

Appendix 1 Participants

Country/Name	Position	E-mail Address
Cambodia		
1. Ly Vuthy	National Coordinator (Chief, Community Fisheries Development Office, DOF)	cfdo@online.com.kh
2. Sophat Chun	Communications Hub Manager	cfdo@online.com.kh
India		
3. Rubu Mukherjee	Communications Hub Manager	rubumukherjee@rediffmail.com
4. Reshmee Guha	Communications Associate	
5. Dr S D Tripathi	Special Advisor	sd_tripathi@rediffmail.com
Indonesia		
6. Abduh Nurhidayat	National Coordinator (Official, Directorate General Aquaculture)	Abduhnurhidayat@yahoo.com
7. Aniza Suspita	Communications Hub Manager	Indostream@perikanan-budidaya.go.id; anizasuspita@yahoo.com
Myanmar		
8. U Khin Ko Lay	National Coordinator (Director of Fisheries)	aquadof@myanmar.com.mm
9. U Khin Maung Soe	Communications Hub Manager	aquadof@myanmar.com.mm
Nepal		
10. Shukra Pradhan	National Coordinator (Program Director, Directorate of Fisheries Development)	dfod@mail.com.np
11. Nilkanth Pokhrel	Communications Hub Manager (Communications Specialist, Agriculture Information and Communications Center)	agroinfo@wlink.com.np
Pakistan		
12. Dr Muhammad Hayat	National Coordinator	muhammadhayat@yahoo.com
13. Muhammad Junaid Wattoo	Communications Hub Manager	junaid_narc@yahoo.com streampak@ntc.net.pk
Philippines		
14. Erwin Pador	Assistant National Coordinator (Chief, Fisheries Resources Management Project FRMP)	Streampador-phil@skyinet.net
15. Elizabeth Gonzales	Communications Hub Manager	Streambfar-phil@skyinet.net;
Sri Lanka		
16. D E Weerakoon	National Coordinator	aqua3@eureka.lk
17. Chatura Rodrigo	Communications Hub Manager	chatura_rodrigo@yahoo.com
Vietnam		
18. Dr Le Thanh Luu	National Coordinator	
19. Nguyen Huy Dien	Vice Director, National Fisheries Extension Center	
20. Nguyen Song Ha	Communications Hub Manager	streamsapa@hn.vnn.vn
STREAM Regional Office		
21. Graham Haylor	Director	ghaylor@loxinfo.co.th
22. Paul Bulcock	Research Associate	Paul.bulcock@enaca.org
23. Supawan Ponglumyai	Information and Communications Technology Associate	Supawan.ponglumyai@enaca.org
24. Rebecca Cajilig	Senior Program Officer	reby@enaca.org
25. Chris Keating	M&E Advisor	christopher.keating@enaca.org
26. Kath Copley	Communications Specialist	kcopley@smartchat.net.au
27. William Savage	Communications Specialist	savage@loxinfo.co.th
Support Staff		
28. Tu Ha	STREAM-SAPA	streamsapa@hn.vnn.vn
29. Minh Nguyen	STREAM-SAPA	streamsapa@hn.vnn.vn
30. Nguyen Thu Hang	Economist / Information Specialist, NAFEC	

Appendix 2 Workshop Agenda

Day One – Friday, 17 June		
0830	Workshop overview	
0900	A brief history of NRSP Project R8363	
0945	An inventory of BPGs and Policy Briefs (PBs)	Poster session
1030	<i>Break</i>	
1100	Existing BPGs from R8363	Review BPGs
1230	<i>Lunch</i>	
1330	Existing BPGs from the WORLP India Project	Review BPGs
1500	<i>Break</i>	
1530	Existing BPGs from the FAO TCP	Review BPGs
1700	<i>Finish</i>	
Evening	Dinner	

Day Two – Saturday, 18 June		
0830	Review of Day One	
0900	New BPGs	e.g., Advocacy, Changing Attitudes, Cross-learning, Policy Development, Stakeholder Relations, Story-Telling Prioritized list of BPGs for development; identify lead authors and timeframes
1030	<i>Break</i>	
1100	Taking BPGs and PBs Forward as a STREAM Genre	Promoting and using BPGs and PBs
1230	<i>Lunch</i>	
1330	Taking BPGs and PBs Forward as a STREAM Genre (continued)	
1500	<i>Break</i>	
1530	Evaluation	
1600	<i>Finish</i>	

Appendix 3 Workshop CD Contents

Better-Practice Guidelines (BPGs)

Cover Sheet

Self-Help Groups (No 1) [12 languages]

Bengali
English
Hindi
Ilonggo
Indonesian
Khmer
Myanmar
Nepali
Oriya
Sinhala
Urdu
Vietnamese

Consensus-Building Process (No 2) [12 languages]

Bengali
English
Hindi
Ilonggo
Indonesian
Khmer
Myanmar
Nepali
Oriya
Sinhala
Urdu
Vietnamese

Information Access Surveys (No 3) [12 languages]

Bengali
English
Hindi
Ilonggo
Indonesian
Khmer
Myanmar
Nepali
Oriya
Sinhala
Urdu
Vietnamese

Buying Fish Seed (No 4)

One-stop Aqua Shop (No 5)

Livelihoods Approaches – Capacity-building and Analysis (No 6)

Western Orissa Rural Livelihoods Project (19 BPGs)

- 1 What is Fish Culture?
- 2 Pond Construction: Selection of Suitable Sites for Ponds
- 3 Pond Construction: Design and Layout of Ponds
- 4 Broodstock Collection, Transport and Maintenance
- 5 Spawn Production in Hapas
- 6 Spawn Production in Hatcheries
- 7 Spawn Production of Common Carp
- 8 Fry Production: Nursing Spawn
- 9 Fast Fingerling Production: Nursing Spawn in Ponds
- 10 Fingerling Production: Nursing Fry in Ponds
- 11 Fingerling Production: Nursing Spawn and Fry in Pens
- 12 Advanced Fingerling Production: Seasonal Ponds
- 13 Advanced Fingerling Production: Perennial Ponds
- 14 Packing and Transport of Spawn, Fry and Fingerlings
- 15 Marketable Fish Production: Seasonal Ponds
- 16 Marketable Fish Production: Perennial Ponds
- 17 Recognizing and Managing Common Fish Diseases
- 18 Marketing and Hygiene
- 19 One-stop Aqua Shops

Policy Briefs

Building Consensus (No 1)

Livelihoods Approaches (No 2)

Appendix 4 Project Logical Framework
R8363 Logframe HP/1.4.2

Narrative summary	Objectively verifiable indicators	Means of verification	Important assumptions
Goal			
Strategies to provide specific groups of poor people with better access to knowledge that can enhance their decisions on management of natural capital, developed and promoted	By 2005, integrated natural resources management strategies adopted by target institutions in at least two target countries that include cost efficient delivery systems for provision of agricultural services (<i>inter alia</i> marketing, input supply, mechanisation, storage, financing)	Reviews by programme manager Reports of research team and collaborating /target institutions Appropriate dissemination outputs Local, national and international statistical data	Adoption of strategies changes behaviour in the private sector Enabling environment exists Budgets and programmes of target institutions are sufficient and well managed
Purpose			
Domain Y stakeholders are able to provide more quality benefits to domain Z primary stakeholders/ ultimate beneficiaries located in non-project sites in target and non-target countries through the enhanced uptake and promotion of process tools from R6759 and R8100 for the delivery of improved rural services.	By January 2005, evidence that stakeholders in at least two non-project sites are using the knowledge that the projects have generated in ways that can benefit the poor, specifically: The consensus-building process (CBP) used in at least one non-project site The Information Access Survey used in at least one non-project site The Building Social Capital tool used in at least one non-project site	NRSP end of project impact assessment report Policy-relevant documentation at national level	Nepali insurgency does not prevent work outside of Kathmandu. Sri Lanka Peace Process continues Partners and line agencies maintain interest in process tools and ways of working

Narrative summary	Objectively verifiable indicators	Means of verification	Important assumptions
Outputs			
<i>Sub-regional promotion of process tools from Eastern India</i>			
<p>1. Key national level stakeholders from non-project countries engage with research products of R6759 and R8100, as they relate to the use of water bodies for livelihood enterprises</p>	<p>By May 2004, key stakeholders from seven non-project countries understand the three process tools generated by R6759 and R8100 and can articulate their utility in their own country context</p> <p>By June 2005 national communications staff from eleven Asia Pacific countries understand the three process tools generated by R6759 and R8100 and can articulate their utility in their own country context</p>	<p>Project annual reports for 2003-04 2004-05</p> <p>Workshop report, includes section on stakeholder assessment of lessons learnt</p> <p>National Government reports includes reference to process tools and how they will or have been utilised.</p> <p>Information distribution and impact assessment from STREAM Communications Hubs M and E system.</p>	<p>For all Outputs: Key stakeholders continue to engage with the process tools</p>
<i>On-line discussion forum of process tools</i>			
<p>2. Potential utility of the process tools developed by R6759 and R8100 further progressed through international on-line discussion forum attended by governmental and non-government, research and academic staff, partners and collaborators, (Domain Y) farmer representatives (Domain Z) and hosted by NACA STREAM</p>	<p>By June 2004, all possible stakeholders are invited to join on-line community to share a vision of how to advance R6759 and R8100's recommendations into formal policy channels.</p> <p>By August 2004, a draft output resulting from the forum discussion is produced within which Domain Y stakeholders express recognition of the utility of process tools.</p>	<p>Intergovernmental agency web-log</p> <p>Synthesized documentation relating to uptake utility</p> <p>Communications Hub records</p> <p>Draft output of forum discussion including Domain Y and Z contributions and actions</p>	<p>Stakeholder elect to join on-line community</p>
<i>Multi-lingual context specific guidance produced and promoted</i>			
<p>3. Policy Briefs and Better-practice Guidelines developed for research products by multilingual specialists/communicati on hub managers; these are then fine-tuned to specific national communication contexts and promoted widely within each country.</p>	<p>By Sep 2004 multi-lingual Policy Briefs and Better-practice Guidelines produced specific to each country</p> <p>By Jan 2005, key GO and NGO stakeholders in at least five non-project sites gain access to and share in the process tools.</p>	<p>Country Focussed Policy Briefs and Better-practice Guidelines in English and regional languages</p> <p>National and/or state government service provision outputs</p> <p>Donor documentation relating to uptake of findings</p> <p>Project process monitoring reports</p>	
<i>Assessing progress towards livelihood improvement of target groups of the poor</i>			
<p>4. GO and NGO stakeholder understanding of the early impact of communications activities in pro-poor service delivery improved.</p>	<p>By January 2005, 'significant change' assessed in at least four countries by intermediate stakeholders</p>	<p>Stakeholder feedback through 'significant change' stories</p> <p>Communications Hub records</p> <p>Reports on emerging findings</p>	

Narrative summary for activities	Milestones and budget	Important assumptions
<i>O 1. Sub-regional promotion of process tools from Eastern India</i>		For all activities: government timeframes for change match with the project and NRSP's timeframes
1.1 Conduct sub-regional multi-lingual workshop with eight participating countries	<i>MS1.a Mid-March 2004 multi-lingual workshop stakeholders meeting</i>	
1.2 Report workshop	<i>MS1.b May 2004. Publish workshop report</i>	
1.3 Regional workshop in Vietnam	<i>MS1.c June 2005 regional workshop</i>	
<i>O 2 On-line discussion forum of process tools</i>		
2.1 Establish on-line discussion forum for sharing information with GO and NGO stakeholders and with farmers and fishers	<i>MS2.a May 2004 On-line discussion forum established</i>	
2.2 Communication Hub Managers elicit inputs from selected farmer communities to the discussion forum	<i>MS2.b May 2005 Farmer input encouraged to on-line discussion forum established</i>	
<i>O 3 Multi-lingual context specific guidance produced and promoted</i>		
3.1 Project team with domain Y stakeholders develop Policy Briefs and Better-practice Guidelines in appropriate media in multiple languages	<i>MS3.a May 2005 Develop Policy Briefs and Better-practise Guidelines</i>	
3.2 Project team with domain Y stakeholders promote Policy Briefs and Better-practice Guidelines in English and local languages through partner institutions and networks	<i>MS3.b June 2005 Promote Policy Briefs and Better-practise Guidelines</i>	
<i>O 4 Assessing progress towards livelihood improvement of target groups of the poor</i>		
4.1 Project team implement with stakeholders a system for understanding the early impact in service delivery to poor people	<i>MS4.a Dec 2004 Implement M&E</i>	
4.2 Project team report against indicators and describe significant changes	<i>MS4.b May 2005 Report M&E</i>	