

Building Learning Systems for Honduran Development

IDRC External Review

**William Edwardson (Ottawa, Canada)
Brenda Bucheli (Lima, Peru)**

July 15, 2007

Project No. 100133 (RPE externally funded by CIDA)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
2. BACKGROUND	6
3. EVALUATION FINDINGS	10
4. RECOMMENDATIONS	46
5. ANNEX 1: LIST OF ACRONYMS	49
6. ANNEX 2: LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED	50
7. ANNEX 3: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	53
8. ANNEX 4: LIST OF SUB-PROJECTS, PARTNERS AND PRODUCTS	55
9. ANNEX 5: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE STUDY	74
10. ANNEX 6: BIOGRAPHIES OF THE EVALUATORS	80
11. ANNEX 7: EVALUATION PLAN	81
12. ANNEX 8: FIELD TRIP SCHEDULE	84
13. ANNEX 9: EVALUATION OF TWO SUB-PROJECTS	86

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The IDRC Honduras Project was a high risk, innovative venture to build learning experiences in a low capacity country to improve the design, operations and success of development interventions to benefit the poor. Additionally the Project had the unique opportunity to take up this challenge in partnership with CIDA, which financed the IDRC Project, as a component of its ongoing ProMesas program of development interventions in Honduras. In the end, the partnership opportunity did not evolve as envisaged for a number of reasons, and the Project-supported learning experiences focused on capacity building for learning in a wide range of institutions, with limited of the hoped-for links to CIDA ProMesas projects or other development interventions in the country.

After implementing such a visionary program as ProMesas , including a novel partnership with IDRC, and the departure of its champions, CIDA appeared to lose interest in the Program and to question the role of IDRC. The subsequent audit and its results dealt a blow to the Program and the partnership, from which it never really recovered. Due to its contract terms, the IDRC Project was able to proceed on its own. However no renegotiation of its contract and objectives was done, so IDRC took the decision to move ahead with essentially a Capacity Building program, in the absence of the Sector Tables and ProMesas projects.

The Project's original very broad objectives covering various aspects of learning systems were achieved to a moderate extent. The Project successfully promoted multi-stakeholder meetings, participatory planning methodologies and conflict management techniques (SAS, AMC, LED) in 29 sub-projects, focusing mainly on local development problems. The cases of Chagas and Remittances are the only projects focusing on national development problems; all other cases are works still in progress at the local level. In the area of monitoring and evaluation, there was extensive training provided on Outcome Mapping. The elements of strategic vision, boundary partner identification and progress indicators were embraced by several different organizations, so this technique was successfully adopted for planning but partially implemented for monitoring.. Of note was the recent interest by the new CIDA team in Honduras to have training by the IDRC Project team in OM for planning their new program.

Achievements at the policy level have been few. Systematization of the Chagas project experience, Alternative Poverty Indices project and the Remittances project were the main cases. The consultations and development of the PRIDE Initiative were aimed at major policy uptake of a National Research Program in Honduras. The changing policy environment at both national and municipal levels due to elections and changes in authorities limited opportunities or interrupted efforts made to influence policy.

Of the 29 sub-projects funded by the Project, 15 research sub-projects were supported , mainly through small grants as well as thesis support at partner universities on mainly ENRM topics using participatory research methods. There were three major research initiatives: Farmer Schools on Agroecological Farming, which developed farmer-led

research activities in agroecological farming in a number of communities in two regions of Honduras and led to significant adoption and income generation from organic fertilizer and potato seed production; Migration and Remittances in Olancho which pioneered research at the community level of the socio-economic impact of remittances on rural families; Chagas disease project which worked successfully with Lenca communities to identify and implement measures to control the disease vectors locally as well as procedures for the mass treatment of children in remote areas. The Evaluation confirmed that the Project provided valuable conditions (methodology training, funding, technical assistance, trust) to support research in its different ways.

With respect to outcomes, there was confusion with respect to who were the Project's main boundary partners, why there was no formal agreement made on their redefinition when the Sector Tables ended and CIDA's ProMesas program was cut-back, as well as how the individual sub-projects which were approved would contribute to the outcomes and changes in the boundary partners. In the end, there was a measure of achievement of each of the outcomes that the Project reported on, but the Project's reports could have more cogently focused on the outcomes and boundary partners in order to present progress.

The Project's Capacity Building strategy was very effective in reaching a significant number of development practitioners and researchers (final numbers have yet to be confirmed by the Project), introducing them and supporting them to test a range of methodological tools with applications in different parts of the learning cycle; SAS, OM, Systematization, LED and AMC. The goal to build learning systems, bringing a range of tools together which facilitate learning across the project cycle, was not achieved in any one of the institutions, or sub-projects supported by the Project due mainly to the time demands of the workshop model of capacity building, the low capacity of institutions and their staff and the absence of a diagnostic and plan for capacity building for learning in target institutions. Although experience with these tools is incipient, except for a few institutions, the Project has contributed to the formation of a foundation of capacity in learning tools for development, especially related to ENRM issues, which did not exist in Honduras prior to the Project. In particular, UNA has developed significant expertise with SAS through training of faculty, incorporation into the curricula, use of tools in student's thesis and other research activities, such as LED. This was most clear case of institutionalization that was observed.

CIDA and other donors, including IDRC can draw on the enhanced capacity that now exists in Honduran institutions and civil society groups and build on it in future development initiatives. In particular, an accumulation of experience of learning skills has evolved in the North Coast around watershed management issues in institutions such as CURLA, REHDES, MAMUCA as well as in local communities on OM, SAS, AMC, Gender analysis, Systematization and small research grants which if consolidated could provide real Learning Systems for application in development of watershed management plans, reduction of conflicts and promotion of local economic development opportunities, particularly related to eco-tourism. A similar situation exists more on a geographic theme, around Catacamas, Olancho, where UNA as well as RDS have developed skills in

SAS, OM and LED, RDS has pioneered attention to Remittances and others have focused on AMC, all with participation of communities.. These synergies should be developed further as Learning Systems to assist in accompanying communities and the municipality in implementing economic development in a sustainable way.

The Evaluation Team believe that the achievements in capacity building would have been greater if a more systematic approach had been taken at the outset, targeted at specific institutions which were important actors in the areas of emphasis of ProMesas. The building of learning systems was really only at the early stage in the majority of the institutions, with the focus on training and application of methodologies. Perhaps only at ANAF AE and RDS was their evolving an understanding of how the various methodological tools could come together to promote learning across the organisation. The Project could have taken more advantage of the opportunity by reviewing the learning goals and needs of key institutions and their community partners and other stakeholders, and thereby establish a capacity building plan to meet these goals and needs which would incorporate multi-stakeholder processes for planning on specific projects, tracking of progress, making adjustments along the way and reflecting and learning from the experience –the learning system.

Communities of Practice have been established around the two of the methodological tools which have been promoted by the Project, which will continue to support their use in the future through sharing of experience and learning among members of the application of the methodology. The most advanced is that of the SAS group (involving staff from UNA, CURLA, ANAF AE, RDS and REHDES); another is being initiated on Outcome Mapping with staff from ANAF AE, REHDES and CURLA. Several activities supported by the Project are expected to continue after the Project ends with support from other donors, such as Ford Foundation on Remittances; GTZ , UNDP and SNV on AMC , GTZ and local municipality support for LED; FAO and Heifer International on Farmer Schools; PRIDE with potential support from World Bank. IDRC has also provided support from PBDD on resource mobilization strategies for PRIDE, UNA, ANAF AE and RDS to sustain their activities in the future.

Strengths of the experience included the location of the IDRC Honduras Project team in the same office as the CIDA team which encouraged regular interactions, planning and meetings; jointly IDRC and CIDA teams provided a large, strong multi-disciplinary group to work together on multiple aspects of development in a low capacity country. several CIDA –ProMesas specialists had long-term experience in Honduras in target; sectors (forestry, agriculture, water). The IDRC Project’s separate management and mandate brought agility and rapid response to construct research, training and learning activities, even when CIDA was reorganizing its program, staffing and resources. IDRC and Promesas collaborated directly in two major sub-projects; once CIDA- ProMesas identified a project opportunity (Rio San Juan Watershed) IDRC was able to program its applied research and learning activities and mobilize resources for collaboration; similarly once IDRC identified its initiative on Chagas disease, CIDA Promesas collaborated with funding and links to the National Chagas Round Table for policy uptake. IDRC supported the CIDA team directly in learning from its ProMesas

experience and more recently in team building and planning for the new CIDA team for future CIDA programming in Honduras.

The management of the Project was challenging for IDRC as it established a new office in Honduras and installed a newly hired Project Team, with no experience of IDRC or CIDA cultures or processes. While best efforts were made to support the Project Team from Ottawa, with visits of experienced Program and Administrative staff from time to time, the set-up was less than ideal for building a brand new program in a low capacity country. The results were that the administrative load was heavy both in Honduras and Ottawa, documentation on sub- projects, results and products showed inconsistencies and transaction costs were much higher than anticipated. The Project Team are to be congratulated for their level of performance and achievements under the circumstances. The Project would have been better served by having senior program and administrative staff from Ottawa (or Montevideo) relocated for the first year until the new team and administrative processes were fully functional.

The Project in itself was a real learning process. CIDA and IDRC learned a lot of how important it was to have regular communication on their joint initiative, and to work together to adapt when major changes to their programs are being made as these will affect the other partner's plans and activities. IDRC learned also that much time and resources at all management levels are required to inform its donor, CIDA, of this sophisticated Project's philosophy and strategy in the challenging context, anticipated contribution of its activities, progress and problems in order to maintain support and receive feedback. IDRC learned of the challenges and costs associated with operating a major program at a distance, in a low-capacity country on a high risk project, remote from the services and linkages at HQ or Regional Office. Additionally, IDRC learned that such an ambitious undertaking as Building Learning Systems in Honduras is a much longer term process than envisaged and that a more targeted and strategic approach, perhaps by sector, problem or geographic focus, would have achieved more of the outcomes and results anticipated.

The process has been initiated and a good foundation has been established. IDRC, hopefully in association with CIDA, can build on this in a consolidation phase with one or two institutional partners in watershed management and local economic development, particularly to consolidate the capacity building initiated for learning systems and apply it to influencing policy and achieving real development progress for poor communities in Honduras. CIDA is encouraged to continue to support learning activities in its development interventions, taking account of the capacity building needs, time frames and process nature of these activities which will lead to communities and civil society groups embracing and influencing the changes required for sustainable development to begin to take root.

BACKGROUND

1. Introduction

The people and Government of Honduras (GoH), with support from the international community, initiated a process of national reconstruction and transformation following the devastation of Hurricane and Tropical Storm Mitch in October, 1998. The development challenges were significant. Mitch left 1.5 million victims in its wake, deepening the country's already pervasive poverty and poor living conditions. Currently one of the poorest countries in Latin America and the Caribbean, approximately 70% of the country's 6.7 million people live in poverty. Approximately 38% of the population does not have access to health services and 22% do not have access to potable water, problems that weigh heavily on women, children, indigenous peoples and other vulnerable populations.

The Project "Building Learning Systems for Honduran Development" came into effect June 13th, 2002, for a five-year period, as part of Canada's cooperation with Honduras. CIDA provide a \$5 million grant to the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) Project which was designed to complement the Canadian International Development Agency's (CIDA) Pilot Program "Pro-Mesas" (Pro-Sector Tables) in Honduras. This was a unique opportunity for CIDA and IDRC to work synergistically in the same location and in the same overall Program. The CIDA Bilateral Program for Honduras built on a process of donor co-ordination created in response to the challenges of national reconstruction and transformation following Hurricane Mitch. Sector Tables comprised of government, civil society and donor representatives were established to share information and perspectives on development priorities and options, guided by the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP).

IDRC's Learning Systems Project was designed to complement CIDA's programming by building research into development projects and by enhancing the capacities of Hondurans to learn from doing, especially in relation to sector-wide discussions and regional forums.

The general objective of the Project was to *strengthen the capacity of people and institutions in Honduras to plan and implement development projects and policies that address the needs of the poor and other vulnerable populations such as women, children and indigenous peoples.*

The specific objectives were:

- 1) To facilitate broad-based dialogue and power sharing in fora on national development problems, priorities and options
- 2) To support project and policy planning and implementation processes that draw on and apply information and knowledge from a range of sources
- 3) To promote monitoring and evaluation processes that enable responsive implementation and cumulative learning by stakeholders
- 4) To support research that enhances the capacity of Honduran society to plan and implement projects and policies in the area of Environment and Natural Resource Management

The working assumption of the Project was that broad-based dialogue and power sharing in decision-making fora, combined with research and collaborative learning, significantly improve project and policy planning and implementation.

The Project is due to end in September 2007. In 2004, IDRC suggested that a final evaluation take place as part of the Project's Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy. IDRC in its latest report to CIDA (Annual Report 2005-2006) confirmed that a final external evaluation of the Project will take place in 2007. The external evaluation will offer an outsider's perspective on the overall effectiveness of the project while at the same time will draw lessons that can inform future programming.

2. Users and Uses of the External Evaluation

Intended Users

The primary users of the external evaluation are IDRC managers. Managers in Ottawa and LACRO (Montevideo) were consulted regarding their expectations and intended use of the Evaluation, and other IDRC staff in Ottawa and Honduras provided input to the design of the Evaluation Plan. CIDA staff in the Americas Branches was approached to provide input also with respect to their perspectives and questions. However as IDRC funded this Evaluation study, IDRC managers were identified as the primary users although efforts were made to make the evaluation as useful as possible to CIDA .

Intended Uses

This external review will be used by IDRC managers, Program and Project staff as a learning tool in order to improve programming. .

3. Objectives and Questions

Objectives:

1. To assess the extent to which the project has met its objectives, as set out in project documents taking into account any evolution in objectives.
2. To assess the outcomes of the project and identify strengths, challenges and lessons.
3. To offer reflections on the strengths and weaknesses of the project's approach and strategies in relation to capacity development and suggest ways for improvement for future capacity development projects and activities.
4. To evaluate how and in what ways the project has added value to CIDA development programming in Honduras.

Questions: The Evaluation Plan considered the following questions according to each of the Objectives of the Evaluation Study.

Objective 1.

- 1.1. To what extent has project met its objectives; what has been achieved?
- 1.2. How have objectives evolved and project has adapted to changing contexts, risks, opportunities and constraints
- 1.3/ How effective have been risk mitigation strategies to support achievement of project objectives; how have risk strategies evolved during the project ?
- 1.4. How sustainable are activities initiated by the project?

Objective 2.

- 2.1. Which are the main outcomes on project partners related to actions, behaviors, institutional orientation, relationships and policies attributable to the project?
- 2.2. Which methodologies/strategies proved to be more effective for achieving the outcomes?
- 2.3. How sustainable are the outcomes achieved with project partners?
- 2.4. How have other project participants been impacted by the project's activities?
- 2.5. What are key lessons for future IDRC programming in Honduras?

Objective 3

- 3.1. What are the contributions made by the project on building and strengthening the capacities of people and institutions to plan and implement development projects and policies?
- 3.2. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the projects approach to capacity building ? Were they relevant/ pertinent?
- 3.3. What capacity will remain in Honduras as a result of the project?

Objective 4

- 4.1. How and in what ways has the Project supported CIDA's ProMesas Program?
- 4.2. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the IDRC-CIDA partnership in the Honduras development programming? How could future partnerships be improved?
- 4.3. How and in what ways have IDRC supported learning activities strengthened CIDA programming in Honduras?
- 4.4. What is the potential of learning activities to strengthen future programming at CIDA?

4. Methodology of the Evaluation.

The Evaluation was carried out according to the Plan (Annex 7) which was based on the Terms of Reference (Annex 5) and was agreed to by IDRC managers and the Honduras Project Team. A field trip was made to Honduras during May 5-19 (see Annex 8).

Two evaluators carried out the study jointly. They were selected independently by IDRC staff, according to their complementary skills and experience (see Biographies in Annex 6). Bill Edwardson, as well as being the Lead Evaluator, took major responsibility for dealing with questions related to the Objectives and Value added by the Project. Brenda Bucheli led on the other two topics; Outcomes and Capacity Building. Both consultants worked harmoniously throughout all the study.

As planned, the methodology involved review of the multiple documents available on the Project and sub-projects, individual and group interviews in Honduras and Canada, as well as observations in the field in order to gather all the information. The questions in the Plan oriented the data collection, which was made in both English and Spanish. Information was triangulated where possible among the different sources to assist in at least partially reconstructing conditions at the initiation of the Project's activities, given

the absence of any baseline. Annex 2 lists all the 72 persons interviewed to cover the broad range of project stakeholders and a wide range of issues. Annex 3 shows all the documents reviewed (almost 40), most of which were provided to the Evaluators ahead of the field trip which helped considerably in understanding the context and scope of the Project. Some documents were not made available until the end of the field work and even close to the presentation of the report¹.

The Evaluation in the end covered almost the full spectrum of 29 sub-projects (with the main exception being that on Chagas Disease which was being evaluated separately), with greater attention to 2 sub-projects: the institutionalization of SAS at UNA and the Alternative Conflict Management Program (see Annex 9 for details), both of which had been selected in coordination with IDRC HQ and the Honduras Project team.

The Evaluation was vast and the field trip extensive, in order to capture as much as possible the impressions and key elements of the experiences in each interview and visit made. Even with a focus on the two sub-projects, it was not possible to learn of the opinions of all the actors involved in each case, neither to confirm exhaustively the accomplishments on the ground. The short time available for the field work did not make possible an in-depth view as would be optimal. The information existing in the documents was not organized by institution, which made it difficult to have a global appreciation of the level of effort experienced by each major partner. Updated figures on the total number of people and organizations which participated in or benefited from the Project's activities have yet to be confirmed.

As this was an external evaluation, the formal participation of the IDRC Honduras team, was limited to their providing information, facilitating contacts with interviewees and logistical support. Nevertheless, the Evaluation Team saw the study as a learning opportunity and so there was regular sharing and reflection on initial impressions during the process. Additionally, meetings with the Project Team were held at the beginning and the end of the field trip to introduce the evaluation and provide some preliminary feedback on observations. In the final meeting, Simon Carter, Program Manager, IDRC, Ottawa, responsible for the Project, was also present. The Project Team was extremely cooperative and provided invaluable support to ensure the Evaluation study was successful. It should be noted that this was the first external evaluation done of this Project, which up till then had mainly periodic analysis of information and monitoring through internal meetings and reports. The participation of other stakeholders was very limited, being mainly sources of information and in some cases supporting the Project team in making contacts and in visits to the field. Considering the participatory and learning character of the project, there should have been planned during the Project's cycle, preferably at mid-term, at least a participatory evaluation involving the Project team and its principal partners , in order to assess what was being learned and make adjustments as warranted.

¹ For example, the final version of the List of Sub-projects, partners and products was sent on June 12, 2007 and the presentation of the draft report was scheduled for June 18, 2007; updated information about Outcome mapping and RDS was provided after the draft report.

The Evaluation team in hindsight feels that the TOR should have perhaps considered more a focus on principal partners of the project rather than try to address the wide scope of topics and institutions. It was ambitious to try and cover this scope with the depth required for a five year project of this scale during a two week field trip. Now that the issues are clearer, and it is evident that institutional capacity building is the major thrust of the Project, IDRC may wish to contemplate another more in depth study of the contribution to capacity building and learning made by the Project with what turned out to be its principal institutional partners.

This report is built on what could be captured and analyzed during the preparation stage and field work. Further evidence was provided by the Program Team after the presentation of the preliminary report, which was included selectively. All the comments received from the IDRC and CIDA staff about the preliminary report were answered by the Evaluation Team .

EVALUATION FINDINGS

This section is presented according to the Evaluation questions set by IDRC in the Terms of Reference.

1. OBJECTIVES

1.1. To what extent has project met its objectives; what has been achieved?

The Project's General Objective was to strengthen the capacity of people and institutions in Honduras to plan and implement development projects and policies that address the needs of the poor and other vulnerable populations such as women, children and indigenous peoples.

This was to be achieved by building learning systems for Honduran development that use broad-based dialogue, power sharing, research and collaborative learning to define development priorities and plan and implement projects and policies, especially in the area of Environment and Natural Resources Management ²

The Project's specific objectives are presented below with discussion on what was achieved.

Obj 1. To facilitate broad-based dialogue and power sharing in fora on national development problems, priorities and options.

The original plan for the Project to work with national development problems as defined by the National Sector Tables (Mesas) was modified as the Tables were not continued when the government changed in 2003.

² IDRC Project Approval Document "Building Learning Systems for Honduras" 100133, July,2002.

The Project has successfully promoted multi-stakeholder meetings, participatory planning methodologies and conflict management techniques (like SAS, MAC, LED) in most of the 29 sub-projects, focusing mainly on local development problems.³ Individuals from institutions who have shown interest (UNA, ANAF AE, CURLA, REHDES, RDS) have been trained in methodologies to test their use in their sub-projects which have been funded by the Project (MAC, SAS, Rio San Juan, Remittances, LED). Many of the sub-projects reviewed (for example UNA-SAS, UNA-LED, AMC, Rio San Juan, Farmer Schools) have applied and continue to apply some of these methodologies and techniques in meetings with community members, civil society groups (NGOs, associations of municipalities, municipalities, water management groups, private enterprise as well as local and national government bodies) in order to identify problems, opportunities, priorities, options, make agreements and develop projects and plans. The application and techniques promoted by the Project have increased confidence and motivation of all participants, especially community members, both women and men, as well as technical and research personnel that progress is achievable.⁴ The cases of Chagas and Remittances are the only projects focusing on national development problems; all other cases are works still in progress at the local level. The Chagas project was the only one in which there was collaboration directly with the National Chagas Roundtable.

Obj 2. To support project and policy planning and implementation processes that draw on and apply information and knowledge from a range of sources.

The Project in addition to the techniques mentioned above promoted improvements in systematization studies and associated training to provide information and knowledge bases particularly for project planning and decision-making (DINADERS and its beneficiaries-both individual and institutional). The systematization efforts have been readily adopted and around 100 practitioners have been trained through the FISDER project. Moreover, systematization was encouraged by the Project to document the main experiences of other sub-projects (e.g. Institutionalization of SAS in UNA, Chagas, and Systematization of ProMesas projects).

Achievements at the policy level have been few (systematization of the Chagas project experience, Alternative Poverty Indices project and the Remittances project.) The consultations and development of the PRIDE (*Programa de Investigacion para el Desarrollo*/National Program of Research for Development) Initiative are aimed at major policy uptake of a National Research Program in Honduras. The changing policy environment at both national and municipal levels due to elections and changes in authorities limited opportunities or interrupted efforts made to influence policy although there were few attempts made. Apparently, no systematic effort was made by the Project or its partners to present for example the information generated from the major systematization work done in a format or mechanism that would be valued by or impact on policymakers. At the project level, Outcome Mapping (OM) training and application

3 Review of Project documents and sub-project interviews.

4 Enthusiasm and comments captured in interviews on sub-projects at communities Flor de café (Olancho (SAS), Balfate (ACM) and institutions such as CURLA, RDS, REHDES and UNA

has been found to be very useful for the strategic vision, identifying partners and relations in project planning⁵, the process of building OM plans was found to be very useful for project design and planning and even was identified opportunities to use SAS techniques to facilitate the process⁶.

Obj 3. To promote monitoring and evaluation processes that enable responsive implementation and cumulative learning by stakeholders.

The Project has focused only on Outcome Mapping training and application in its efforts to improve monitoring and evaluation (M&E) during project implementation. The adoption of OM has been partial for M&E. UNA and ANAF AE are preparing their sub-project reports to IDRC using Progress Markers and Indicators, no evidence was found about the use of Diaries for feeding these reports. The Tracer Study mentions 6 organizations⁷ of 50 trained that were using Progress Markers and qualitative Indicators in accordance with OM practice.⁸

Some of the reasons for this level of implementation were the complexity of the methodology, and the time and human resource it demands. More particularly there needed to be an institutional commitment to its adoption, which was not possible as some institutions felt restricted by their donors as each demands specific M&E methods such as LFA, and found incompatible or would lead to duplicate work. In other cases, discussions with institution directors had not taken place⁹. More could have been achieved if the Project had looked at these limitations and opportunities and adjusted the training and application according to partners' concerns. The training in OM advanced mainly to the visioning and planning components, so its use in monitoring was limited to a few cases –Rio San Juan, UNA and ANAF AE (ACM) sub-projects. ANAF AE and UNA are moving on to apply OM principles to their institutional planning and performance monitoring. A Community of Practice on Outcome Mapping has been established recently to link those institutions and individuals working with this technique to share experiences. Resources for training and accompaniment were limited to two consultants (one local and one from Colombia) and the IDRC-team. Project staff was directly responsible for leading training sessions. This was not sufficient to advance the uptake of OM. In addition the OM training focused on the strategic vision and intentional design stages and so exposure to the monitoring and evaluation components was very limited which also has reduced its use in M&E.

The Evaluation Team was surprised to find that OM was not fully used as a monitoring and evaluation tool for the overall IDRC Honduras project. No evidence was found for the use of Diaries to feed into the progress benchmarks. However progress benchmarks

⁵ Interviews with ANAF AE, CURLA, UNA, PNUD, ACDI, and REHDES representatives highlighted this appreciation and potential.

⁶ CURLA and UNA interviewed mentioned this joint application.

⁷ CESAL, ADEPES, CIDICCO, COHDEFOR, FUCAGUA, and ICADE.

⁸ The Project Team provided with the comments on the draft evaluation report additional information about the implementation of OM in the Sub-projects. It is an extract of a report of the consultant Natalia Ortiz, where it is mentioned that 3 projects (DEL, Rio San Juan, and the Committee of MAC) have designed their diaries and used the progress markers for a group reflection.

⁹ Tracer study, page 14- 20, interviews with two project institutions.

suggested by OM were used on individual sub-projects reports. Monitoring of the Project was not systematic. Reports did not clearly show what was being achieved, according to organized plans for activities and monitoring within an overall OM or LF plan. Annual reports were confusing as they mixed OM concepts of reporting on outcomes as well as those of “temporal log frames”. IDRC should have negotiated with CIDA on the type of report it would require or at least that OM would have been accepted and implemented.

Regarding the promotion of cumulative learning, systematization played a major role on this, and it has been treated on the earlier section on Objective 2 (see page 11).

Obj 4. To support research that enhances the capacity of Honduran society to plan and implement projects and policies in the area of Environment and Natural Resource Management.

Of the 29 sub-projects funded by the Project (see Annex 4), 15 research sub-projects were supported, mainly through small grants (PRIDE pilot, MAC Research Fund, Rio San Juan) and thesis support at partner universities on mainly ENRM topics which utilized participatory research approaches.

There were three major research initiatives: Farmer Schools on Agroecological Farming, which developed farmer-led research activities in agroecological farming in a number of communities in two regions of Honduras and led to significant adoption and income generation from organic fertilizer and potato production; Migration and Remittances in Olancho which pioneered research at the community level of the socio-economic impact of remittances on rural families; Chagas disease project which worked successfully with Lenca communities to identify and implement measures to control the disease vectors locally as well as procedures for the mass treatment of children in remote. The opportunity to apply the methodologies promoted by the Project in larger and high-priority ENRM sub-projects was not taken up as much as it might due to the lack of local research capacity and the lack of time for research project development due to the time intensive capacity building activities of the Project team. Thus little evidence was generated of the value of research and learning to progress in development and policy. Most research stayed at the local sub-project and thesis level, except for the cases of Chagas which affected health policy and Farmer Schools project which extended to North Coast communities during the life of the sub-project.

1.2. How have objectives evolved and project has adapted to changing contexts, risks, opportunities and constraints

The specific objectives of the Project changed marginally over its first three years, mainly to focus on characteristics of the Learning Systems as they evolved. (Table 1) There was no evidence that these changes were officially agreed on between IDRC and its donor, CIDA.

The concepts of efficiency and equity were added to the first objective presumably to ensure the integration of gender equity and appropriate participatory methodologies, such

as those from SAS, to make stakeholder meetings more effective. In the second objective learning systems were specified as the source of knowledge and information, as the Project aimed to concentrate on their promotion and adoption. The third objective remained unchanged. The fourth objective was modified also to replace research by the broader concept of learning systems (which includes research). At the same time the project areas were aligned to three priority sectors defined by the CIDA-ProMesas program in 2003-4 viz. health, environment (particularly watershed management) and education instead of the Environment and Natural Resource Management field originally specified.

TABLE 1. EVOLUTION OF OBJECTIVES ¹⁰

Original Objectives (Project Approval Document, 2002)	Objectives (Annual report to CIDA, May 2004)	Objectives (Annual report to CIDA, June 2005)	Objectives (Annual report to CIDA May 2006)
Obj 1. To facilitate broad-based dialogue and power sharing in fora on national development problems, priorities and options	No change	To facilitate broad-based, <i>efficient and equitable</i> dialogue and power sharing in fora on national development problems, priorities and options	No change
Obj 2. To support project and policy planning and implementation processes that draw on and apply information and knowledge from a range of sources	To support project and policy planning and implementation processes that <i>are enriched by</i> , and apply information and knowledge from, <i>Learning Systems</i>	No change	No change
Obj 3. To promote monitoring and evaluation processes that enable responsive implementation and cumulative learning by stakeholders.	No change	No change	No change
Obj 4. To support research that enhances the capacity of Honduran society to plan and implement projects and policies in the area of Environment and Natural Resource Management.	To support <i>Learning Systems</i> that enhance the capacity of Honduran society to plan and implement projects and policies in the area of environment, <i>health and education</i>	No change	No change.

¹⁰ There was no presentation of the specific objectives in the Annual Report to CIDA, May 2003.

In the second year of the project, the CIDA-ProMesas Program was having difficulty in identifying local institutions with the capacity to implement its projects. At the same time, the change in Government in 2003 led essentially to the dismantling of the Sector Tables (mesas) which were expected to be the source of project ideas both for CIDA support and complementary research and learning activities to be supported by the IDRC Project. These changing contexts led IDRC to focus on capacity building for research and learning as its main strategy in the Project. The objectives thus became slightly more focused, and the Project concentrated on promotion, training and application of the range of learning tools and methodologies that responded to these objectives.

A major risk was moving ahead in this direction without identifying key partner institutions and evaluating their needs for capacity building. The program decided on the methodologies and promoted them widely to all institutions, through open invitations to introductory training workshops. This was high risk as there was no guarantee that institutions would adopt them, and if so whether they would adopt them in a short enough time frame so that they could be applied to CIDA projects or that if indeed CIDA-ProMesas would use these institutions for its development interventions. Additionally, as CIDA projects were not coming on stream other applications for their use would need to be identified. IDRC saw the opportunity to build capacity in a range of institutions so that there would be a platform of expertise to be used for development projects in Honduras in the near future, especially for those of CIDA when they emerged.

No only did IDRC and CIDA decide to try and work synergistically in the ProMesas Program, which was a challenge in itself, but ProMesas was also an experimental program at CIDA, from which CIDA wished to learn. If this was not risky enough, IDRC did not foresee the effects to its Project that CIDA's audit would have on its planning over the 2004/5 period: staffs changed three times in the field and HQ, its funding for ProMesas programming was frozen for several months, an internal audit led to reduction in funding which in turn reduced , the number of sectors to be covered and the number of technical staff, as well as a reversal from decentralized management of the CIDA ProMesas project. During this period, communications were even more limited and opportunities for joint planning in the field vanished. The IDRC- Honduras project funding carried on, with bridge funding from IDRC-HQ but the partnership and planned complementary programming disappeared over this period. The IDRC Project adapted to this situation by continuing on its Strategy of capacity building independent of CIDA-ProMesas and from then on the two programs developed on parallel tracks.

Another major risk taken on by IDRC was establishing an office outside of HQ or a Regional Office (Montevideo, in this case) and the hiring of new staff to coordinate and support the Project's activities both technically and administratively. Although the Project was an important activity of one of IDRC's Program Initiatives (MINGA) at the outset and managed by experienced Ottawa-based Program Officers, this decision was a leap of faith for IDRC which brought with it an inevitable time lag and learning curve for new staff to be productive as well as master IDRC's programming and administrative procedures, as well as its culture. It should be said that the staff chosen performed extremely well and worked intensively over the duration of the Project with dedication and commitment. It did not help that as the staff were learning to work with IDRC and CIDA-ProMesas that CIDA changed course.

In addition, risks were high that changes in governments at national, regional and local levels during the life of the Project would affect its progress and relevance. Moreover, IDRC's Project in particular was a very sophisticated undertaking related to foster learning for development in the challenging context of a low capacity country.

Opportunities for alliances were taken up readily especially in linking with GTZ in jointly supporting the National Initiative on Systematization; and again with GTZ/DED (Germany) in collaboration on ACM and LED and later with SNV (Netherlands) in ACM. UNDP joined with SNV and DED on the Research Committee for the ACM initiative which indicates the level of interest in conflict resolution by some donors in Honduras.

Although the IDRC Project carried on, essentially divorced from CIDA ProMesas programming, opportunities for complementarity which had been identified earlier, were continued through development and funding of Chagas Disease and Rio San Juan watershed management sub-projects, but others that were developed for Olancho were cancelled when CIDA removed this region from its revised program in 2004/5. Only now in the final months of the Project are opportunities to work with the new CIDA team being explored and implemented. (see section 4.1) .

The major constraints on the IDRC Project related to limitations in human resources and administration procedures for grant administration. Two new program staff and one support staff were hired specifically for Project, both of whom had no experience with IDRC as an organization, its processes and culture. They took time to get the project operationalised and to learn IDRC 's project administration procedures. This reduced progress in the first year. Once the Strategy was implemented and capacity building activities were underway, their time was taken up with extensive hands on support and training requirements of institutional partners. This reduced time that should have been spent on research project development.

1.3. How effective have been risk mitigation strategies to support achievement of project objectives; how have risk strategies evolved during the project ?

The Project responded to the risk of moving ahead with low capacity institutions in the learning projects, by focusing on capacity building to respond to objectives. This emphasized training in methodologies for multi-stakeholder processes (SAS), planning (OM and Systematization), monitoring and evaluation (OM) and research support for all institutions interested. Project staff were heavily involved in training, mentoring and accompaniment to ensure quality control of training. Later they were supported by a small team of local consultants who were also trained by the Project.

As CIDA ProMesas and Sector Tables did not provide entry points, the Project mitigated its risk of lack of programming, through implementing its own program based on capacity building around a few key methodologies. This advanced without any major impediments, but regrettably CIDA was not able to follow up with any of the institutions whose capacity was improved by the project. This was due not only to changes in CIDA's programming but also to the lack of

targeting of the IDRC Project on institutions which had potential to be partners with CIDA in implementing its program.

In order to minimize the risks of the new staff in operationalising the Project, IDRC did arrange for training sessions at HQ for the Project Officers shortly after their hiring, and held annual meetings in Ottawa with the wider Program team interested in and supporting the Project, to assist them in integrating into the IDRC culture and procedures. Problems continued with administrative issues for quite some time, as HQ had to authorise and make payments on every activity, until the Coordinator was able to obtain some level of signing authority later in the project. Despite the high transaction costs associated with this ‘country office’ which was an anomaly in the IDRC set-up, the Project team and their support at HQ, successfully executed a large number of activities over the life of the Project.

The changing Government actors led the Project to have few interventions with central government, so local, municipality and municipal associations were targeted as partners. In addition other civil society partners were sought in order to neutralize the impact of change of local government actors in projects as well as capacity building activities. (LED with the Chamber of Commerce of Catacamas, water councils and community groups and organizations in AMC, SAS, Rio San Juan, Chagas, Farmer Schools sub-projects). Another example is the PRIDE initiative where the Project encouraged co-management by FOPRIDEH (Honduran Federation of Private Development Organisations) and COHCIT (Honduran Science and Technology Council) to neutralize the risk of inaction if the funds were left solely with the government partner. As most of these activities are still works in progress, these strategies have proven to be effective up till now.

1.4. How sustainable are activities initiated by the project?

Since the Project concentrated on promotion of methodologies and elements of capacity building, and many individuals and, in some cases, institutions have partially adopted them, it is anticipated that many of these tools will continue to be applied and built on in future projects and in other fields in Honduras and elsewhere in the Central American region.¹¹ Staff of some of the institutions visited – ANAF AE, CURLA, REHDES, UNA and RDS all emphasized that they and some of their colleagues have learned of the value of aspects of Outcome Mapping, SAS, Systematization and Conflict Management that will continue to influence their work at their institutions, with project partners and communities and more widely in their family and church relationships. “IDRC planted a seed which will continue to grow”.

These developments will be supported through the mechanism of Communities of Practice which have been established around the methodological tools which have been promoted by the Project. The most advanced is that of the SAS group (involving staff from UNA, CURLA, ANAF AE,

¹¹ Examples are : UNA staff, and the university reported they will continue to promote the training and application of SAS techniques in the future, including in Central American regional projects, following certification of initial 7 professors and the institution; CURLA staff interviewed indicated they would continue to actively promote OM and SAS techniques with local mayors, colleagues and university authorities; community members from Balfate during their interview expressed how the ACM techniques learned in the Project had application in other conflicts such as at the family level.

RDS and REHDES); another is being initiated on Outcome Mapping with staff from ANAFAE, REHDES and CURLA. These Communities of Practice encourage sharing of experience and learning from each other in the application of the methodology mainly through meetings, as Email communication is not readily available to all, or it is not yet a regular mode of communication.

In terms of financial sustainability, a number of the projects will continue with financial support from elsewhere:

- Sustainable Development Network/*Red de Desarrollo Sostenible* (RDS) will receive support of 50,000 USD from the Ford Foundation to continue its Migration and Remittances research and expand it to watershed conservation and bringing unused land into production. This will permit preparation for a larger project to be presented jointly to Ford Foundation and IDRC for funding.
- RDS will also continue to work with staff from UNA on the Local Economic Development (LED) sub-project initiated with the municipalities of Catacamas (UNA) and Santa Maria Real (RDS), in Olancho to take the next steps to implement priority investment projects. These will utilise limited local funds at the municipality as well as finance being applied from the Central Government's funds for Poverty Alleviation (resulting from HIPC relief). In addition, RDS's efforts to establish a Savings and Loan Cooperative with the community at Santa Maria Real for processing of remittances from family members, will provide an opportunity for the community via the Coop to promote and partner in small local investments in productive projects, some identified through the LED exercise, which will help build some sustainability and growth in the community. The Project team recently indicated that GTZ through DED as well as SNV have been reviewing the UNA experience in LED and are considering incorporating elements from the UNA sub-project into their activities.¹²
- ANAFAE expect to be able to continue extending their experience on participatory action research in the Farmers Schools (Escuelas de Campesinos (ECA)) through a contract with FAO in the Centre and North Regions and with Heifer International in the West where livestock will be integrated into the agroecological systems being tested by farmers in their own communities. Other possibilities are being explored with Zamorano University and CATIE (*Centro Agronomico Tropical de Investigacion y Ensenanza/Tropical Agricultural Research and Higher Education Centre*), based in Costa Rica.
- The Alternative Conflict Management (AMC) sub-project coordinated by ANAFAE is expected to continue with some support from GTZ and possibly UNDP, who are participants of the Research Committee. A proposal for continued support from IDRC is under preparation, which will likely request support for organization of training and research in two or more regions, rather than coordination from the capital. There is also potential interest from CIDA to ensure Conflict Management activities are integrated into Watershed Management projects in the North Coast.

¹² Comments on Draft Evaluation Report from IDRC Program Branch, July 2007 (Annex 1)

- IDRC's Partnership and Business Development Division (PBDD) has begun in 2007 to assist 3 institutions (UNA, RDS, and ANAFAE) as well as the project PRIDE partners (COHCIT and FOPRIDEH) to develop strategies for resource mobilization and partnerships which will support their sustainability in the future. These strategies will involve developing business plans, fees for services, identification of partners for funding and fund raising activities. This support from PBDD needs to be accelerated so that some possibilities are in place by the end of the Project. UNA is planning to establish a Foundation to be able to promote and provide fee for service training and consultancy services on SAS, based on international certification of 7 of its professors and future certification of the institution and continued links to the international SAS community coordinated through Carleton University in Ottawa.
- The National Program of Research for Development, PRIDE has just been launched as a pilot activity for 8 months, supported by the Project to continue supporting applied research and capacity building in Honduras, coordinated jointly by COHCIT (Government) and FOPRIDEH (NGO sector). Additionally FOPRIDEH will continue to promote systematization methodology developed through Project support together with GTZ to the National Systematization Initiative¹³ and it has created its own Knowledge Generation Unit to strengthen "learning" among its 77 own members.¹⁴ One of the aims of the PRIDE project is to attract funding from other donors and government as a means to establish a National Research Fund mechanism in the country. Following the launch, which the evaluators were able to attend, there are indications of possible interest from the local World Bank office, in providing some funding, which could provide sustainability into the future. Regrettably this initiative has only been initiated in the final months of the Project, leaving little time for the Project staff and PBDD to build partnerships for sustainability.
- There may be opportunities for CIDA to continue building on activities initiated by the Project:
 - Six CIDA funded activities are being tracked through Systematization studies for lessons learned.
 - The new CIDA team in Honduras has requested training on Outcome Mapping. This has been initiated by the IDRC-Honduras team. Members of the CIDA team interviewed , stated that they had found this useful for visioning, planning and identification of partners and relationships. A follow-up session has been planned. CIDA staff indicated their keenness to test this approach and to explore how OM can integrate with their corporate RBM systems.
 - Although the CDPF for future work in Honduras has not yet been approved, it is anticipated that CIDA will continue support for Watershed Management at least in the North Coast. This could provide opportunities for institutions such as REHDES, CURLA, MAMUCA and community groups which have developed experience with SAS, Systematization, OM or Alternative Conflict Management to continue their work in that region. IDRC may wish to consider consolidating any continued support in this region and sector in collaboration with CIDA.

¹³ Information provided to Evaluation Team during interview with GTZ staff, Tegucigalpa. May, 2007

¹⁴ Comments on Draft Evaluation Report from IDRC Program Branch, July 2007 (Annex 1)

- The Project Team has recently indicated that UNA and Carleton University are both working on two proposals for CIDA to continue promoting SAS in Honduras.¹⁵

2. OUTCOMES

2.1. Which are the main outcomes on project partners related to actions, behaviors, institutional orientation, relationships and policies attributable to the project?

Outcomes are defined by the Outcome Mapping (OM) approach¹⁶ as *changes in the behaviour, relationships, activities, or actions of the people, groups, and organizations with whom a program works directly*. They are expected to happen in the Boundary partners, that are those individuals, groups, and organizations with whom the program interacts directly and with whom the program anticipates opportunities for influence. The assumption is that the boundary partners control change and that, as external agents, development programs only facilitate the process by providing access to new resources, ideas, or opportunities for a certain period of time. A focus on the behavior of the boundary partners does not mean that the program decides how, when, and why those partners will change, it devolves power and responsibility to endogenous actors. These principles of OM, were followed partially by the Project (the concept of Boundary partners, definition of expected outcomes, reporting of the project based on outcomes).

The original project Outcomes, as described in the Project Approval Document were changed without any formal approval. The Temporal Logic Model included in the Project Approval Document (2002) considered four Outcomes. They were maintained throughout the project until the Annual Report to CIDA 2003-04 (2004) where some rewording (*highlighted in italics* in Table 2) was done to better fit the activities carried out by the Project. In particular, it should be noted the change in the focus from **Boundary** partners to **Partners** in general. Later on, additional changes (underlined in the text) were incorporated in the Project Performance Report 2005/2006 (April, 2006), which indicated that the Project could only be expected to initiate the outcomes expected.

TABLE 2: Evolution of Outcomes

Project Approval Document (2002)	Project Performance Report 2005/2006 (April, 2006)
1. Boundary partners share, appreciate and accommodate the experience and perspectives of diverse stakeholders when defining development problems and identifying development priorities and options.	1. <i>Partners <u>begin to</u> share, appreciate and <i>integrate</i> the experience and perspectives of diverse stakeholders when defining development problems and identifying development priorities and options.</i>
2. Boundary partners plan and implement knowledge intensive projects and policies that	2. <i>Partners <u>begin to</u> plan and implement <i>research in response to knowledge needs</i> that address</i>

¹⁵ op.cit.

¹⁶ This is a framework promoted by IDRC. More in Sarah Earl, Fred Carden, and Terry Smutylo, OUTCOME MAPPING -- Building Learning and Reflection into Development Programs. IDRC Books free online, http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-28377-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html.

Project Approval Document (2002)	Project Performance Report 2005/2006 (April, 2006)
address complexity, diversity and power differences.	complexity, diversity and power differences of <i>multiple stakeholders</i> .
3. Boundary partners actively identify, share and map out their learning priorities, make course adjustments and disseminate cumulative learning emerging from projects and policies.	3. <i>Partners begin</i> to actively identify, share and map out their learning priorities, make <u>adjustments based on monitoring and systematization</u> , and disseminate the cumulative learning emerging from projects and policies.
4. Boundary partners collaborate in assessing and addressing knowledge gaps, generating development options and applying and disseminating knowledge to solve development problems.	4. <i>Partners begin to</i> collaborate <u>with others</u> in assessing and addressing knowledge gaps, generating development options and applying and disseminating knowledge to solve development problems.

It is difficult to follow the different kinds of Outcomes used in the Project reports. Besides the four global Outcomes mentioned above, there are others used by the Project team and the sub-projects in their reports that do not have a direct link to these original four. The box below illustrates some examples of Expected, Achieved and Desired Outcomes:

<p>1)Source: Annex JEO – 010, Project Annual Report May 2003</p> <p><u>Expected Outcome for MAMUCA (Association of Municipalities of Central Atlantida):</u> MAMUCA, as a learning organization, promotes discussion processes focusing on issues of the equity and efficiency of networking.</p> <hr/> <p>2) Source: Section IV – Project Monitoring Matrixes, Annual Report to CIDA 2005 – 2006 (May 2006)</p> <p><u>Expected Outcome N° 2: UNA plans and implements research in response to the knowledge needs of multiple stakeholders.</u> <u>Achieved Outcomes:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The UNA lead team uses SAS techniques to identify alternatives to problems addressed through its intervention work, outside of the SAS II project. Four community assessments were developed for at least four communities (Coray – Department of Valle, Olanchito – Department of Yoro, El Naranjal – Department of Olancho, Dulce Nombre – Department of Copan). These diagnoses identified the communities’ main research needs, and thesis proposals were developed in response to the results. (continues...) <hr/> <p>3) Source: Project Document – Alternative Conflict Management on Natural Resources, ANAF AE, August 2005, page 26.</p> <p><u>Desired Outcome 1: Strategic partners apply research – action in the management of specific conflicts,</u> count with trained facilitators, who facilitate new training processes and accompanying in the region to apply research – action in the management of new conflicts. Also generate mechanisms of collective communication, sharing, and learning with new organizations interested on ACM. They manage resources and assume responsibilities in the monitoring of the process in their regions.</p>

Confusion increases when considering that the project documents also have Objectives and Results, and their internal connections with Outcomes are not explicit either. In addition, it is

also difficult to identify the boundary partners among the large number of organizations that the project reached directly and indirectly during its life cycle¹⁷. In the end, it is not easy to say who will change and what kind of changes (or Outcomes) will be experienced by the project. Consequently it is difficult to monitor and evaluate any changes due to this inaccuracy and the lack of a baseline of learning capacities or systems for each of the (boundary) partners. The design of the Program Objectives and Outcomes was not clear enough to assure a good connection with the Project's M&E system.

Regarding the latest update of the four global Outcomes, some comments can be made on their accomplishment. The Evaluation Team shares the perception of the Project Team when they did the last reformulation of the project Outcomes: the Outcomes show important progress, but will not be fully achieved by the end of the Project. Some factors that have influenced this situation are: the time of implementation was reduced by the project reorientation mentioned in section 1.2; the dispersion of efforts among many actors and sub-projects; capacity building is a slow process especially due to the initial low capacity levels found in the partners¹⁸; the intensity of direct hands-on support provided by the Project Team in training and accompaniment.

The following are some specific comments for each Outcome:

Outcome 1: Partners begin to share, appreciate and integrate the experience and perspectives of diverse stakeholders when defining development problems and identifying development priorities and options.

In its draft final report to CIDA, the Project Team mentions that this Outcome can be seen in the following partners: DINADERS, ANAF AE, GTZ, RDS, UNA, and San Juan Project (CURLA, REHDES and MAMUCA) and World Vision. Except for the latter, the Evaluation Team interviewed members of all these partner institutions, and found in all of them an appreciation and some level of application of the different methodologies promoted by the Project that encourages the integration of diverse perspectives. But, we are not able to demonstrate any institutional change. The Evaluation Team is in agreement with the Tracer Study of 2006 that the application of two of the methodologies promoted for more time (SAS and Outcome Mapping), is incipient and at the individual level in most cases, so could not be considered as an institutional practice in any of the institutions reviewed.

¹⁷ In the Position Paper (2007) the evaluation team identified more than 70 organizations/ projects with whom the project related in its 29 sub-projects. Sector Tables, Planning Fora and Applied Research Communities in Honduras, LAC and Canada were identified as initial Boundary partners in the Project Approval document 2002. Some more detail was provided in the document IDRC – Honduras Learning Strategy and Annual Report 2003, where up to 19 Boundary Partners were identified, but this selection was not updated after the Sector Tables were cancelled. The Evaluation Team requested the Project team provide a summary of sub-projects by partners to appreciate the investment in each of these organizations. ANAF AE, UNA, GTZ, RDS and PRONADERS were those included in the summary and are assumed as the main partners by the evaluators. For recently provided full list see Annex4.

¹⁸ Pointed out in different documents of the Project e.g: Meltzer, J. Assessment of the Political, Economic, and Institutional Contexts for Participatory Rural Development in Post – Mitch Honduras (2001); Programa de Investigación para el Desarrollo: Propuesta para la operacionalización e institucionalización. Mayo, 2005; Méndez Sofia, Evaluación Formativa: Componente de Construcción de Capacidades del Proyecto Construcción de Sistemas de Aprendizaje en Honduras N° 103545. Setiembre 2006 (Tracer Study)

The experience of UNA with SAS might be one of the best examples of the success achieved by a partner regarding this Outcome. The authorities and professors of this university find, among other benefits, that the application of SAS allowed them to be more responsive to the community needs. UNA is planning to become in the short term an accredited SAS university, and 7 lead teachers will receive international certification soon. Signs of mainstreaming of SAS were captured: trained teachers, incorporation into the curricula, use of tools in student's thesis and other research activities.

Outcome 2: Partners begin to plan and implement research in response to knowledge needs that address complexity, diversity and power differences of multiple stakeholders.

The Project team is reporting in the draft final report that ANAFAE, CURLA, REHDES, UNA, GTZ and RDS are accomplishing this Outcome. They also mention the PRIDE initiative (whose partners are FOPRIDEH and COHCIT) as an example of this Outcome taking place.

In the Evaluation, it was confirmed that the Project provided valuable conditions (methodology training, funding, technical assistance, trust) to support research in its different ways, and there is a large list of outputs generated with the project support and within the 29 sub-projects funded (see Annex 4 for the list of the project outputs). Research was done within participatory processes, for example in the case of the implementation of LED or ACM, where the opinion of people was gathered using SAS methodologies; also as a sub-project itself as in the case of Farmer Schools.

The Project was committed to include gender issues in its interventions and this orientation was followed. Gender issues were considered in OM, while identifying strategic partners and also in applying SAS tools, in order to capture diverse points of view, and in adapting them to include different gender perspectives¹⁹. Some sub-projects like the Integrated Watershed Management in Rio San Juan included training on gender issues targeted to the municipal association MAMUCA. And among the Farmer Schools carried out by ANAFAE there was an outstanding group of women whose work was highlighted

Institutions like ANAFAE, UNA and RDS expressed their interest in continuing their research beyond the project end, but funding is a major limitation. RDS partially solved it through a grant from Ford Foundation. Much of the acquired capacities are not consolidated yet, such as in the case of CURLA which has been related with the Project for only about a year and a half. At ANAFAE, the staff at headquarters of their network feels strongly about adopting some research methodologies but this is not necessarily happening within its affiliated partner organizations.

The PRIDE Initiative launch coincided with the field visits of the Evaluation Team. It will operate until December of this year under the leadership of FOPRIDEH (umbrella NGO organization) and COHCIT (governmental entity) and will focus on two topics: Water and Energy. The presentation raised some doubts in the evaluators regarding how this fund for research would really encourage applied non-academic research projects like those promoted by

¹⁹ The consultant Cecilia Sánchez who was supporting LS in this area made a reflection and proposal on how to make more explicit the incorporation of gender issues in SAS.

the Project, such as Farmer Schools and systematization ²⁰ or the improvement of M&E systems using Outcome Mapping, since this seems to be out of the scope of PRIDE.

Outcome 3: Partners begin to actively identify, share and map out their learning priorities, make adjustments based on monitoring and systematization, and disseminate the cumulative learning emerging from projects and policies.

The Project team reports in its draft final report that DINADERS, ANAF AE, CURLA, GTZ, RDS, UNA, REHDES and World Vision are showing this Outcome. They also mention that nine partner organizations (ANAF AE, UNA, RDS, CURLA, Popol Nah Tun, CENET, FIPAH, Fundación Simiente and CESAL) are using Outcome Mapping tools in their own M&E processes.

As mentioned before, the Tracer study concluded by the end of 2006 that Outcome Mapping had not been institutionalized²¹ yet within the partners. The Evaluation Team found evidence of the use of OM in the Sub-projects of UNA and ANAF AE regarding its strategic approach (definition of outcomes and boundary partners) and the identification and reporting of progress signs, but did not find any example of the use of the recommended tools like diaries of outcomes, strategies and performance. Some reasons were mentioned above, like the perceived complexity for using these reporting tools, or the lack of institutional support due to the exigencies of donors to use Log Frame Approaches. See also section 1.1. and 3.1.

Regarding the dissemination of cumulative learning, once again, the large number of outputs included on Annex 4 is evidence of the important role that the Project played stimulating learning, especially from research and systematization projects²². However the Evaluation did not capture evidence that there was any institutional incorporation of lessons learned coming from systematizations, neither the utilization of the published materials.

The connection between the cumulative learning and policies is still weak. The sub-projects on Remittances and Chagas seemed to have been the only ones with some influence on public policy makers.

Outcome 4: Partners begin to collaborate with others in assessing and addressing knowledge gaps, generating development options and applying and disseminating knowledge to solve development problems.

The project team reports in its draft final report that this Outcome is being achieved by DINADERS, ANAF AE, RDS, UNA, REHDES and GTZ. There are also specific examples of

²⁰ FOPRIDEH was one of the partners of DINADERS and GTZ transferred their systematization approach and methodology from the National Systematization Initiative to them. It is anticipated that FOPRIDEH will advocate for incorporating these other modalities of systematization.

²¹ Institutionalization understood as the “systematic implementation of the methodology inside an organization, related to the operational processes of the activities, to use the instruments the methodology proposes into the activities” Tracer Study page 20.

²² The Project Team provided with the comments on the draft evaluation report an Excerpt from NSI final technical report where are mentioned some organizations – like PRORENA Olancho, CARE, SAVE THE CHILDREN, and ASONOG – that are planning to do by their own other systematizations.

this collaborative work in ACM, LED, potato seed production among Farmer Schools, the Community of Practice of SAS and the Systematization Initiative.

The evaluators found evidence that collaborative work was happening, which was a very positive and new development in the research and development community in Honduras. New partnerships and alliances and the strengthening of them are seen as a benefit that the Project brought with the sub-projects. The RDS coordinator mentioned alliances with other organizations as added value of its activities in the Project; UNA and Carleton University are working closely on using SAS in development activities DED is currently considering a request to provide an advisor to UNA on institutional strengthening; the open “mesas de dialogo” in the Rio San Juan sub-project have evolved to bring a number of local stakeholders, communities and development groups together to identify knowledge gaps, research need and work on implementation of projects

Changes in self-esteem, positioning and reputation have also been detected in the Evaluation, such as in the case of UNA with the incorporation of SAS, or the opportunity that Farmer Schools brought to some producers.

Regarding attribution of the Outcomes to the Project, the absence of baseline data on partner’s behaviors and capacities limits the extent of the conclusions. The underlying assumption is that the methodologies promoted by the project were new and no other organizations were doing something similar, or if it was the case (like in systematization) the project supported it. But participatory methodologies have been known in Central America for more than 10 years and apparently the limitations that the Project helped to solve were the correct application of them and providing resources to test them in the field.

2.2. Which methodologies/strategies proved to be more effective for achieving the outcomes?

The methodologies supported by the project were: Social Analysis Systems (SAS), Outcome Mapping (OM), Systematization, Communities of Practice (CoPs), Alternative Conflict Management (AMC), Local Economic Development (LED), and Farmer Schools (ECA).

Systematization was an effective methodology to achieve Outcomes N°2 and 3, through generation of knowledge based on study and reflection of the project experience and lessons learned, so it provides learning for the needs of different actors, and is easy to disseminate in published form. When the Project began, it was widely accepted in Honduras as a valid mechanism for generating knowledge. The Project made a good strategic decision when it decided to join forces with DINADERS and GTZ to bring increased rigour and strengthen the methodology of systematization through the National Initiative on Systematization.(NIS) The implementation of NIS had enough time to almost conclude its cycle during the life of the Project. GTZ is completing the transfer of it to FOPRIDEH and consolidating it as an academic program to continue training of Honduran professionals on this methodology. However no evidence was found in the evaluation about the use of lessons learned from systematization to make adjustments in interventions. For example, the Systematization study on the Chagas

Project was completed at the end of the sub-project, so none of its findings could influence the sub-project. However they will be of value if the sub-project is replicated elsewhere in the country or region in the future.

SAS is a set of methodological tools which contributed to Outcome N°1, and excited the UNA, CURLA, and an individual consultant (Laura Suazo) about its potential and multiple applications. Users say that the methodology helps them to be more inclusive and participatory, and encourages ownership by stakeholders of the results. It is seen as a toolkit that includes simple and flexible participatory techniques, some of them known, that can be used in the short term. Although 75% of participants in the SAS training program said they knew beforehand some of the SAS tools, they found the methodology facilitated more systematic application²³.

Farmer School methodology was suitable for Outcome N° 2 and opened an opportunity for community members to carry out their own research based on their own needs. This methodology has been tested in different parts of the world before being implemented by the project.

OM was a novel methodology²⁴ which was inserted in a context of low capacities of different types, including M&E. As seen in section 1.1., Objective 3, in OM the strategic vision, boundary partner identification and progress indicators were embraced by several different organizations. Some of them tried to link this to their other logic models by incorporating qualitative indicators in their M&E system. The Evaluation Team did not find evidence that monitoring components of OM, such as diaries were being used. None of the projects had reached the evaluation stage. OM is seen as a more complex process that influences organizational practices and relationships over the medium to long term. As no other M&E systems were promoted, the decision to focus only on OM might have limited progress on the Outcome No.3

ACM is seen as relevant and positive by some users of the methodology, but is difficult to discriminate to what extent it is an intervention or it is really research. It appears to be an intervention. Also it is difficult to sustain because it relies on active local facilitators to lead the discussion and negotiations among parties. It will take time to build up the experience and skills of the local facilitators. There has not been sufficient time yet to know how well this approach will work; it still needs to be consolidated and tested fully in real conflict situations. (Annex 9)

LED is a promising methodology which is being tested in its first applications in Honduras through the Project. Local development plans in two municipalities will be finished close to the end of the Project, but the impact of this process will not come until much later. There is a risk that good intentions will stay in a plan, a common experience in the Honduran context. To avoid these frustrations, efforts should be made to accompany the municipalities in the implementation of the aspirations identified with the LED methodology. In Santa Maria Real, RDS is planning

²⁵ Reference from Tracer Study.

²⁴ The Evaluation Unit provided additional information about the OM along with their comments on the draft evaluation report: "...The novelty and experimental nature of outcome mapping throughout the period in which this project was implemented. The project was an early adopter of an innovative methodology that is focused on supporting social change and social learning (not feeding a bureaucratic performance measurement system). The Honduras project team engaged in this experimentation and contributed greatly to the community of people worldwide learning about how to use outcome mapping".

to continue supporting the municipality because they will continue working in the topic of remittances, which is closely linked to LED. In the case of Catacamas, a DED advisor is deeply involved in the LED process and will continue supporting the municipality in association with the team at UNA.

The Communities of Practice were only initiating at the time of the Evaluation, so there has not been enough time to prove if they worked, but sustainability will be a challenge. The SAS CoP shows some progress, local practitioners have joined with international knowledge sharing virtual spaces, and the upcoming certification process is also a motivator for keeping this CoP dynamic.

The Project did not attempt to compare learning systems according to sectors, since its focus on learning and capacity building was cross-cutting. Most of its partners applied their skills in the natural resources area, with the range of outcomes discussed above. There was one research and systematization sub-project in the health area (on Chagas disease) and none in the education sector, since the Project strategy was not aimed at targeting specific institutions by sector. Strategies will be discussed in section. 3.2.

2.3. How sustainable are the outcomes achieved with project partners?

As mentioned above, all the Outcomes – understanding them as changes in behaviours, attitudes, relationship, action -- are in process, there is progress but more time is required for them to be consolidated.

The sustainability of the Outcomes should not be confused with the sustainability of the activities carried out by the project that was treated in section 1.4. However there is an assumption that methodologies lead to outcomes, and they contribute to the achievement of the objectives. This is the underlying project theory of change. The evidence found in the Evaluation supports this assumption and it is expected that the continuity of the methodologies introduced and supported by the Project will contribute to the consolidation of some of the associated Outcomes (see Table 3 , elaborated by the Evaluation Team).

TABLE 3. Project Objectives, Outcomes and Methodologies

OBJECTIVES MAY06 ANNUAL REPORT 2005-6	OUTCOMES PPR 2005- 06 REPORT	METHODOLOGIES
Obj 1. To facilitate broad-based, <i>efficient and equitable</i> dialogue and power sharing in fora on national development problems, priorities and options	1. Partners begin to share, appreciate and integrate the experience and perspectives of diverse stakeholders when defining development problems and identifying development priorities and options.	SAS, LED, ACM
Obj 2. To support project and policy planning and implementation processes that draw on and apply information and knowledge from <i>learning systems</i>	1. Partners begin to plan and implement research in response to knowledge needs that address complexity, diversity and power differences of multiple stakeholders.	Systematization, Farmer Schools

OBJECTIVES MAY06 ANNUAL REPORT 2005-6	OUTCOMES PPR 2005- 06 REPORT	METHODOLOGIES
Obj 3. To promote monitoring and evaluation processes that enable responsive implementation and cumulative learning by stakeholders	2. Partners begin to actively identify, share and map out their learning priorities, make adjustments based on monitoring and systematization, and disseminate the cumulative learning emerging from projects and policies.	OM, Systematization, CoP
Obj 4. To support <i>learning</i> systems that enhance the capacity of Honduran society to plan and implement projects and policies in the area of Environment, <i>health and education</i>	3. Partners begin to collaborate with others in assessing and addressing knowledge gaps, generating development options and applying and disseminating knowledge to solve development problems.	LED, ACM, Farmer School

2.4. How have other project participants been impacted by the project's activities?

The Project did not clearly identify which were their specific boundary partners²⁵, nor who were the boundary partners of the boundary partners. All were treated as a general group of partners, and the effects on them were described above.

However, some positive reactions were registered on those who benefited from the improved performance of those partners strengthened by the Project. Some examples:

- The community Flor de Café of Catacamas, exposed to SAS, whose members could describe in their own words the process they had gone through with UNA professors and could justify their priorities.
- The municipal council of Catacamas was satisfied with the LED process and product that UNA was conducting under the guidance of ACEDI of Canada and CEMET of Bolivia
- The mayor of Masica was grateful for the support of REHDES in the municipality, especially regarding the incorporation of gender issues. As a result, the mayor created an office within the municipality to attend to women's issues.
- Community members of Balfate demonstrated that they had learned much about how to deal with conflicts due to their participation in the ACM sub-project.

2.5. What are key lessons for future IDRC programming in Honduras?

- IDRC should include a capacity building and learning systems component to all its future projects in Honduras to continue to strengthen the institutional base which has been initiated in rural/community development related to conflict management, participatory planning and research for future programming

²⁵ There is an attempt to do this in the Project Approval document 2002 and in IDRC – Honduras Learning Strategy (2003) but it was not updated after the Sector Tables were cancelled.

- While it is laudable in a low capacity country to invite all who are interested to participate in learning systems, progress would be faster and outcomes more achievable with a more focused and strategic approach whether geographic or thematic to really see full cycle benefits. There should be a strategic analysis of partners, to identify which would be most appropriate as boundary partners and what their needs are for capacity building and learning.
- Focus should be on local government and communities and other actors to achieve outcomes and sustainable development results
- Longer time frames are required to see real outcomes of capacity building and development results on the ground, with the clear intention to build learning systems .
- Importance of building Communities of Practice, building and strengthening networks of individuals and institutions and community groups to sustain momentum and sustainability of learning and development results
- It is essential to work with the whole institution. Authorities and leaders of the institutions must be brought on board for commitment to change. In addition it is important to assess whether it is the right “moment” for the organization to embrace change such as that proposed by the project.

3. CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

3.1. What are the contributions made by the project on building and strengthening the capacities of people and institutions to plan and implement development projects and policies?

The Project has significantly increased the access of individuals and organizations of Honduras to innovative and tested participatory methodologies that encourage different ways of learning as well as a wide range of options to apply in different moments of a project cycle that encourage learning.

The Project considers as trained those who participated in its workshops²⁶ regardless of the number of events attended by each person or any other criteria that demonstrate an appropriation of the methodology. This understanding of who is trained and/or has the capacity can be questioned. The certification of SAS is significant progress on this issue.

Figures of the number of trained people and institutions are uncertain. IDRC reported to CIDA that a total of 590 persons were trained in the new methods: 420 persons in SAS, 78 in OM, 40 in ACM and 28 in systemization of research techniques as well as 24 farmers in conducting research on common crops (corn, beans, cassava, cucumber, squash)²⁷. These figures are quite different from those reported in the Tracer study (2006), where those considered as trained were

²⁶ Two references which show this understanding are: 1) Tracer Study (2006), which shows the total number of trained people in OM (230) as the sum of the number of participants to the 14 workshops, without identifying number of workshops attended. 2) PPR 2005 on page 3 reports without any additional comment: “... Finally, two conflict management workshops have been organized training 99 participants from 64 institutions”

²⁷ Source: CIDA ProMesas External Evaluation (2006), section Use of Knowledge Based Approach to Program Design and Delivery.

196 people representing 42 institutions in SAS and 230 people representing 35 institutions in OM. The actual figures have yet to be confirmed by the Project Team.

The LS Project was careful to neutralize some potential limitations in the application of the methodologies through creating enabling conditions such as providing small grant funds for application of the methodologies, technical guidance by qualified consultants, as well as continuous feedback among peers in the CoPs.

As noted in the Tracer study and in the interviews done for the Evaluation, some level of individual and group appropriation of the methodologies was found. Institutionalization did not happen as expected, at least in the case of OM and SAS, with the exception of UNA with SAS that is the more advanced case of institutionalization. The Tracer study highlighted some of the factors that limited the systematic implementation of these methodologies within the organizations, as follows:

For OM:

- Some institutions did not see the added value of OM: it was more workload and expense or it needed more resources for implementation.
- There were difficulties to match the institutions’s existing M&E system with OM. There was more likelihood of success where no M&E system was in place.
- Some institution directors were unaware of the demands and value of the methodology, since trainees were generally technical staff, so it was difficult to obtain support for its implementation in their Institution.

For SAS:

- Similarly there was a lack of support from management, since the methodology was introduced at technical or mid-level staff.
- Technically oriented trainees, presented a certain resistance to include social analysis in research.
- There was insufficient knowledge of some tools and the basis for applying them (knowledge of computing and statistics was required for using some tools).

In terms of institutions where capacity building was supported, about half of the sub-projects (14 of 29) funded by the Project involved 5 organizations. (Table 4).²⁸ Three of these -ANAFAE, UNA and RDS where most interventions were concentrated, were identified as initial boundary partners in the IDRC – Honduras Learning Strategy document:

TABLE 4. Institutions supported most by the Project

Institution	Sub - project name and number	Total Investment CA	Methodology/ Topic
-------------	-------------------------------	------------------------	-----------------------

²⁸ This table was prepared based on the Position Paper (2007) and the document “Listado de Instituciones Socias del Proyecto Sistemas de Aprendizaje – Mayo 2007”, provided by the Project team. In this latter document, there are other activities mentioned for these 5 institutions which have no sub-project number. assigned Those were not included in this table. A full list of sub-projects by institution was recently provided (see Annex 4).

Institution	Sub - project name and number	Total Investment CA	Methodology/ Topic
ANAFAE	Outcome Mapping for Honduran Development (N° 101883)	25,419	OM
	Participatory Research for the Promotion of Ecological Agriculture (Honduras) (N° 102140)	385,890	Farmer Schools
	Capacity building for partners (N° 102418 -13)	182,318	ACM
	Natural Resources Conflict Management Program	253,500	ACM
	Capacity building for partners (N° 102418 -002)	See above	SAS
UNA	Stakeholder analysis workshop (N° 101752)	33,467	SAS
	Social Analysis Systems Phase II (N° 102600 - 003) Honduras component	165,000 ²⁹	SAS
	Capacity building for partners (N° 102418 -021)	See above	SAS
	Capacity building for partners (N° 102418 -018)	See above	LED
	Local Economic Development in Catacamas and Santa María Real, Honduras (N° 103621)	130,000	LED
	Capacity building for partners (N° 102418 -012)	See above	Remittances
GTZ	Systematization training (N° 102176)	123,410	Systematization
	National Systematization Initiative on Development Experiences (N° 103331)	52,400	Systematization
RDS	Capacity building for partners (N° 102418 -009)	See above	Knowledge sharing
	Case study of knowledge sharing: the collaborative water group (N° 102391)	42,300	Knowledge sharing
	Impact of mitigation and remittances on local development in Olancho, Honduras (N° 102559)	193,900	Remittances
	Local Economic Development in Catacamas and Santa María Real, Honduras (N° 103621)	See above	LED
	Capacity building for partners (N° 102418 -002)	See above	SAS
PRONADERS	World Organic Congress (N° 101589)	2,410	Research/ Systematization
	Strengthening the Management of Rural Development (N° 101658)	8,250	Research/ Systematization
	Strengthening Research and Training for Sustainable Development (N° 101893)	373,024	Research/ Systematization

²⁹ Total budget 1,406,400, of which 165,000 CA is for Project activities in Honduras (Position paper 2007, page 43)

PRONADERS, a Government Program, was one of the institutions supported in the early stages of the Project. Its FISDER sub-project promoted Systematization at the national level, trained more than a 100 people and supported up to 24 systematization studies (10 of which have been published). This experience with PRONADERS and FISDER created an important precedent in the country. Unfortunately there was a rupture between the Project and PRONADERS due to the results of an IDRC audit and the current government did not give the same relevance to this institution in its administration. The plans to form a network of systematization practitioners, in a Community of Practice, are expected to continue within the PRIDE initiative.

GTZ was and continues to be a key partner in the project for scaling up systematization. The Project was also able to interest GTZ in other methodologies like ACM, where it participates on the Research Committee and it is now willing to explore some further activities. GTZ – IDRC collaboration is an interesting case to show how aid harmonization can work in Honduras. This case challenges the definition of Boundary Partner, whether Cooperation Agencies should be considered in this way.

RDS really took advantage of the opportunity the Project brought to them to enter into a new theme - research on remittances. This is a new field for them and they gained a good reputation with the work done, positioning themselves as leaders in this field. As a result of this support and the results achieved, they have been successful in obtaining additional funding from Ford Foundation to continue in this theme in addition to their continuing work with the credit cooperative of Santa Maria Real. Beside this institutional impact of the Project support for RDS, it seems that the findings from their research are filling a gap in the knowledge about this important socio-economic issue in Honduras.

Regarding UNA, what is remarkable about this institution is how they embraced SAS and how they have progressed to institutionalizing it, incorporating SAS methods in the curricula, promoting its use in students' and faculty research, facilitating the preparation and the pending certification of a team of 7 lead professors, and initiating an application to become a certified SAS centre(Annex 9). LED was also important for UNA as it gave them a chance to support the municipality with this technical role. How UNA will be able to continue using this methodology and maintain its role with the municipality is not clear.

ANAFAE's capacity in ACM is well recognized and demanded. It was built on its former experience with COLABORA , to which has been added one year and a half experience supported by the Project.(Annex 9). It is one of their key possibilities for service provision, as a funds mobilisation strategy to continue to build ACM in Honduras. However they still have the challenge of how to decentralize this capacity and develop more qualified ACM facilitators in the regions. Some progress has been made with associated organizations on ACM like REDHES and Popol Natuh. Farmer Schools for participatory research is another area in which ANAFAE has worked with Project support. They capitalized on this experience and motivated their regional network affiliates to be more active on this methodology. ANAFAE's coordination at its headquarters is attempting to use OM for planning their sub-projects and for their own institutional planning. They appreciate how this methodology enlarges the vision of actors. SAS was not used as intensively as the other methodologies.

PRIDE inherits the Project's accumulated experience and goals to provide a mechanism that hopefully will provide continuity for existing partners and motivate the involvement of new ones, contributing in this way to an improvement in the capacities in the country to encourage learning through research for development.

With respect to the formulation and implementation of policy advocacy, the action of the Project was limited, as it principally concentrated on the generation and sharing of knowledge coming from the systematization of practice and research. There was essentially no capacity building or other activities carried out by the Project designed to influence decision makers.

**3.2. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the projects approach to capacity building ?
Were they relevant/ pertinent?**

The Capacity Building Strategy

Given the low capacity for learning detected at the beginning of the Project, it was considered necessary to have a capacity building strategy targeted to boundary partners, to strengthen their learning systems³⁰. The Project described Learning Systems as methods, processes and activities that enable people to create, organize and share knowledge that can be used to help make better institutional decisions and more appropriate development interventions. The development of LS within an organization, institution or network establishes practices and mechanisms that facilitate this learning and collective generation of knowledge. The focus is on the organization. This relates to the reflective learning systems as described in the box below.

³⁰. Source: Position Paper, March 2007.

WHAT ARE LEARNING SYSTEMS³¹

The term systems and processes are widely used in various contexts. The difference between a process and a system is the focus. In a system the emphasis is on the function (what the system does). In a process the emphasis is on the activities (how things are done). If we can consider the organization as a learning system and we ask ourselves HOW the organization (and its departments, units) learns, we can distinguish 3 types of situations:

- a. A non-adaptive system: It does not learn and consequently does not adapt itself to the environment. The activities have a repetitive character and continue until the system fails.
- b. An adaptive learning system: In this system information is provided about the results and ploughed back into the system, adapting the system. We can think of a development project with a monitoring system. However, there is no feedback on how the monitoring system functions. So, an adaptive system learns, but does not improve its learning capacity.
- c. A reflective learning system: In a reflective learning system one is not only concerned about the results, but also about the functioning of the feedback system. Continuous feedback is obtained on how the feedback system functions and how the feedback system can be improved. An example of a reflective learning system is a development project that regularly evaluates the functioning of its monitoring system.

A reflective learning system reflects upon learning and improves:

The way of feedback and assessment; The way to get information about alternatives; The way to make decisions; The way to enable people to implement new decisions.

A reflective learning system learns and learns to learn better, thus improving the speed and quality of learning which makes it better able to adapt itself to changes in the environment.

The IDRC - Honduras Learning Strategy document (2003) includes 3 lines of action:

- a) First line of action: The identification of the entry points was one of the most critical tasks and the first line of action. Based on initial discussions with local actors, a diagnosis carried out by Judy Meltzer on 2001, and the availability of some methodologies promoted by IDRC, it was decided to focus on methodology improvement as the entry point; firstly on SAS, OM and systematization, and then later on knowledge sharing (Communities of Practice, CoP), Local Economic Development (LED), and institutional strengthening³².
- b) Second line of action: In addition to the Sector Tables existing at the outset, the Project aimed to implement a tripartite Sector Table focusing on applied research in Honduras in order to stimulate dialogue, discussion and research about the practices of Learning Systems Approaches in Honduras, and to assess the need for reliable data. This was not implemented as planned because of the changes in the Sector tables.

³¹ Based on Management for Development Foundation, Materials of the course Organisational Development for Advisors and Consultants, Ede, The Netherlands, June 2006.

³² There is reference to different activities for institutional strengthening of boundary partners to contribute to the sustainability of the learning systems in the Tracer study, page 7. This entry point is only mentioned in this document.

- c) Third line of action: The Project would develop a research fund to sponsor applied research activities to increase and strengthen local knowledge, which it was hoped would attract the interest of other donors. The National Program of Research for Development , PRIDE is the mechanism that resulted.

The Learning Systems Project used a combination of mechanisms for the capacity building, which varied depending on the methodology and on the interest of the institutions to an initial open invitation:

- Sequence of introductory and more advanced workshops, carried out by consultants trained by the Project and by members of the Project team.
- Application of the methodology to a specific situation through a sub-project. Grantees received resources and technical assistance from a consultant trained by the project , as accompaniment during this activity
- Knowledge sharing via CoPs.

Comments about the Capacity Building strategy

The Evaluation Team agrees on the need for a capacity building (CB) strategy in a context like Honduras, but we believe it should have been targeted to the boundary partners..

There is a first observation about the boundary partners. As mentioned before, there was an initial identification of about nine categories of boundary partners in the IDRC – Honduras Learning Strategy, that was not updated later. The capacity building activities were provided essentially to individuals of various organizations that showed some interest to apply the methodologies promoted by the Project, and the expectation was that this would lead to an institutional impact. There was not a real targeting on boundary partners.

The second observation is about the understanding of learning systems (LS) as the implementation of a range of participatory methodologies rather than as a system that exists in an organization (it may be weak, incomplete or implicit but it is there), that should generate and gather information to answer learning questions relevant to the critical issues of the organization, using different mechanisms, and provide continuous feedback about the learning mechanisms. The definition and understanding of LS in the Project lacks the “what for” and a real connection with the organization’s concerns and challenges, that would motivate it to encourage adoption of new practices and organizational change. It would appear that the Project was more concerned with promoting its methodologies rather than understanding the specific potential and needs for learning of their boundary partners. Additionally, there was no diagnosis of what was understood as a learning system for each of the partners and therefore what were the gaps. As concluded in the Tracer study, an initial individual diagnosis should had been done for each institution that was participating in the CB program, to identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and needs, as well as enabling or limiting conditions for a CB process.

The entry point, the why to build or strengthen a capacity, should have been related to the “problematique”³³, not the methodology, neither the institution. It is the problem in the

³³ As mentioned in the document IDRC- Supported Capacity Building: Developing a Framework for Capturing Capacity Changes. Neilson and Lusthaus, Universalia, February 2007.

institution that needs to be addressed, and if it is so, the problematique is part of a research system, and the focus should be on creating or building a critical mass to focus on the enabling conditions and the capacities needed to find the solutions to these challenges, that may vary over time. The point was that in the Project , essentially a wide range of institutions (not necessarily boundary partners) were provided with methodology training as a means of upgrading the general knowledge management capacity in Honduras. The opportunity to really build capacity in key institutions in Honduras in learning systems (including where appropriate new methodologies) to contribute to development priorities, was only partially realized.

Regarding the mechanisms used for implementing the CB, the combination (training, accompaniment, application opportunity, CoP) as well as the approach of learning by doing, were appropriate. The training and facilitation of conditions for the application of methodologies (technical assistance, funding) were very useful for reducing the “knowing-by-doing” gap. However the lack of attention to bringing the institutional leadership on board *apriori* was a mistake that limited progress on institutionalizing good practices. Most benefits remained at the individual level. Besides this, some participants of the CB program felt overloaded by the sheer number of workshops and methodologies that were offered, so the effectiveness of so many workshops as the mechanism did not work very well, even though the workshop mode is popular in Honduras as presential learning appears to be what is desired.

Dispersion was also a factor. Many small projects, on different topics, in different institutions and parts of the country demanded technical and administrative attention for their management and took time for their implementation. Progress was slow, workload for Project staff was heavy, intense and stressful. The Project Team had to split their time between management issues and CB activities which they assumed with courage and total dedication and commitment, but their time could have been better allocated if more strategic institutional targeting had been done.

As mentioned earlier, the Project Team took the wise decision to collaborate with GTZ on systematization and pool efforts and funding. This approach could also have been explored more fully and earlier with other institutions like SNV and DED who also work on capacity building of key institutions, although more at the individual institution level than at the larger scale, multi-institutional level managed by GTZ.

Although it was not intended, the Project became involved in general organizational strengthening as it accompanied the institutions with whom they worked. The Project also brought PBDD from IDRC to build capacity in partnership development, resource mobilization and fundraising at ANAFEA, RDS, UNA and PRIDE partners. Also skills were improved on financial management, budget preparation and bank reconciliation for ANAFEA and RDS administrative staff, through training provided by IDRC staff at LACRO in Montevideo, which considerably improved their financial management and reporting to IDRC. Most institutions were mentored by the Project Team in report writing and preparing proposals and presentations. This support provided for a very select group, was well appreciated, but was not implemented in a systematic way.

Specific strengths and weaknesses of the Project’s CB strategy can be highlighted:

Strengths:

- Innovative methodologies were introduced to Honduran institutions, together with enabling conditions for their application (resources, technical assistance, materials).
- Participant organizations are now in a better position to handle social analysis systems, outcome mapping, systematization and other learning systems methodologies.
- Learning was encouraged from a number of angles³⁴
- Trust was nurtured in the partners to experiment and learn.
- IDRC brought opportunities to diverse organizations, not only to those that were more developed.
- The Project's time frame of 5 years provided opportunities to build capacities over time with some organizations.

Weaknesses:

- The entry point was the methodology and not the needs of key organizations nor a problem to solve that motivated them to improve their learning systems.
- LS were not widely understood, especially by CIDA over the life of the Project.
- Institutions focused on, and their improved capacity, were not utilized by CIDA-ProMesas.
- Time lag for the capacity building, in the manner conducted, was perhaps too long to be of value to CIDA
- Boundary Partners were not clearly identified. Dispersion was around a sub-project model of intervention with many partners.
- No institutional diagnostic was done to identify learning needs of Boundary partners.
- The M&E system of the IDRC Project did not clearly connect to the Project's objectives and activities, nor detect needs for any adjustment in them.
- CB did not include other skills such as project management or communications. Only three institutions were assisted in acquiring resource mobilization skills, two only in financial management.
- There was no analysis done of the organisation's needs or challenges and whether the Project was active at the opportune moment for promoting learning systems.
- Too many methodologies and workshops at the same time. Although other mechanisms were used (i.e. accompaniment, CoP) workshops were perhaps overused.

3.3. What capacity will remain in Honduras as a result of the project?

The capacities discussed in section 3.1. are still at an early stage in most institutions and require more time for their consolidation. It is envisioned that there will be some continuing efforts in the institutions to develop and mature the capacity in Honduras after the Project ends:

³⁴ Theorists of learning, and adult education in particular, have long observed that cognitive – sense making is only one dimension of learning and knowledge. Changes in behavior are more likely to occur where learners cycle through a variety of learning experiences, usually including an iteration of action, reflection, conceptualisation and practice, or combining experimental, presential, propositional, and practical learning. Source: IDS, “Knowledge management and organisational learning for development – KM4Dev Workshop Background Paper”, July 2006, Page 11.

- Individual capacities, especially in those interventions that had more time and intensity of implementation, like SAS and Systematization. For example: 40 professors at UNA, trained in SAS methods, 7 of whom will become certified practitioners (Annex 9).
- Consultants that collaborated with the project were updated with innovative methodologies and approaches. This new knowledge and skills became part of their potential, which they used when working with different organizations. The Project continues its influence through the action of these trained consultants
- Some progress has been made at the institutional level, particularly with UNA and RDS. The Project came at a time that was opportune, when UNA was coming out of a crisis and RDS was taking advantage of the opportunity of the Project to experiment with research in the new field of Remittances. As a result of CB support from the Project, UNA is in the process of becoming a certified SAS institution and. RDS entered into research on migration and remittances, which was a new field for them, and in which they developed leadership. ANAFAE's progress on the use of ACM (Annex 9), OM and Farmer Schools is also significant. At CURLA, particularly the Rural Development group have embraced the initial SAS and OM training and are promoting these areas with other colleagues and the institutional authorities.
- The relationships built and strengthened within the activities promoted by the Project, are now part of the institutions' social capital.
- Several members of communities were empowered with skills to discuss conflicts and plan development activities with other stakeholders, based on SAS and ACM activities of the Project, which will no doubt carry on in the future.
- The total numbers of people trained in the various techniques have yet to be confirmed by the Project.

4. ADDED VALUE OF PROJECT

4.1. How and in what ways has the Project supported CIDA's ProMesas Program?

The IDRC Project was designed to support learning related to the Sector Tables which were to be the focus of CIDA's ProMesas Program. At the outset, IDRC- Honduras staff and former CIDA ProMesas staff reported to the Evaluation Team that they worked closely together to review opportunities and needs, as well as to develop operational procedures for the decentralized pilot CIDA program in Honduras. IDRC assisted CIDA in decision making on projects and institutions during the first year or so. Early on, the government changed and the Sector Tables were not supported and they failed to operate, so this central design feature for the CIDA and IDRC collaboration collapsed.³⁵ While CIDA-ProMesas adjusted to this situation, the IDRC Honduras Project staff adopted a strategy to focus on capacity building emphasizing methodological training and later applied research projects. This strategy responded to the low capacity of Honduran institutions to implement CIDA's development programs as well as to

³⁵ Comment from CIDA on Draft Evaluation Report, July 2007 on "the efforts made by the IDRC team to integrate their work into PRO-MESAS, as they joined and participated actively on the weekly PRC meetings held within the PRO-MESAS team" in the early stages of the Project.

carry out applied research to inform development project design.. The methodologies were expected to assist in building learning into projects so that adjustments could be made as experience was gained and lessons were learned. Thus multistakeholder participatory methodology tools in SAS, planning, monitoring and evaluation through Outcome Mapping (OM) and more rigorous systematization methodologies were promoted through a series of training workshops, with follow –up funds for application projects supported by coaching from consultants. There was an obvious time lag built into the IDRC approach, as such capacity building took time and results were not available in the short term to be able to assist CIDA in its initial stages of ProMesas Program implementation.

In 2004, CIDA carried out an internal audit of its ProMesas Program which resulted in the freezing of operations for almost a year, the reduction of the program and its staffing. The IDRC Honduras Project continued functioning and was able to initiate two projects which linked directly to CIDA’s ProMesas program by providing complementary support: the National Chagas Disease project (2004) and the Rio San Juan Watershed Management project (2005) on the North Coast, both of which were identified from the original Sector Tables. The projects also were the only ones which had collaboration with two Ottawa-based IDRC Program Initiatives, EcoHealth and RPE . In these projects IDRC’s support fostered multistakeholder and participatory approaches in the development projects, as well as applied research together with regular technical and administrative assistance from the Project team, which had the advantage of being close-by. In the Rio San Juan Watershed project, the desired synergy between the participatory and research activities on the one hand (supported by IDRC) and the development intervention (supported by CIDA_ProMesas) did not evolve; rather activities ran essentially in parallel.³⁶ The use of SAS and MAC and gender analysis training, provided by the IDRC Project to several individuals from the institutions participating in the project (REHDES, CURLA, MAMUCA) was reported to have facilitated the evolution of the regular round tables, *mesas de dialogo* (multistakeholder meetings involving communities, municipalities, private sector, development agencies) which have advanced the possibilities of planning for integrated watershed management.³⁷ This work is still in process and should be consolidated.

In the Chagas case the two organizations involved one on applied Ecohealth research in the communities and the other on interventions on treatments, did not work well together and they both advanced at different rates. However the project also worked well with the National Chagas Round Table and the results particularly on mass treatment of children and community awareness and community-managed vector control assisted CIDA ProMesas to work with government health authorities in pushing for mobilization of resources for treatment of children. The IDRC Project also supported the systematization of the Chagas project experience, which outlines lessons learned and recommendations for future work in replicating this experience to other parts of the country and the region. It should be noted that none of the staff from the

³⁶ Comment received from IDRC Program Branch on Draft Evaluation Report, July,2007. “In designing the IDRC project, efforts were made to create synergies but these did not result in much. There was little evidence that the CIDA project leadership in the North Coast wanted to learn jointly with the IDRC project, even though IDRC originally designed the project to support CIDA programming

³⁷ Emphasiised in interviews with REHDES staff as well as Ann Thomas, RPE Program Officer (IDRC,Ottawa).

institutions or communities involved in this project were trained by the Project in any of its methodology workshops³⁸.

More short term results were obtained when the IDRC Project provided assistance directly to the CIDA team through workshops on Systematization of the ProMesas Project³⁹ and exit interviews of departing CIDA staff in 2005. These pointed to issues related to operationalizing ProMesas projects and lessons learned. This led later to IDRC supporting Tracking studies or systematization of a number of small CIDA Promesas projects. These studies which are currently underway, will highlight what has been learned in these small projects and will identify opportunities to use this experience in future CIDA programming. This activity will complete by the end of the Project.

During these last few final months of the IDRC Project, at the request of the new CIDA Team in Honduras, who are managing the final stages of ProMesas and CIDA's future Honduras program (CDPF), the Project provided training in Outcome Mapping as a planning, monitoring and evaluation tool to the full CIDA Team, both Canadians and Hondurans. The CIDA staff stated that they found that this was valuable to the Team for bringing their ideas together on visioning, identifying partners and relationships which need to be included in planning of CIDA's new Honduras program. There are questions of how the OM approach can be reconciled with the official RBM approaches used by CIDA. The new CIDA team has also been reviewing the Systematization and Alternative Conflict Management methodologies that the Project has promoted for its new Program⁴⁰

In summary, the direct contribution to CIDA's ProMesas Program was very limited to the two main projects that CIDA implemented. The IDRC Program did not find it easy to collaborate with the large number of, often small, initiatives that CIDA ProMesas supported⁴¹. IDRC's support was mainly related to facilitating multistakeholder processes and applied research. Results in these cases are longer term. CIDA was not able to take advantage of the capacity being built by the IDRC Project, as when this was underway CIDA ProMesas was undergoing major changes in its operations. Shorter term results were achieved through IDRC's support to training and learning by the CIDA ProMesas Team and more recently to the new CIDA Team in Honduras.

In essence the opportunity was missed by the IDRC and CIDA-ProMesas teams in Honduras to identify and develop the synergistic relationship originally envisaged, due mainly to the crisis caused by the CIDA audit and the reduction of the CIDA ProMesas funding, staffing, geographic and sector coverage. However, this could have been handled better by IDRC. The IDRC Honduras Project Team, recognizing the low capacity of institutions to carry out research and support learning or implement development interventions with CIDA, should have done a systematic study of the key institutions in ProMesas three target sectors of environment, health

³⁸ Interview with Ana Boschio, Ecohealth Program Officer (IDRC, Ottawa).

³⁹ Sistemizacion/Sistemas de Aprendizaje en Pro-Mesas, Octubre 2005

⁴⁰ Interviews with Eric LaPalme and Martin de Groot, UAP, CIDA, Honduras, May 2007

⁴¹ Eric LaPalme, CIDA, Honduras, stated during interview that Promesas supported around 100 initiatives, many of which were very small. However the ProMesas Project list provided by IDRC Project in Honduras to the Evaluation team indicates that a total of 46 projects were supported by ProMesas.

and education to identify their needs for capacity building, develop plans for filling the gaps, including planning for applied research activities in these sectors in which to apply their acquired capacity. This should have been the main thrust of IDRC's program.

When the CIDA Program was revised, IDRC could have offered to assist the remaining ProMesas team, using OM and elements of SAS together to focus on the reduced program and what had been achieved to date to plan the revised program which they could have continued to develop together. At the time of the crisis, IDRC should have renegotiated its contract, or at least the objectives and expectations of its Project with CIDA, since the original premises of Sector Tables and the changes in CIDA's ProMesas Program and the very broad original objectives had altered its partnership potential. At this time agreement on joint planning between ProMesas and IDRC Honduras on essentially focusing on capacity building tied to achieving results in applied research related to CIDA's refocused Promesas Program could have occurred. In this way, IDRC's activities would have continued to complement CIDA's ProMesas objectives, despite the changes, and would have served to develop more capable institutions, as well as some initial research results relevant to the three target sectors. Simultaneously communications between the two institutions would have been more frequent as sectors, geographic focus and institutional partners would have been similar. There would appear to have been a vacuum in management at both IDRC and CIDA at the time, as there was no attempt to redefine IDRC's role and expectations given the significant changes made by CIDA to ProMesas. The IDRC Honduras team was left to carry on regardless.

4.2. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the IDRC-CIDA partnership in the Honduras development programming? How could future partnerships be improved?

Strengths:

- The partnership was specifically designed to encourage synergy and link activities on initiatives defined by the Sector Tables set up in Honduras after the Hurricane Mitch disaster. IDRC was to bring its strengths in participatory applied research, monitoring and evaluation and capacity building as approaches to complement CIDA's development projects in the same sectors, so that CIDA and its partners could learn during the implementation process, identify research needs and feed in research results as they became available and make adjustments as necessary. In this way sustainable and successful results for CIDA-ProMesas would be more likely.
- The IDRC Project team was located in the same office as the CIDA team which encouraged regular interactions and meetings to discuss and plan initiatives with CIDA colleagues.
- The IDRC and CIDA teams together provided a large, strong multi-disciplinary group to work together on multiple aspects of development in a low capacity country.
- Several CIDA –ProMesas specialists had long-term experience in Honduras in target sectors (forestry, agriculture, water) which would facilitate project and partner identification
- The IDRC Project's separate management and mandate brought agility and rapid response to construct research, training and learning activities, even when CIDA was reorganizing its program, staffing and resources.

- Once CIDA- ProMesas identified a project opportunity (Rio San Juan Watershed) IDRC was able to program its applied research and learning activities and mobilize resources for collaboration, including those from Ottawa-based Program Staff and Program Initiative. (RPE).
- Once IDRC (Honduras and Ottawa-based Program Staff from EcoHealth Program Initiative) identified its initiative on Chagas disease, CIDA Promesas collaborated with funding and links were made to the National Chagas Round Table for policy uptake.
- IDRC was able to support the CIDA team directly in learning from its ProMesas experience and more recently in team building and planning for the new CIDA team for future CIDA programming in Honduras.
- The IDRC Project concentrated on building research and learning capacity in a number of institutions as well as civil society groups which, although for the most part is a work in progress, represents a foundation of skills which CIDA can build on in the future.

Weaknesses

- Due to the experimental and decentralized nature of the CIDA-ProMesas program, there was no clarity or agreement on how to implement the initial programming or operations by CIDA and IDRC in the field which would have clearly established collaboration modes and expectations on both sides. The result was that the first year was taken up principally with meetings, planning, identifying areas of common interest and establishing operational procedures.
- IDRC's research and capacity building activities were longer term in achieving technical and learning results, given their nature and the low capacity of partner institutions. This frustrated CIDA which needed also short term results. Expectations from both sides were not clear.
- Frequent staff turnover at CIDA (in field and HQ) meant learning and relationships with the IDRC Project did not build over time. More particularly, within months of the start of the Project three of the ProMesas Program champions at CIDA HQ (VP Americas, Director of Central America Program and the Honduras Desk officer) left the organization or their post. They had been key actors in the development and negotiation of the project with IDRC. This left the Project with somewhat of an orphan status, with perhaps no-one at CIDA with a stake in the Project. The IDRC Team spent much time in educating CIDA's new staff of its role and activities.
- CIDA staff, especially at HQ, had difficulty understanding IDRC's role and what learning systems were and how they were to contribute to the ProMesas Program. This is still the case for several of the CIDA staff interviewed.
- IDRC's reports were not well received by CIDA's officers at HQ as they claimed that they did not clearly state what was being contributed and learned. This was despite the Project team's efforts each year to improve them. They also did not readily integrate with CIDA's official RBM systems, even though this was not required by the Grant Agreement. The Evaluation Team agree that greater efforts should have been made by IDRC at the outset to establish a clear understanding of what was expected in reporting to CIDA as this would have helped CIDA understand better what was being done and how this was contributing to ProMesas and broader development issues in Honduras, under the CIDA grant.

- CIDA's decision during 2004 to audit the CIDA-ProMesas Program, subsequently freeze its funds for a period, reduce its program to three sectors (environment, health and education) and fewer specialist staff, stalled momentum in the IDRC-CIDA collaboration.
- The IDRC Project developed then on a parallel track, recognizing that it could contribute to build learning systems through focusing on capacity building in regional and local networks and institutions dealing essentially with natural resource management issues in the North Coast and Olancho where the CIDA ProMesas Program had originally planned to be active.
- CIDA failed to utilize in large part the capacity being built in Honduran institutions by the IDRC Project for its program
- Formal communications from CIDA to IDRC, especially at the Headquarters level, were very limited. Meetings were rare and mainly dealt with problems and crises. There was no active communications strategy to maintain all management levels of CIDA and IDRC (field and HQ) adequately informed of progress and issues. The submission of the annual report was the main tool used. At the outset CIDA decentralized decision-making to the field level without any responsible contact at HQ, which prevented IDRC's HQ staff who were actively involved with its Honduras Team, to maintain good liaison with counterparts in CIDA-HQ. No record was found by the Evaluation Team of any formal correspondence on file between CIDA and IDRC on matters such as acceptability of annual reports, planning for the audit, results of the audit and implications for the IDRC Project.⁴² IDRC staff at all levels from field to management at the project, program and regional level made several visits to CIDA to meet with each new staff member as they came on board, to discuss progress and issues related to the IDRC Project, and on a few occasions give a seminar on the Project. It seems to have been essentially a one way flow, which did not help the IDRC Team to adjust their programming or report presentation in response to CIDA's apparent concerns.⁴³

Suggestions for improvement of future partnerships

- CIDA and IDRC together have the potential to provide a unique combination of skills and experience for pro-poor development, so every effort should be made to design the appropriate partnerships when the conditions are right, taking advantage of IDRC's experience and resources in the promotion of knowledge and research for development and CIDA's capacity to implement major development interventions. The partnership must recognize that IDRC's approaches and partners take time to bring forth results and develop processes. IDRC's activities need to be ahead of CIDA's timetable, in order to inform and contribute locally generated knowledge and processes to CIDA's programs at the opportune moment.
- IDRC and CIDA should negotiate and agree on roles, responsibilities and collaborations that would be used in operationalizing partnership programs, sharing the agreements at all levels from senior management to the field level, including administrative staff. Any

⁴² Copies of 5 Emails (dated from 2003 to 2006) from CIDA referring to Annual Reports, Meetings and Documents were applied to the Evaluation Team after submission of the Draft Final Evaluation Report

⁴³ In comments from CIDA on the Draft Evaluation Report, July 2007, it is mentioned that there has been much more interaction between CIDA and IDRC staff at HQ in the last year of the Project.

- changes which become necessary during the life of the partnership should be discussed and agreed on by both partners and shared at all levels.
- IDRC should ensure that any partnership with CIDA furthers, and takes advantage of its programming priorities, technical and financial resources and administrative procedures. The Honduras Project experience had major transaction costs for IDRC dealing with project administration and management oversight at a distance⁴⁴.
 - Greater risks are incurred when new staff are hired, who have to learn about both IDRC and CIDA while starting up the project.
 - IDRC should ensure that senior experienced program staff, with appropriate signing authority, is relocated to the project site at least for the first year to ensure a smooth start-up for the project and good relations with CIDA and administrative and other support units at IDRC HQ. Similarly experienced grants administration staff should also be relocated for the start-up phase at least. In this way any new staff could be trained and coached as required and IDRC and CIDA staff could make decisions on the spot for smoother execution of projects.
 - CIDA for its part should also ensure that it has the appropriate skill set for its role in the partnership, which is capable of working as a team with IDRC colleagues and designing and implementing projects with the desired synergies and flexibility, taking account of time lines for capacity building, research results generation etc
 - Based on this experience IDRC should avoid establishing a Project Team in a country where it does not have a Regional Office or a strong institutional partner capable of executing IDRC's responsibilities in the partnership.
 - IDRC and CIDA should from the beginning adopt communications strategy and tools so that all levels are regularly informed of progress and issues and adjustments to operations and programming in the most appropriate way. This should include an annual meeting (including tele/video conferencing of all staff and management) to review progress and aid learning among all involved.
 - IDRC should make efforts to provide RBM reports to CIDA and CIDA should make efforts to utilise OM reports for planning and monitoring of partnership projects. IDRC's Evaluation Unit could look at developing a hybrid system to capture all outcomes and results that would be acceptable to both institutions, perhaps as a broader study of how OM can be integrated into other donors' project management systems. This again would need to be evaluated by both groups and internalized by all, especially when new personnel come on board through staff movements.
 - While it is inevitable that staff changes will occur during the life of projects, IDRC and CIDA should minimize these changes in partnership projects and when necessary, sufficient time and resources should be applied to provide for orderly transfer of knowledge and relationships associated with changeovers, as well as for the capture of corporate knowledge and learning from the departing staff-member. In this way continuity and accumulation of learning and knowledge will be maintained.

4.3. How and in what ways have IDRC supported learning activities strengthened CIDA programming in Honduras?

⁴⁴ Interviews with IDRC Program Branch (Simon Carter, Jean Lebel) and ,Donna Bickford (GAD). May/june 2007

The response o this question is subsumed within question 4.1.

4.4. What is the potential of learning activities to strengthen future programming at CIDA?

The IDRC Honduras Project used the following definition for Learning Systems: “methods, processes and activities that enable people to create, organize and share knowledge that can be used to help make better institutional decisions and more appropriate development interventions”⁴⁵

Learning Systems therefore should be of major interest to a development agency such as CIDA whose mandate it to achieve successful appropriate development interventions. The issue is how to operationalize these methods, processes and activities in the institution and its projects. The attempt to link Learning Systems to CIDA’s programming in Honduras was part of the visionary design of the ProMesas Program, by CIDA and IDRC personnel who recognized its potential only a few years ago. The result in this case was not very positive, not because of the value of learning for development, but due to the difficulties to operationalize it under the conditions encountered in Honduras, the changes made by CIDA in the course of the program and the difficulties encountered between the two agencies in communicating their needs to make it work. In addition the nature of learning, based on consultation, research and reflection means that it is a longer term process that does not fit readily with structured and planned development interventions, which have little, if any opportunities for ongoing adjustments built in. However this should be possible and is essential if development projects are to respond to the basic needs of the poor, or their human rights to food, health, income and security. CIDA should be able to assign resources for ongoing learning processes in its projects, so that learning can be done and fed into the process as it evolves. This would reduce the reliance solely on external mid term evaluations to check progress, as learning approaches, including research, would provide ongoing tracking of progress, participation by stakeholders and opportunity for adjustments as interventions advanced. As was found in the Honduras Project, resources may have to focus on an initial phase of capacity building for key institutions to be involved in the project for learning and research, so that when the development project begins there already are institutions capable of working productively in the project, or in parallel to it to carry out learning systems work, as well as some initial research results which can benefit the initial stages of CIDA’s project. The learning processes, while they can be considered as cross-cutting, must be associated with a specific project, region, community or set of stakeholders and coordinated by key institutions and actors who can competently and actively generate, exchange and disseminate the knowledge and learning to facilitate decision making, planning and adjustment of CIDA’s development projects so that acceptable and sustainable outcomes are achieved. CIDA can take the positive aspects and the foundation built on learning systems in this Project for its future programming in Honduras and other low-capacity contexts elsewhere.

⁴⁵ Annual Report to CIDA 2003-04, IDRC, May 2004, p 4.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) It is recommended that for complex projects of this type, project planning is systematically carried out; that objectives are more precise and measurable, outcomes and expected results are more clearly connected and appropriate. This will not only assist in implementation, but will provide clarity for monitoring and evaluation, reporting and communications between partners and donors as well as ensure that sub-projects clearly contribute to the overall project's outcomes, objectives and goal.
- 2) CIDA and IDRC should ensure that the contract and project plan clearly expresses the expectations, the type of reporting and communication mechanisms to be used, in order to minimise frustration. When conditions change during the life of the project, the contract and plan should be renegotiated where appropriate so that activities can proceed according to the revised context. The changes observed in the Project in CIDA's plans were not formally communicated to IDRC, and the modifications to the Project's objectives and the strategies were not approved formally, which no doubt affected relations and expectations on both sides.
- 3) IDRC and CIDA should negotiate and agree on roles, responsibilities and collaborations that would be used in operationalizing partnership programs, sharing the agreements at all levels from senior management to the field level, including administrative staff. Any changes which become necessary during the life of the partnership should be discussed and agreed on by both partners and shared at all levels.
- 4) IDRC should ensure that any partnership with CIDA furthers, and takes advantage of its programming priorities, technical and financial resources and administrative procedures. The Honduras Project experience had major transaction costs for IDRC dealing with project administration and management oversight at a distance.
- 5) IDRC should avoid establishing a Project Team in a country where it does not have a Regional Office or a strong institutional partner capable of executing IDRC's responsibilities in a partnership, such as this Project. . At any rate, IDRC should ensure that senior experienced program staff, with appropriate signing authority, is relocated to the project site at least for the first year to ensure a smooth start- up for the project and good relations with its partners and administrative and other support units at IDRC HQ. Similarly experienced grants administration staff should also be relocated for the start-up phase at least. . In this way any new staff could be trained and coached as required and IDRC could make decisions on the spot for smoother execution of projects.
- 6) IDRC and its partner should from the beginning adopt a communications strategy and tools so that all levels are regularly informed of progress and issues and adjustments to operations and programming in the most appropriate way. This should include an annual meeting (including tele/video conferencing of all staff and management) to review progress and aid learning among all involved.

- 7) While it is inevitable that staff changes will occur during the life of projects, IDRC and its partner should minimize these changes in partnership projects and when necessary, sufficient time and resources should be applied to provide for orderly transfer of knowledge and relationships associated with changeovers, as well as for the capture of corporate knowledge and learning from the departing staff-member. In this way continuity and accumulation of learning and knowledge will be maintained.
- 8) If IDRC seeks to promote Outcome Mapping as its preferred tool for project planning, monitoring and evaluation, it should ensure that this is accepted by its partner during negotiations, as well as ensure that it is properly utilized in its own project. To encourage other partners to utilize this approach, it needs to be integrated with existing approaches such as RBM and LFA. IDRC's Evaluation Unit should consider promoting the development of hybrid systems to capture all outcomes and results, perhaps as a broader study of how OM can be integrated into other donors' project management systems.
- 9) In the application of Outcome Mapping, IDRC should ensure that the Boundary partners, which the project aims to influence, are clearly identified; who they are and how many it is feasible to cope with in the project. If changes are made during the life of the project, then the Boundary partners should be reassessed and any changes made accordingly.
- 10) IDRC should include a capacity building and learning systems component to all its future projects in Honduras to continue to strengthen the institutional base which has been initiated in rural/community development related to conflict management, participatory planning and research for future programming.
- 11) It is recommended that any future capacity building strategy should begin with an analysis of potential boundary partners, to identify which would be most appropriate and what their needs are for capacity building and learning. Each boundary partner institution should be handled individually, beginning with its own diagnosis of its problem or challenge which would lead to a specific sub-project to focus on. Care needs to be taken over the entry point for capacity building. It is recommended that this should be a critical problem or a need for change felt by the organization, and not methodological tools, chosen *apriori*. The organization should then conduct a mapping of its existing talents and skills and gaps, then individual training plans could be prepared. Not all the capacity building needs to be done by the Project, some could be handled by other donors or the institution itself. In addition some of these individual capacity building topics could be done collectively (with participants from other organizations), which could may lead to a Community of Practice or support group which could go on to share experiences or exchange staff to assist with implementation of new skills.
- 12) It is recommended that a wider range of tools be used in a more balanced way for capacity building than workshops to improve effectiveness and access to a range of learning options, such as mentoring, audio-visual techniques, exchanges between peer organizations, formal courses in educational institutions, placements, action-research projects.
- 13) IDRC should ensure that the whole institution is considered in capacity building, rather than individual technical staff. Authorities and leaders of the institutions must be brought on board

for commitment to change. In addition it is important to assess whether it is the right “moment” for the organization to embrace change such as that proposed by the project.

- 14) IDRC should acknowledge that longer time frames are required to see real outcomes of capacity building to build learning systems and see development results on the ground. Hence more focus on key institutions, development problems and sectors would be more manageable and successful than dispersed approaches.
- 15) It is recommended that IDRC consider continuing support in Honduras to build on the foundation established and provide time for consolidation of the skills and learning initiated. In particular, IDRC, hopefully in association with CIDA, should focus on one or two institutional partners in watershed management in the North Coast and local economic development in Olancho, particularly to consolidate the capacity building initiated for learning systems and apply it to influencing policy and achieving real development progress for poor communities in Honduras.
- 16) CIDA should be encouraged to continue to support learning activities in its development interventions, taking account of the capacity building needs, time frames and process nature of these activities which will lead to communities and civil society groups embracing and influencing the changes required for sustainable development to begin to take root.
- 17) Considering the participatory and learning character of the project, there should have been planned during the Project’s cycle, preferably at mid-term, at least a participatory evaluation involving the Project team and its principal partners, in order to assess what was being learned and make adjustments as warranted.

ANNEX 1: LIST OF ACRONYMS

ACEDI	Atlantic Community Economic Development Institute
ACM	Alternative Conflict Management
ANAFAE	<i>Asociacion Nacional para le Fomento de la Agricultura Ecologica</i> /National Association for the promotion of Ecological Agriculture.
CB	Capacity Building
CENET	<i>Centro Nacional de Educacion para el Trabajo</i> /National Labour Education Centre
CESAL	<i>Centro de Estudios y Solidaridad con America Latina</i> / Centre for Studies and Solidarity with Latin America
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
COHCIT	<i>Consejo Hondureno de Ciencia y Tecnologia</i> /Honduran Council for Science and Technology
CURLA	<i>Centro Universitario de la Region Litoral Atlantida</i> / University Centre for the Atlantic Coast Region
DED	German Technical Assistance Agency
DINADERS	<i>Direccion Nacional para el Desarrollo Rural Sostenible</i> /National Office for Sustainable Rural Development
ENRM	Environment and Natural Resources Management
FIPAH	<i>Fundacion de Investigacion Participativa de Honduras</i> /Honduran Foundation for Participatory Research
FISDER	<i>Proyecto de Fortalecimiento a la Investigacion y Sistematizacion para el Desarrollo Rural</i> /Project for Strengthening Research and Systematization for Rural Development.
FOPRIDEH	<i>Federacion de Organizaciones Privadas de Desarrollo de Honduras</i> / Honduran Federation of Private Development Organizations
GOH	Government of Honduras
GTZ	German Development Agency
HQ	Headquarters
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
LED	Local Economic Development
LF	Logical Framework
LS	Learning Systems
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MINGA	Former Natural Resources Management Program Initiative of IDRC in Latin America region.
OM	Outcome Mapping/ <i>Mapeo de Alcances</i>
PBDD	Partnerships and Business Development Division (IDRC)
PRIDE	<i>Programa de Investigacion para el Desarrollo</i> /Program of Research for Development
ProMesas	National Sector-Tables Program (name of CIDA Program in Honduras)
PRONADERS	<i>Programa Nacional para el Desarrollo Rural Sostenible</i> /National Program for Sustainable Rural Development
RDS	<i>Red para el Desarrollo Sostenible</i> / Sustainable Development Network
REHDES	<i>Red Hondurena para el Desarrollo Sostenible</i> /Honduran Network for Sustainable Development
SAS	Social Analysis Systems
SNV	Netherlands Technical Assistance Agency
UNA	<i>Universidad Nacional de Agricultura</i> /National University of Agriculture
UNDP	United Nations Development Program

ANNEX 2: LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED

NAME	AFFILIATION	CONTACT INFO
1. Merle Faminow	IDRC, LACRO (Montevideo, Uruguay) Team Leader, RPE	mfaminow@idrc.org.uy 011-598-2-709-0042 x239
2. Marie-Claude Bouchard	CIDA, Sr Development Officer, Central America Division	819-997-1393 marieclaud_bouchard@acdi-cida.gc.ca
3. Kate Stefanuk	CIDA, Program Manager (Honduras, Guatemala, El Salvador), CA Division	819-997-1369 kate_stefanuk@acdi-cida.gc.ca
4. Kristina Taboulchanas	IDRC, Research Officer, Honduras Project	ktaboulchanas@idrc.ca 613-236-6163 x 2132
5. Raul Zelaya	IDRC, Senior Program Specialist, Honduras Project, Tegucigalpa	rzealya@uap.hn 011-504-221-5045
6. Federico Burone	IDRC, Regional Director, LACRO (Montevideo, Uruguay)	fburone@idrc.org.uy 011-598-2-709-0042
7. Simon Carter	IDRC, Program Manager, Honduras Project, Ottawa	scarter@idrc.ca 613-236-6163
8. Amy Etherington	IDRC, Evaluation Unit	aetherington@idrc.ca 613-236-6163
9. Raquel Isaula	RDS (Red de Desarrollo Sostenible, Sustainable Development Network), Honduras. National Coordinator	
10. Ed Weber	Consultant, Ottawa	613-829-1330
11. Philippa Wiens	Research Officer (on leave), IDRC Honduras Project, IDRC, Ottawa	pwiens@idrc.ca
12. Camille Pomerleau	Senior Policy Advisor (Water). Environment Division. Policy Branch, CIDA, Gatineau	Camille_pomerleau@acdi-cida.gc.ca 819-956-3298
13. Rebecca Mellet	Senior Analyst, Regional Program Manager, Central America Division, CIDA, Gatineau	Rebecca_mellet@acdi-cida.gc.ca 819-994-1277
14. Jean Bernard Parenteau	Program Manager, Tanzania, Africa Branch, CIDA, Gatineau	Jeanbernard_parenteau@acdi-cida.gc.ca 819-994-1385
15. Benedicte Bucio	Former Project Officer, IDRC Honduras Project, Honduras	bbucio@hotmail.com
16. Daniel Buckles	Former Senior Program Specialist, responsible for IDRC Honduras Project, IDRC, Ottawa	dbuckles@sympatico.ca 613-722-8048
17. Markus Gottsbacher	Project Officer, IDRC Honduras, Project, Tegucigalpa, Honduras	mgottsbacher@uap.hn
18. Sofia Mendez	Research Officer, IDRC Honduras, Project, Tegucigalpa, Honduras	smendez@uap.hn
19. Ana Mireya Suazo 20. Amilcar Colindres 21. Kenny Nagera	Professors, Universidad Nacional de Agricultura, Catacamas, Olancho, Honduras. Participants in SASII	
22. Jacqueline Chernier	Coordinator, ANAF AE, Tegucigalpa, Honduras	coanafae@cablecolor.hn
23. Francisco Paredes	ANAF AE, Coordinator, ACM Project, ANAF AE, Tegucigalpa, Honduras	
24. Werner Valar 25. Mateo Ganas	Technical staff: Farmer Schools Project, ANAF AE, Tegucigalpa, Honduras	
26. Laura Suazo	Consultant on SAS, IDRC Honduras Project Tegucigalpa, Honduras	
27. Manuel Hernandez	Local Technical Advisor, Forestry, CIDA-ProMesas, Tegucigalpa, Honduras	mhernandez@uap.hn

28. Ivette Castillo 29. Elena Maria Freije	COHCIT (Honduras Council on Science and Technology), Government of Honduras (GOH), Tegucigalpa, Honduras	ivette@cohcit.gob.hn wmfreije@cohcit.gob.hn
30. Wilfredo Cardona	Former Coordinator, FISDER Project, DINADERS,	
31. Josee Fluet	Consul and Head of Aid, Consulate of Canada, Tegucigalpa, Honduras	504-239-7767 josee.fluet@international.gc.ca
32. Lorena Silva	Development Officer, Consulate of Canada, Tegucigalpa, Honduras	504-239-7767 Lorena.silva@international.gc.ca
33. Louis Beijer	Consultant, SNV (Holland) Member of Research Committee of AMC Project, Tegucigalpa, Honduras	504-236-9233 lbeijer@snvworld.org
34. Marco Antonio Martinez	Consultant on Systematization, PRIDE, IDRC Honduras Project, Tegucigalpa, Honduras	
35. Cecilia Sanchez	Consultant on Gender, IDRC Honduras Project Tegucigalpa, Honduras	
36. Ruth Varela	Consultant on Systematization, IDRC Honduras Project Tegucigalpa, Honduras	
37. Rafael Carias 38. Freddy Sierra	Professors, Rural Development, CURLA, La Ceiba, Honduras	
39. Juan Carlos Carrasco 40. Bestalina Martinez	REHDES (Honduran Network for Sustainable Development), La Ceiba, Honduras	
41. Guillermo Rosales	MAMUCA (Association of Municipalities), Masica, near La Ceiba, Honduras	
42. Maximo Caceres	Community leader, Rio San Juan watershed, near La Ceiba, Honduras	
43. Mario Roberto Ayala	Mayor, Masica. President of MAMUCA, near La Ceiba, Honduras	
44. Juan Jose Ferrando	Environment Program, UNDP, Tegucigalpa, Honduras. Member of Research Committee, AMC Project.	504-220-1100 Juan.ferrando@undp.org
45. Francisco Javier Medina	Coordinator, LED Project, UNA, Catacamas, Olancho, Honduras	
46. Tania Mendoza 47. Anabel Alvarado 48. Alba Julia Munoz 49. Jochen Durr (DED)	Professors and team members, LED Project, UNA, Catacamas, Olancho, Honduras	
50. Gustavo Lopez (Rector) 51. Trino Reyes (Vice-Rector Academic)	UNA, Catacamas, Olancho, Honduras	
52. Wilmer Reyes 53. Esmelyn Obed Padilla 54. Marlen Castro	Professors (trained in SAS) Catacamas, Olancho, Honduras	
55. Juan Tellez	Professor and Director, ACEDI(Atlantic Community Economic Development Institute), St Mary's University, Halifax, NS . Leader of DEL project supported by IDRC, Ottawa (including Honduras component).	902-445-0855 juan@cedinstitute.ca
56. Stefan Gransow 57. Elenisa Mairena 58. Iris Zavala	DED advisor with Pacto Ambiental, Catacamas Fundacion San Alonso Rodriguez, Tocoa, Colon Fundacion Pico Bonito, Ceiba	

59. Edgardo Mercado	Unidad Ambiental, Municipality of Catacamas Participants of AMC workshop at UNA, Catacamas	
60. Andreas Gettkant 61. Maria Delfina Flores	GTZ, Tegucigalpa, Honduras	504-238-1906 andreas.gettkant@gtz.de
62. Eric Lapalme	Director, PSU, CIDA, Tegucigalpa, Honduras	504-221-5045 elapalme@uap.hn
63. Marten de Groot	Environment /Water Program, PSU, CIDA, Tegucigalpa, Honduras	504-221-5045 mdegroot@uap.hn
64. Pedro Torres	Field Manager, RDS, Tegucigalpa, Honduras	504-235-4141 pedro@rds.org.hn
65. Warren Kidd	First Secretary (Development), Consulate of Canada, Tegucigalpa, Honduras	504-232-4551 Warren.kidd@international.gc.ca
66. Donna Bickford 67. Carmen du Bois	Grant Administration, IDRC, Ottawa	dbickford@idrc.ca cdubois@idrc.ca
68. Ann Thomas	Senior Program Officer, Poverty and Environment Program, ENRM, IDRC, Ottawa. Responsible for Rio San Juan project	athomas@idrc.ca
69. Frank Schneider	Knowledge Partners Division, Partnership Branch, CIDA, Gatineau. Former Specialist in ProMesas Team (Agriculture)	819-953-5591 Frank_schneider@acdi-cida.gc.ca
70. Sarah Earl	Evaluation Unit, IDRC, Ottawa	searl@idrc.ca
71. Ana Boischio	Senior Program Officer, EcoHealth Program, IDRC, Ottawa. Responsible for Chagas Project.	aboischio@idrc.ca
72. Jean Lebel	Director, ENRM Division, IDRC, Ottawa.	jlebel@idrc.ca

ANNEX 3: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

1. ANAFAE, Informe Narrativo: Programa de Manejo Alternativo de Conflictos en Recursos Naturales N° 103304 – 001. Periodo Octubre 2005 – Marzo 2006, Marzo 2006.
2. ANAFAE, Informe Técnico: Periodo Octubre 2005 – Setiembre 2006. Programa de Manejo de Conflictos en Recursos Naturales en Honduras, N° de Donación 1033304 – 001. Octubre 2006.
3. Bernard Anne, Buckles Daniel. Knowledge for Sustainable and Equitable Rural Development in Honduras: Toward a Framework for Institutional Learning. DRAFT, January 2001.
4. Diseño intencional Región Sur 2007, ANAFAE.
5. Documento de Proyecto: Programa Manejo Alternativo de Conflictos en Recursos Naturales. Agosto 2005.
6. IDRC, Annual Report to CIDA, May 2003.
7. IDRC, Annual Report to CIDA 2003 – 04, May 2004
8. IDRC, Annual Report to CIDA 2004 – 2005, June 2005
9. IDRC, Annual Report to CIDA 2005 – 2006, May 2006
10. IDRC (Honduras), Draft Annual Report to CIDA, May 2007.
11. IDRC Honduras Learning Strategy, 2003.
12. IDRC Honduras Program Communication Strategy Plan, March 2007.
13. IDRC Honduras Program Position Paper, October 2006.
14. IDRC Honduras Program Team Meeting Notes, Friday, October 21, 2005.
15. IDRC Memorandum. Subject: CIDA - IDRC collaboration in Honduras, January 24, 2001.
16. IDRC, Project Approval Document, Building Learning Systems for Honduras, Project No.100133, July 2002.
17. IDRC, Project Approval Document, Natural Resources Conflict Management Program, Project No. 103304, September 2005.
18. IDRC, Project Approval Document, Social Analysis Systems (Phase II) Project No. 102600, September 2004
19. IDRC – UNA, Sistema de Análisis Social (Fase II), Proyecto N° 102600-003. Diciembre 2005.
20. IDRC – UNA, Sistema de Análisis Social (Fase II), Proyecto N° 102600-003. Diciembre 2006.
21. Listado de Instituciones Socias del Proyecto Sistemas de Aprendizaje. Mayo 2007.
22. Melara Werner, Informe de Visita de Campo a la Región Sur – Del 18 al 21 de Julio del 2006. ECA Aguacatal, ANAFAE.
23. Meltzer Judy, Assessment of the Political, Economic, and Institutional Contexts for Participatory Rural Development in Post-Mitch Honduras. February 2001.
24. Memoria de III reunión de Región Sur, Oficinas Save The Children, 25 de Mayo, San Lorenzo. ANAFAE.
25. Memoria Reunión del Comité de Investigación – Programa del Manejo de Conflictos en Recursos Naturales (N° 103304-001), Diciembre 2006.
26. Méndez Sofia, Evaluación Formativa: Componente de Construcción de Capacidades del Proyecto Construcción de Sistemas de Aprendizaje en Honduras N° 103545. Setiembre 2006.

27. Neilson Stephanie and Charles Lusthaus. IDRC – Supported Capacity Building: Developing a Framework for Capturing Capacity Changes. February 2007.
28. Plan Operativo de la Instancia Regional para el 2007, ANAFAE.
29. Programa de Investigación para el Desarrollo: Propuesta para la operacionalización e institucionalización. Mayo 2005.
30. Project Performance Report 2005/ 2006 (Draft), April 2006.
31. PRO-MESAS, Lista de Socios por Proyecto. 17 de Mayo de 2007.
32. Proyecto CIID – Investigación. Memoria de Intercambio de Escuelas de Campo ANAFAE en Honduras – Nicaragua, del 6 al 10 de Noviembre del 2006.
33. Proyecto de Investigación Participativa en Agroecología – Resultados del Taller en Centro Occidente.
34. Proyecto de Investigación Participativa en Agroecología – Resultados del Taller de la Zona Sur.
35. Proyecto Promoción de la Soberanía Alimentaria y la Conservación de la Biodiversidad en Honduras – Comité de Semillas
36. Trip reports from December 2000 to February 2007.
37. UNA, Implementación del Sistema de Análisis Social (SAS) en las actividades de docencia extensión e investigación de la Universidad Nacional de Agricultura. Agosto 2004.
38. Varela Ruth, Proceso de Institucionalización de Sistemas de Análisis Social (SAS) en la Universidad Nacional de Agricultura, 2007.

ANNEX 4: LIST OF SUB-PROJECTS, PARTNERS AND PRODUCTS

Institución	Temas/Metodologías desarrolladas	Actividades (Project No.)	Productos (Título de publicaciones/Autor)	Aporte del proyecto LS (CAD)
ANAFAE	Mapeo de Alcances	<p>Realización del Plan Estratégico de ANAFAE, revisión de la planificación por parte de las instancias regionales (No. 101883) con apoyo técnico de consultora (No. 102418-001= 19,535 CAD*)</p> <p>Realización de planificación de proyecto HEKS-semilla.</p> <p>Diseño Plan Operativo Bienal regional Norte- Sur</p> <p>Ejercicio de Monitoreo con instancia Regional del Sur</p> <p>Ejercicio de Monitoreo MAC- Comité de investigación.</p> <p>Elaboración de la propuesta de proyecto: "Investigación Participativa en Agroecología" II fase</p>	<p>Planificación estratégica de la institución y socializada con sus tres instancias regionales; memorias de talleres de socialización de diseño intencional</p> <p>Propuesta del proyecto con su diseño intencional</p> <p>Plan Operativo 2007, instancia regional Norte usando el diseño intencional.</p> <p>Memoria de III reunión de región sur, 15 mayo 2006</p> <p>Memoria reunión de comité de investigación MAC.</p> <p>Memorias de los talleres en las instancias regionales (Sur, occidente) y propuesta del proyecto.</p>	25,419.00*
	Investigación Participativa	Elaboración y Ejecución de la propuesta de investigación y Fondo de Investigación (No. 102140)	<p>A.-Propuesta "Investigación Participativa para la promoción de la agricultura ecológica2004-2006"</p> <p>B.- Informe Anual Marzo 2005 y anexos: 1.- Memoria Taller de Intercambio en Escuelas de Campo en papa del 2004 realizadas en la Región Centro Occidente, 10 y 11 de Marzo 2005, Yamaranguila, La Esperanza 2.- Evaluación práctica (prueba de caja) empleada para las ECA's y resultados de la prueba inicial y final, ECA centro-occidente. 3.- POA región sur y centro-occidente. 4.- Ayuda Memoria del Taller de Sistematización de experiencias en Sistemas de captación y riego, Choluteca del 26 al 27 de mayo 2005 5.- Directrices para la preparación de proyectos de investigación y tabla de valoración.</p> <p>C.- Informe Anual, Marzo 2006 y anexos: 1.- Folleto "Producción de Papa con Semilla Sexual" por Eligio Meza. 2.- Resultados ECA San Isidro producción pepino 3.- Resultado proyecto de Investigación: "Evaluación de 3 Practicas Manejo Integrado de Plagas en el Control de la Mosca Blanca en Tomate 4.- Listado de Participantes en las ECA's de la región centro-Occidente 2005-2006</p>	235,890.00

			<p>5.- Memoria del Proceso de Capacitación de Capacitadores en ECA's de la Región Sur</p> <p>6.- Listado de Participantes en las ECA's de la Región sur 2005-2006</p> <p>7.- Informe Escuela de Campo de San José, Guajiquiro</p> <p>8.- Informe Escuela de Campo de Jesús de Otoro</p> <p>9.- Informe Escuela de Campo de Chiligatoro, La Esperanza</p> <p>D.- Memoria de las visitas de intercambio entre ECA's de Papá; 15 de noviembre: ASOCIAL-Vallecillo y Ojo de Agua con Chiligatoro; 22 de noviembre: Quesuntega/San José con Ojo de Agua; 7 y 8 de Diciembre: Pastoral Social de Tocó con Región Centro Occidente</p> <p>E.- Informe de Visitas de Campo a la Región Sur. 18-21 julio 2006</p> <p>F.- Ayuda Memoria Comité de Investigación- Cuaderno de Actas ANAF AE.</p> <p>G.- Convenio Firmado entre ANAF AE y OM para desarrollar propuestas de investigación.</p> <p>H.- Compendium "Gotitas de Esperanza, el uso eficiente del agua"; contiene 5 experiencias de las estudiadas durante el primer año del proyecto</p> <p>I.- Guía de Escuelas de Campo en Papa: "Dejamos de aprender, cuando perdemos la voluntad de compartir"</p> <p>J.- libreto: Uso de abonos orgánicos en el cultivo de Papa: resultados de experimentos de ECA 2004.</p> <p>K.- libreto: "Producción de semilla de maíz usando el agua gris". Resultado de proyecto de investigación- Grupo Guía</p> <p>L.- Poster: "Asegurando la producción de Tomate con tres prácticas agroecológicas". Producto de Proyecto de Investigación- Fundación Simiente.</p> <p>M.- Libroto: "Subiendo la Cuesta: principales aprendizajes de ANAF AE durante el 2004". En este documento existen aprendizajes sobre el primer año del proyecto pero no es exclusivo.</p> <p>N.- Calendario: "planificador 2007: Apoyando la investigación y la agroecología"</p> <p>O.- ANAF AE's newsletter</p> <p>P.- Memoria de Intercambio de Escuelas de Campo ANAF AE- NICARAGUA, Nov 2006</p> <p>Q.- Memoria Intercambio de ECA-Ecuador, 2005- Presentación PP.</p> <p>R.- Informe de Actividades por región (Norte, Sur, centro occ); junio 2006</p> <p>S.- Resultados de las ECA's en la zona Sur y centro occidente.</p> <p>T.- Materiales Didácticos de apoyo para ECA's:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> El barrenador del Pepino La Mosca blanca La mosca del maíz Pesticidas Naturales El Gusano cogollero <p>U.- Propuestas de Investigación sometidas al comité: (Primer</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>llamado del proyecto) Validación participativa de un programa MIP en el control de la mosca blanca (<i>Bemisia tabaci</i>) en el cultivo de tomate. Fundación Simiente (aprobada). Evaluación de dos densidades de maíz para producción de semilla con uso de riego por goteo con reciclaje de aguas grises- Grupo Guía (aprobada) Evaluación de mora silvestre en dos sistemas de producción- Fundación Simiente (aprobada) Evaluación del efecto de fertilizante orgánico (bocashi) sobre la fertilidad del suelo en cultivo de berenjena (<i>Solanum melongena</i>). CONAGROH (aprobada-no realizada) Identificación de mejores prácticas en producción animal- Región Occidental (No aprobada) Investigación participativa con jóvenes en reforestación de micro-cuenca Yorito- FIPAH (No aprobada) Investigación participativa de un programa de manejo de la fertilidad del suelo en la parte alta del municipio de Guajiquiro- APAS (No aprobada) Determinación de los factores limitantes y caracterización de suelos de la etnia Pech de Dulce Nombre de Culmí. CONAGROH (No aprobada) (Segundo y llamado del proyecto) Evaluación del potencial y la viabilidad de 9 rubros productivos, bajo un enfoque de manejo agroecológico, en 10 sectores de la región del Aguan- Fundación Popol Nah Tun (aprobada) Producción de Tilapia con insumos de bajo costo en tres localidades del municipio de Jutiapa, Atlántida- CURLA (aprobada) Producción de Cultivos no Tradicionales bajo el enfoque Agro-ecológico en zonas de ladera del PNCC- FUCAGUA, Marzo 2006 (aprobada) Variedades de Maíz resistente de maíz muerto posición de la mazorca- CURLA (aprobada) Investigación sobre el cultivo de Caña- ADEPES (aprobada) Cultivos en asocio- Vecinos Mundiales (aprobada) Cultivo de Frijol- Grupo Guía (aprobada) Evaluación de 3 practicas MIP en el control de plagas de suelos que afectan el sistema de asocio de yuca y camote- Fundación Simiente (aprobada) Almacenamiento de Granos- PRR (aprobada) Tricoderma y control biológico -APAS (aprobada) Investigación de producción de frijón con abonos orgánicos- AFACAO Frijol y el uso de Tricoderma para su control- Asocial Yorito (aprobado) Validación de alternativas para controlar el hielto del frijón en comunidades de La Esperanza, Buenos Aires y Feo, municipio de Bonito Oriental. (Aprobada- No Realizada) Estudio participativo de oportunidades de comercialización productos ago-ecológicos- FUBNAPIB (No aprobada)</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Generando capacidades de investigación en comercialización local- Consejo Lenca Guajirito (No aprobada)</p> <p>Evaluación de <i>Beauveria bassiana</i> para el control de gusano cogollero (<i>Spodoptera frugiperda</i>) en el cultivo del maíz en el CURLA (No aprobada)</p> <p>Investigación participativa sobre la implementación de cultivos sucesionales como alternativa para mejorar la fertilidad del suelo y la dieta alimenticia de la familia rural- CURLA (no aprobada)</p>	
	Manejo de Conflictos	<p>Financiamiento del Primer Foro Nacional de Manejo Alternativo de Conflictos y capacitaciones de seguimiento (No.102418-13)</p> <p>Elaboración, Revisión y Presentación de la propuesta del proyecto MAC; contratación de consultores y revisión de los borradores de la propuesta (No. 103304)</p>	<p>a.- Memoria Taller “Capacitación y Planificación en Manejo de Conflictos de Recursos Naturales”; Agosto 2004</p> <p>b.- Memoria Taller “Capacitación y Planificación en Manejo de Conflictos de Recursos Naturales”; 25 y 26 de noviembre de 2004.</p> <p>c.- Propuesta para el programa de Manejo Colaborativo de Conflictos en Recursos Naturales, Agosto 2005</p> <p>d.- Informe Interino “Programa de Manejo Alternativo de Conflictos en Recursos Naturales: Octubre 2005 – Marzo 2006”</p> <p>e.- Informe Técnico Anual: “Programa de Manejo de Conflictos en Recursos Naturales en Honduras: Octubre 2005 – Septiembre 2006”; incluye minutas de los eventos de disseminación: Intercambio en la costa Norte</p> <p>f.- Informe Avances MAC: Marzo 2007</p> <p>g.- Página web: www.manejodeconflictos.org</p> <p>h.- Banners de Proyecto MAC (4)</p> <p>i.- Propuestas de Estudios de casos sometidos al comité: Gestión participativa de la cuenca del Río Bejucales: una propuesta de investigación participativa que se basa en el Manejo Alternativo de Conflictos. Tenencia de la Tierra en las Áreas Protegidas del Departamento de Colón. Mecanismos de Distinción para Reducir los Efectos de la Tala y Aprovechamiento Ilegal de Madera Manejo de conflictos en la implementación del Plan de Ordenamiento Territorial de la Sub Cuenca del Río Tocóa, Colón. Manejo Alternativo de Conflictos, Propuesta para la Construcción Participativa de una Visión de Manejo Integral para La Cuenca del Río Cangrejal Manejo Alternativo de Conflictos como Mecanismo para la Gestión Integrada de la Cuenca del Río Catacamas Manejo Alternativo de Conflictos aplicado en la gestión</p>	<p>2,200.00**</p> <p>50,000.00**</p>

		Organización Foro“ Procesos Participativos para le Gestión del Territorio”	<p>comunitaria de bosques en áreas concesionadas. Concesiones de Ríos en Zonas Productoras de Agua, San Esteban Olancho.</p> <p>j.- Minutas Reuniones Comité de Coordinación MAC: Cuaderno de Actas ANAF AE.</p> <p>k.- Memorias Talleres de Capacitación: SAS, Negociación abordaje contractivo de conflictos, sistematización</p> <p>h.- Memoria Foro: “ Procesos Participativos para le Gestión del Territorio”, 20 septiembre 2006 Presentaciones Realizadas durante el Foro (3 PP)</p>	
	Sistemas de Análisis Social	Asistencia Técnica y capacitación mediante talleres para al incorporación de las herramientas SAS en la metodología MAC (No.102418-002)	a.- Plan de Capacitaciones SAS en MAC	13,089*
UNA	Sistemas de Análisis Social	<p>Participación en los talleres introductorias de SAS.- 2004 (No. 101752)</p> <p>Elaboración y Ejecución de la propuesta “Introducción de los sistemas de Análisis Social en las actividades de docencia, extensión e investigación dentro de la UNA”; La propuesta fue elaborada con el acompañamiento cercano del personal del CIID y J. Chevalier. (No.102600-003)</p> <p>Desarrollo del Foro: “ El análisis social como alternativa para el desarrollo”</p>	<p>a.- Memorias taller SIS; febrero 2003</p> <p>b.- Memoria Taller institucional SAS-UNA; febrero 04</p> <p>c.- Propuesta de Proyecto: “Implementación del Sistema de Análisis Social (SAS) en las actividades de docencia extensión e Investigación de la Universidad Nacional de Agricultura”.</p> <p>d.- POA 2005, 6 componentes</p> <p>e.- POA 2006, 5 componentes</p> <p>f.- Informe Anual Diciembre 2005</p> <p>g.- Informe Anual Diciembre 2006</p> <p>h.- Informe Final Complementario, 2007</p> <p>i.- Experiencia particular en la aplicación del SAS dentro de mis actividades Académicas, Investigativas y de desarrollo- Juan Amilcar Colindres, 2004</p> <p>j.- Memoria Taller de Intercambio SAS, enero 2005</p> <p>k.- Memoria Jornada de Aprendizaje del Equipo Líder de l proyecto SAS II, junio 2006</p> <p>l.- Informe componente institucional: El SAS en la Universidad Nacional de Agricultura; Leonel Mercadal, enero 2007</p> <p>m.- Artículo: “Promoviendo el desarrollo de las comunidades a través de experiencias concretas y con procesos y productos reales”; Wilmer Reyes</p> <p>n.- Video Proyecto SAS</p> <p>o.- Banners Proyecto SAS (1 por cada componente)</p> <p>p.- Sistematizaciones por componente (primer año): Sistematización de la experiencia del proyecto SAS-II en la microcuenca del Río Talgua, Catacamas, Olancho, Honduras. Sistematización de la Experiencia Proyecto SAS, Nivel Institucional, año 2005. Evaluación Participativa de Variedades de Frijol Común de Grano Rojo: Una Experiencia con enfoque diferente. La Experiencia del PROYECTO SAS II: subcomponente de Lácteos, en el Valle de Guayape, Olancho.</p>	<p>33,467.00*</p> <p>165,000.00*</p>

			<p>La Experiencia Del PROYECTO SAS II: Subcomponente Desarrollo Económico Local. Sistematización de la Experiencia Proyecto SAS en el componente adaptación al Cambio Climático.</p> <p>q.- Componente Institucional Memoria taller de capacitación a estudiantes de I año de Ingeniería Agronómica, 13-14 junio 2005. Memoria taller de capacitación a estudiantes de II año de Ingeniería Agronómica, 06 –07 junio 2005. Memoria taller de capacitación a estudiantes de III año de Ingeniería Agronómica, 30-31 mayo 2005. Memoria Taller de trabajo con representantes de personal administrativo, docente y de apoyo de la UNA para analizar problemática académica que afronta la institución; 7-9 marzo 2005. Memoria de los tres talleres para la identificación y análisis de los factores que afectan la deserción estudiantil; estudiantes de los 3 años de Ingeniería agronómica; 2 febrero 2006. Memoria Taller de Capacitación para analizar la problemática administrativa de la institución; participantes: personal docente, administrativo y estudiantes del III año de Ingeniería Agronómica; 9-10 agosto 2005.</p> <p>r.- Componente Cambio Climático Memoria taller de capacitación introductoria con alumnos y alumnas de 6º,7º,8ºy 9º grado del Centro Básico Francisco Morazán, Guata, Olancho 24 de mayo 05 Memoria primer taller de análisis de la problemática de los recursos naturales; Esquipulas del Norte; 25 de Mayo de 2006 Memoria segundo taller de análisis de la problemática de los recursos naturales; Esquipulas del Norte; 8 de junio de 2006 Memoria taller de capacitación de productores y docentes de la comunidad de Guata; 12 de Septiembre de 2006</p> <p>s.- Componente Fríjol Informe componente fríjol: Evaluación Participativa de Variedades de Fríjol común de grano rojo; enero 2007</p> <p>Informe técnico: Evaluación participativa de variedades de fríjol grano rojo, aplicando herramientas SAS.</p> <p>t.- Sistematización: Institucionalización de SAS en la UNA; abril 2007</p> <p>u.- Tesis de pre-grado elaboradas con el proyecto SAS: Estudio Técnico Social Para Incrementar La Sustentabilidad De La Empresa “Productos Lácteos Catacamas” Determinación Del Queso Seco Artesanal Olanchano Con Los Mejores Índices De</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>Asesoramiento/ Co-financiamiento de trabajos de tesis de investigación</p> <p>Asesoramiento y financiamiento de trabajos de tesis de investigación en le tema de Manejo de Cuencas (RSP No. 102418-021)</p>	<p>Preferencia Y Estándares De Calidad Microbiológica Para El Mercado Local</p> <p>Análisis Social De La Problemática De Las Cadenas Agroalimentarias Del Municipio De Catacamas.</p> <p>Caracterización Paisajística y Definición de Lineamientos de Manejo de “Montaña Grande”: Zona de Recarga de las Microcuencas de la Soledad, las Cañas y El Cobre, Valle De Angeles y Santa Lucia; Fidel Barahona</p> <p>Caracterización Paisajística De La Zona De Recarga De La Microcuenca “Buena Vista” En El Municipio De Valle De Angeles; Cesar Godoy</p> <p>Estudio Integral De La Microcuenca “El Ocotoe” , Aldea De El Bijao, Juticalpa, Olancho; Juan Carlos Paz</p> <p>Monitoreo Y Evaluacion Del Proceso de capacitacion Del Componente Pastos Del Proyecto Catie/Noruega En El Sector De Olanchito Yoro, Diciembre 2006; Angel Lagos</p> <p>Análisis De Actores, Relacionados con el Recurso Hídrico, en la Microcuenca de las Piñuelas En El Norte De Copan, Honduras; Jaime Moe Montoya Rodríguez</p> <p>Participación De La Mujer En Procesos De Desarrollo Agrícola En Tres Comunidades Influenciadas Por El Proyecto Catie/ Noruega, Olanchito – Yoro; Olvyn Leonel Hernández</p> <p><i>Valoración Ecológica y Económica del Recurso Hídrico en la Microcuenca del Río Catacamas- No. 102418-021</i></p> <p><i>Estrategias para El Desarrollo Territorial En La Microcuenca del Río Talgua. No. 102418-021</i></p> <p><i>Mapeo y Análisis Participativo de Recursos Naturales: Integrado Sistemas de Análisis Social (SAS) y Sistemas de Información Geográfica (SIG) No. 102418-021</i></p> <p><i>Pago por Servicios Ambientales y Mecanismos para su Internalización en la Microcuenca del Río Catacamas. No. 102418-021</i></p>	<p>6,500.00</p>
	DEL	<p>Organización y facilitación del taller para la elaboración del proyecto DEL (RSP-102418-018)</p> <p>Asesoramiento para le elaboración de la propuesta del proyecto DEL</p> <p>Presentación y Desarrollo de la propuesta de DEL: capacitaciones en la metodología de la Ruta Metodológica para el Desarrollo (RMD) (No. 103621)</p> <p>Aplicación de SAS dentro de la metodología</p>	<p>Memoria del Taller sobre Desarrollo Económico Local (DEL); 8 Febrero 2005</p> <p>Informe Final de consultoría, Juan Tellez, dic 2005</p> <p>Propuesta para la ejecución del proyecto de investigación de Desarrollo Económico Local en Catacamas y Santa María del Real, Olancho</p> <p>Acta se Conformación Del Comité De Proyecto Interinstitucional Para El Proyecto Desarrollo Económico Local En Catacamas y Santa Maria Del Real</p>	<p>620.00</p> <p>1,400.00</p> <p>130,000.00</p>

		de RMD	POA del proyecto DEL Lista de actores DEL: del-olancho@listas.rds.org.hn Memoria de los tres talleres de Capacitación en la metodología RMD. Memoria del taller de capacitación en metodologías SAS.	
	MAC	Dos personas del equipo de la UNA (Wilmer Reyes y Ana Suazo) participan en el comité de MAC que aprueba propuestas en Olancho	Actas del comité MAC en Olancho- Arriba mencionado	
	Género	Facilitación de dos Talleres de Género y su incorporación al proceso de DEL Capacitación en materia de género para su incorporación en proyecto SAS (102418-005)	Memoria y materiales de facilitación de los dos talleres de capacitación en materia de Género y desarrollo Rural. Reporte de consultoría C. Sánchez sobre apoyo en materia de género a la UNA.	2,000.00 22,000.00*
	Sistematización	Taller de Cómo Sistematizar en el marco del proyecto SAS II	Sistematización del proceso de institucionalización de SAS en la UNA—Arriba mencionado	
	Mapeo de alcances	Capacitación en mapeo de alcances: construcción del diseño intencional del proyecto DEL.	Memoria en Taller de capacitación de Mapeo de Alcances para el equipo del proyecto DEL-SAS, diseño intencional del proyecto. Están preparando su ejercicio de monitoreo.	
	Remesas	Financiamiento de 4 tesis de investigación en el tema de Remesas (RSP-102418-012).	Las Remesas y su Impacto Socioeconomico en los hogares del Municipio de Campamento, Olancho; Jose Isaías Milla Gamez; Diciembre 2005 Impacto Socio-Economico de las Remesas en el Desarrollo Economico Local Del Municipio De Juticalpa, Olancho; Marco Antonio Goldberg Calix, Diciembre 2005 Remesas y su impacto Socieconomico en el Municipio de Santa Maria del Real, Olancho; Amilcar Alejandro Medina Sánchez; Diciembre 2005.	3,100.00
GTZ	Sistematización	Creación y co-financiamiento de la Iniciativa Nacional de Sistematización. (RSP- 102176)	Ayuda Memorias e reuniones entre oficiales de proyectos del CIID, Gtz, FISDER, CENET Formatos preparados para el Sondeo Inicial del proyecto Formatos del prediagnóstico realizado previo al establecimiento de la INS Guía metodológica para el proceso de sistematización empleado por la INS. Fotomemorias de módulos I, II, III del segundo ciclo de sistematización---INS & FISDER; Nov 2003-feb 2004 Fotomemoria Módulo de capacitación facilitado a	123,410.00**

		Fortalecimiento de la INS (RSP- 103331): transferencia a organización local, finalización de productos y ejercicio de monitoreo de impacto	<p>FUNDEMUN----INS&FISDER; Dic 2003</p> <p>Productos de los ciclos de sistematización: Como establecer una parcela agroforestal, Noel Ruiz (FUCAGUA)- poster y Guía. Estrategias populares de agronegocios: la participación de tres asociaciones de productores en Tocoa, Saba y Sonaguera; Mario Argenal (CISP)- librito La Feria Cambio mi vida; Mario Argenal (CISP)- Radionovela Desarrollo para la taza de excelencia; Miguel Welchez (IHCAFE)- Guía y Poster Manejo participativo de un fideicomiso para el desarrollo rural; Efraín Herrera (PROLANCHO) Administración del financiamiento para el desarrollo rural: la experiencia FONADERS; Gabriel Osorio (SAG: FONADERS)- reporte El voluntariado comunitario y el acceso a los servicios de salud; Nery Zelaya (Care Hogasa)- CD, cartilla, poster La participación Ciudadana en la elaboración de las estrategias locales para la reducción de la Pobreza; Richard Terrazas (ASONOG) – Documento impreso Participación comunitaria y mecanismos de compensación para el saneamiento de microcuencas; Osmar Obed Ramos (CARITAS Trujillo)- Documento escrito. Café certificado: promocional; Jose Luis Flores y Billy Tejada (BECAMO)- video Cambiando comunidades: enfrentando nuevos retos; Jose Luis Flores y Billy Tejada (BECAMO)- video Proceso de certificación sostenible de fincas de café; Jose Luis Flores y Billy Tejada (BECAMO)- multimedia CD ¿Cómo Sistematizar?: Una Guía didáctica para sistematizar experiencias; Ruth Varela (Río Plus)- Guía Formando sistemastizadores; Río Plus- Guía Gestión Municipal para el desarrollo con un mecanismo financiero local; Luis Alberto Torres- pentafolio, CD Radionovela Las Crucitas- CD Forestería Comunitaria- CD CARE- extensa- CD Presentations from the National Forum: Visualizando cambios sostenibles en la reducción de la pobreza; Río Plus- CD- Rom</p> <p>Propuesta para el fortalecimiento de la INS Propuesta de Formación de Formadores; Ruth Varela Informe Final del proyecto y anexos: 1.- Primer boletín electrónico “La Brujula” 2.- Mejores prácticas y lecciones aprendidas: Compendium de experiencias de la INS 3.- Informe de Monitoreo de Impacto de la INS</p>	52, 400.00
	MAC	A través del proyecto PRORENA se esta acompañando fuertemente la incorporación de MAC en la zona	Actas del comité MAC en Olancho- Arriba mencionado	

	DEL	Aporte económico al proyecto DEL-UNA (12,000 CAD); interés en continuar con al promoción de la RMD en Olancho	Aporte económico presentado asciende a Lps.190,000	
	Mapeo de Alcances	Planificación de la transferencia de la INS a una organización local (con RDS, FOPRIDEH)	Memoria del taller de MA para RDS y Gtz	
RDS	Gestión de Información e Intercambio de Conocimientos (GIIC)	Capacitación y acompañamiento en el tema de GIIC para la preparación de una propuesta de investigación (No. 102418-009). Financiamiento del estudio De Caso “Los procesos de construcción de conocimiento en el Grupo colaborativo del agua y saneamiento de Honduras”; RDS, RAS-HON, Fundación Acceso; noviembre 2003 (No. 102391)	Informe de Avances para Propuesta de Investigación en Gestión de Información e Intercambio de Conocimientos. Informe Final “Propuesta de Investigación: Estudio de Investigación de la Gestión de Información e Intercambio de Conocimientos en las Familias, Comunidades e Instituciones en Honduras” Propuesta para el estudio de caso Informe Final del estudio de caso Memoria del evento de socialización del estudio de caso con la RAS-HON Minutas entrevista de seguimiento con René Benitez Documentos generales sobre el Grupo Colaborativo de Agua	14,160.00 42,300.00
	Remesas	Financiamiento para la ejecución de la propuesta de investigación “Impactos de la Migración y Remesas en la Economía Local de Olancho; Nov 2005. (No. 102559)	Propuesta de proyecto de Investigación. Primer Informe Anual (1ery 2ndo paso de investigación); abril 2006- vides de 10 minutos y anexos: 1.- Programación del trabajo para la obtención de las Unidades Secundarias de Muestreo del Marco Muestral; Alex Tábor, 28 marzo de 2006 2.- Borrador de Boleta para colectar la información de los hogares 3.- Boleta de entrevista para los hogares 4.- Boleta para Profundizar sobre emprendimiento con la inversión de las remesas. 5.- Estrategia para el mapeo municipal de migración y remesas 6.- Guía metodológica utilizada durante el proyecto 7.- Informe mapeo de emigración y remesas municipal municipio de San Francisco de Becerra, Departamento de Olancho; marzo2006 8.- Informe mapeo de emigración y remesas municipal municipio de Catacamas, Departamento de Olancho; marzo2006 9.- Informe mapeo de emigración y remesas municipal municipio de Juticalpa, Departamento de Olancho; marzo2006 10.- Informe mapeo de emigración y remesas municipal municipio de Santa María del Real, Departamento de Olancho; marzo2006 Segundo Informe técnico; diciembre 2006 Memorias reuniones P. Wiens con equipo de remesas.	100,000**

			Mapeos comunitarios y levantamiento de información estadística- video Socio-drama de migración y remesas- video Portal de RDS: http://migracion-remesas.rds.hn/	
	DEL	Desarrollo del Estudio de Caso de la aplicación de la RMD en la comunidad de Santa María del Real en el marco del proyecto DEL (No. 103621)	La documentación mencionada sobre el proyecto DEL, una vez se cierre el proyecto se tendrá información específica para el caso de SMd R	
	SAS	Participación en los talleres de capacitación SAS (no. 102418-002)	Memoria de Taller SAS; nov2006	
	Mapeo de Alcances	Uso de la metodología de MA en el estudio de caso del proyecto DEL , planificación para el proyecto de remesas	Memoria Taller de MA-Remesas 28-29marzo, 2006	
	Sistematización	Institución receptora de la INS		
PRONADERS	Investigación/ Sistematización	Participación n el WOC (No. 101589) Desarrollo de una propuesta para la integración de la sistematización e investigación en DINADERS (No. 101658) Ejecución del proyecto FISDER (No. 101893)	a.- Propuesta metodológica para el mejoramiento de los procesos de la gestión del desarrollo local y la entrega de servicios: investigación, sistematización y formación”. b.- Propuesta del proyecto “Fortalecimiento de la Investigación y Sistematización para la Gestión de Desarrollo Rural en Honduras”. c.- POA 2005 d.- Actas de Reuniones comité de Orientación e.- Documentos sobre procesos de selección de los coordinadores de los componentes (CV, matrices etc) f.- Informe de Avances “Fortalecimiento de la Investigación y Sistematización para el Desarrollo Rural en Honduras”; Julio- Noviembre 2003. g.- Informe de Avances Mayo, 2004 con resultados del proyecto a la fecha. h.- Informe Ejecutivo septiembre 2004 con resultados por componente a la fecha i.- Informe Técnico de Actividades Enero 2005 j.- Informe Final FISDER 2003-2005 k.- Evaluación Final del Proyecto para La Investigación, Sistematización y Formación para los Procesos de Desarrollo Rural Sostenible En Honduras (FISDER) Componente de Investigación. Informes de	2,410.00 8,250.00 373,024.00**

			<p>Sistematizaciones realizadas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Efecto de remesas en las comunidades rurales- UPNFM; marzo 2005 - Evaluación de diferentes dosis y tipos de fertilizantes químicos bajo dos sistemas de siembra y dos prácticas culturales para el control de mazorca muerta en tres comunidades del municipio de Jutiapa- CURLA; feb 2005 - Identificación de los Contaminantes y sus Respectivas Procedencias en las Microcuencas que drenan al Lago de Yojoa, Honduras; nov 2004 - Conocimientos y Prácticas Alimentarias de las madres de niños (as) menores de dos años de las comunidades de San Antonio de Chuchuitepeque, Canculuncos y el Ocote, del Municipio de San Pedro Zacapa, Santa Bárbara. – UPNFM; mayo 2005. - Índice de vulnerabilidad mediante la evaluación de la situación socio ambiental y su impacto frente a las inundaciones en santa rosa de aguan, colon- ESNACIFOR; 2005 - Sistemas de Mercadeo y Organización de Pequeños productores- POSCAE-UNAH <p>Componente de Sistematización Fotomemoria Taller de Metodologías Participativas impartido al CENET; 16-19sep t2003 Fotomemorias Escuela de Alternancia Módulo I y II; Fotomemorias Diplomado de Sistematización CURLA Módulo I y II; 2004 Fotomemoria Módulo de sistematización de Experiencias de Organizaciones Rurales.</p> <p>Informes de Expetiencias Sistematizadas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - El Sistema de Finca Tradicional Mejorada: un aporte al Desarrollo Rural sostenible- Proyecto Aldea Global; 2005 - El uso de estufas Lorenas en el ahorro energético- Proyecto UE Cuencas/FHIA; junio 2005. - Capacitación en cascada: Una alternativa para el aprendizaje de tecnologías en tracción animal- RELATA; junio 2005 - Implementación de pequeños proyectos de riego en parcelas de familias productoras de la etnia Chortí- Organismo Cristiano de Desarrollo Integral de Honduras; 2005. <p>Componente de Comunicación Página web: www.fisder.hn 3 Revista: Saberes para el Desarrollo Rural Documento de prensa: El INTAE de hoy,a ño VII, edición 3 septiembre de 2004; pag 25. Trifolio promocional 2 baners de presentación del proyecto Elaboración y distribución de maletines y gorras promocionales</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			del proyecto	
	Sistemas de Análisis Social	Participación de dos miembros del personal en taller SAS	<p>a.- Memoria del Taller SAS Olancho, junio 2003</p> <p>b.- Memoria y guión metodológico de la Jornada de evaluación sobre los avances del proyecto FISDER; 2005. En el cual se hizo uso de herramientas SAS.</p> <p>c.- Memoria participación de proyecto FISDER en taller de intercambio SAS; marzo 2005</p>	
Visión Mundial	Chagas- Salud	Prevención y Control del Mal de Chagas en Honduras (No. 102058-001)	<p>a.- Propuesta completa: “Prevención y Control de la transmisión vectorial del Chagas, entre las comunidades Lenca en el Municipio de San Francisco de Opalaca; Departamento de Intibucá, Honduras”</p> <p>b.- Informe Técnico Proyecto de Chagas; 6 meses; agosto 2004</p> <p>c.- Informe Técnico Proyecto Chagas; 9 meses; noviembre 2004 y anexos: 1) Listado de personas seropositivas en San Francisco de Opalaca (SAFO). 2) Características de las viviendas en SAFO. 3) Plan de tratamiento en Chagas SAFO 4) fotos</p> <p>d.- Informe Técnico Proyecto Chagas; 12 meses; febrero 2005 y anexos: 1) Resumen de Logros y Resultados en componentes de operaciones e investigación</p> <p>e.- Informe Técnico Proyecto Chagas; 18 meses; septiembre 2005</p> <p>f.- Informe general de investigación Proyecto: enfoque ecosistémico de la enfermedad de Chagas; agosto 2005</p> <p>g.- Plan Operativo; Febrero 2004, Febrero 2005</p> <p>h.- Informes de Equipo de Investigación 1.- Características Sociodemográficas Y De Salud (Investigación Cuantitativa). 2.- Propuesta sobre los Elementos para un abordaje Ecosistémico de Chagas en el municipio de San Francisco de Opalaca. 3.- Etnografía del área Lenca: La lógica Lenca de “el común” y la enfermedad de Chagas. 4.- Diagnostico Biofísico del Municipio de San Francisco de Opalaca dentro de la Cuenca del Río Gualcarque y sus implicaciones para el Control de la Enfermedad de Chagas</p> <p>i.- Resultados del Proyecto: Enfoque Ecosistémico de la Enfermedad de Chagas, Municipio SFO;</p>	115,000.00**

		<p>Componentes de Investigación y Operaciones</p> <p>j.- Materiales Promocionales, proyecto Chagas:</p> <p>1.- Reportaje: “El Mal de Chagas hace estragos con al niñez”; La Tribuna 29 de agosto de 2004.</p> <p>2.- Panfleto: “No dejes que et pique: ten cuidado con al chinche”</p> <p>3.- Reportaje: “Mal de Chagas: Chinche Picuda ataca a niños indígenas”; El Heraldo 28 de junio de 2005.</p> <p>4.- Cartilla: Se buscan chinches picudas! Porque transmiten la ENFERMEDAD DE CHAGAS”</p> <p>5.- trifolio: “ sin chinches no hay Chagas”</p> <p>Chagas Project receives nation-wide coverage through newspapers and TV. (August 19,2004).</p> <p>6.- Cuñas radiales y reportes televisivos: Chagas: La Muerte silenciosa</p> <p>7.- vides: La carga- 4:58 min</p> <p>k.- Memorias Reuniones:</p> <p>1.- Reunión sobre control de la enfermedad de Chagas en América Central y México; agosto 2005</p> <p>2.- Reunión con representantes visión mundial: Género y Ecosalud; nov 2004.</p> <p>3.-Reunión Visión Mundial- CIID; 3- Dic-2004, 4:00 p.m.</p> <p>4.- Ayuda Memoria: Reunión con el equipo del proyecto “Prevención y Control de Chagas en comunidades Lencas de San Francisco de Opalaca, Honduras”, el 17 de febrero, 2005</p> <p>5.- Reunión con Philippa Wiens and Raul Zelaya with Ana Boischio re: World Vision Chagas project, IDRC, April 7, 2005.</p> <p>6.- Reunión con Anna Grellert, WV offices, April 26, 2005.</p> <p>7.- Reunión con equipo de Investigadores, IDRC - ACIDI – WVH; 31may05</p> <p>8.- Reunión con Mesa Nacional de Chagas; enero 2007</p> <p>l.- Evaluacion Interna: Equipo Visión Mundial Intibucá; Proyecto Chagas SFO; febrero 2006</p>	
	Sistematización	<p>Sistematización del proyecto Prevención y Control del Mal de Chagas (No. 102058-002)</p> <p>a.- Propuesta de Sistematización; marzo 2006</p> <p>b.- Informe Final de consultoría: “Sistematización de experiencias de aprendizaje generadas por el Proyecto de Enfoque Eco sistémico de la Enfermedad de Chagas Municipio de San Francisco de Opalaca, Departamento de Intibúca, Honduras. Grant # 102058-002; agosto 2006</p> <p>c.- Rescate de percepciones locales sobre el tratamiento colectivo y la vigilancia comunitaria; 30 junio 2006</p> <p>d.- Fotomemoria Primer Taller de aprendizaje-trabajo con equipo sistematizador de la experiencia de Chagas; junio 2006</p> <p>e.- Fotomemoria segundo Taller de aprendizaje-trabajo con equipo sistematizador de la experiencia de Chagas; julio 2006</p>	24,100.00

			<p>f.- Documento: “Control y prevención de la Enfermedad de Chagas: Una experiencia de participación comunitaria para compartir” Ardon & Mazariegos; marzo 2007</p> <p>g.- CD interactivo sobre la experiencia de sistematización SFO</p>	
CIDICCO	Desarrollo Rural	Permitió que un comité editorial desarrollara una edición y publicaran el libro “La Finca Humana” en español. (No. 101795)	a.- Libro: La Finca Humana	10,000.oo
	Mapeo de Alcances	Organizó Talleres de seguimiento de Mapeo de Alcances para proyecto de Cajas Rurales (No. 102418-016)	a.- Diseño Intencional Proyecto Cajas Rurales para la región Sur del país	920.oo
	SAS	Participación y Organización en Talleres de SAS (No. 102140-019)	a.- Memoria de taller de intercambio SAS	2,970.oo
REMBLAH	Sistemas de Análisis Social	Organizó y participo en el primer Taller SIS; feb 2003 (No. 101752)	a.- Memorias taller SIS; febrero 2003	33,467.oo*
		Financiamiento de la propuesta Abordaje de la situación ambiental en las comunidades de San Francisco y Santa Ana, Atlántida (No.101752- 003)	<p>a.- Propuesta “Abordaje de la situación ambiental en las comunidades de San Francisco y Santa Ana, Atlántida”; agosto 2004</p> <p>b.- Informe Final “Abordaje de la situación ambiental en las comunidades de San Francisco y Santa Ana, Atlántida”; julio 2005.</p>	14,765.oo
		Financiamiento de la propuesta “El Rol y Potencialidad de las Comunidades Garífunas en la Reducción de la Vulnerabilidad de Bosques Ubicados dentro de su Hábitat Funcional”. (No. 102418-015)	<p>a.- Propuesta: “El Rol y Potencialidad de las Comunidades Garífunas en la Reducción de la Vulnerabilidad de Bosques Ubicados dentro de su Hábitat Funcional”; agosto, 2004</p> <p>b.- Informe Final: “El Rol y Potencialidad de las Comunidades Garífunas en la Reducción de la Vulnerabilidad de Bosques Ubicados dentro de su Hábitat Funcional”; julio 2005</p> <p>c.- Documento de Tesis: “El Rol y Potencialidad de las Comunidades Garífunas en la Reducción de la Vulnerabilidad de Bosques Ubicados dentro de su Hábitat Funcional”; marzo 2006</p>	
FOPRIDEH	Investigación	Desarrollo de una propuesta de investigación (No. 101960); la propuesta no fue financiada después de casi un año de negociaciones	a.- Propuesta de Investigación: ““Las capacidades y posibilidades de las OPDs para participar con efectividad en el proceso de desarrollo rural sostenible dentro de la Estrategia para la reducción de la pobreza en Honduras”	5,150.oo
	PRIDE (FOPRIDEH & COHCIT)	Institución co-ejecutora de la fase piloto del Programa de Investigación para el Desarrollo (No.102560)- vale la pena mencionar que el desarrollo de la visión de PRIDE fue elaborado con presupuesto del proyecto LS mediante la contratación de un consultor (102418-007=	<p>a.- Propuesta proyecto piloto del programa Nacional de investigación para el desarrollo (PRIDE); Sept 2006</p> <p>b.- Presentación de Lanzamiento de PRIDE; mayo07</p> <p>Antecedentes de PRIDE:</p>	43,200.oo**

		6,349.00 CAD)	Investigando las capacidades de investigación en Honduras: Estudio línea base; abril 2005 Propuesta para la Operacionalización e Institucionalización PRIDE; mayo 2005 Reglamento del Fondo para Financiar Propuestas Presentadas al PRIDE; 2005 Divulgativo PRIDE; agosto 2005 Nota: Estos no fueron pagados por el proyecto PRIDE, mas bien a través de consultorías con el proyecto de Sistemas de Aprendizaje	
CIAT	Alianzas de aprendizaje	Proyecto de Alianzas de Aprendizaje No. 102224		56,000.00**
	Agua	Generar alternativas de manejo de los recursos hídricos en las cabeceras de las cuencas a través de la investigación participativa con jóvenes rurales de las comunidades No. 103585	a.- Nota Conceptual del proyecto; noviembre 2005 b.- Informe de Avances; junio 2006	34,800.00**
	SAS	Los coordinadores del proyecto y parte del equipo de investigación fueron parte del personal capacitado por el proyecto SAS II No. 102600	a.- Memorias del proyecto SAS II (102600-003)-arriba mencionado	
REHDES/ MAMUCA/ CURLA	Manejo de Cuencas	Organización y facilitación del taller para la elaboación del proyecto San Juan Manejo Participativo de la Cuenca del Río San Juan en la Costa Norte No. 103296	a.- Pre-propuesta de investigación del Río San Juan a.- Propuesta del Proyecto; Julio 2005 b.- Informe Preliminar de avances; dic 2005 c.- Plan Operativo Anual; dic 2005 d.- Informe Primer semestre; feb 2006 Anexo 6. Resumen de Instituciones que realizan actividades en la Cuenca del Río San Juan Anexo 7. Resumen de Lideres y Lideresas de las comunidades de la Cuenca del Río San Juan d.- Reporte de Segundo semestre; marzo-agosto 2006 Anexos I: Ayudas memorias de las reuniones de Mesa de dialogo f.- Reporte Anual; agosto 2006 Anexo 1. Metodología para la formación de la Mesa de Diálogo e Investigación Anexo 5.- Agenda de Investigación Anexo 9.- Gira de Intercambio de Experiencia en Ecuador Anexo 10.- Reporte de Comité de Becas CURLA; feb 2006 f.- Informe Tercer semestre; feb 2007 Anexo 2. Resultados de las Investigaciones realizadas Anexo 3. Perfiles de segundas investigaciones Anexo 4. Investigación Acción: CIAL's Anexo 5. Consultorías ambientales. Anexo 6. Resumen Memorias Anexo 7. Trifolios g.- Presentación PP: Resumen de Lecciones Aprendidas sobre	100,000.00**

			el desarrollo de la primera jornada de tesis; feb 2007	
	SAS	Uso de herramientas SAS para planificación del proyecto y facilitación de las reuniones de mesa de dialogo	<p>a.- Planificación operativa basado en Diseño Intencional de Mapeo de Alcances; (Anexo)</p> <p>b.- Taller de Formación de la mesa de dialogo; feb 2006 (anexo)</p> <p>c.- Memoria Taller Sistemas de Análisis Social (SAS); nov 2005 (Anexo)</p>	
	MA	El proyecto de Río San Juan fue planificado usando el Mapeo de Alcances	<p>a.- Diseño Intencional, matrices operativas para proyecto del Río San Juan; agosto 2006</p> <p>b.- Monitoreo y Evaluación Del Primer Año del Proyecto Con Metodología Mapeo de Alcances (anexo)</p>	
	Género	Apoyo por parte de la consultora C. Sánchez para la integración del enfoque de género durante las investigaciones	a.- Memoria Taller “La Perspectiva de Género en el Trabajo de Investigación del proyecto Río San Juan; nov 2005	
MAMUCA	Sistematización	<p>Taller “ Definición de Roles y Responsabilidades del personal de la MAMUCA” (102418-003)</p> <p>2 talleres de Sistematización de la MAMUCA del trabajo de Pro-MESAS con la MUMUCA (no. 103069)</p>	<p>a.- Foto memoria del Taller de Roles y Responsabilidades de la MAMUCA; marzo 2005</p> <p>b.- Guía para la Jornada de rescate y construcción de aprendizajes e inducción a la Junta Directiva en la MAMUCA”; marzo 2006</p> <p>c.- Memoria “Jornada de rescate y construcción de aprendizajes e inducción a la Junta Directiva en la MAMUCA”; marzo 2006</p>	2,115.00
UNAH- PLATS	SAS	<p>Participación en los talleres introductorias de SAS.- 2004 (No. 101752). Reuniones de seguimiento y taller SAS (1024-18-010)</p> <p>Financiamiento del proyecto de investigación sobre los métodos para medir al pobreza y la evaluación de sus criterios empleando las herramientas SAS (No. 102946)</p>	<p>a.- Memorias taller SIS; febrero 2003</p> <p>b.- Minutas de reuniones con entre equipo CIID, PLATs y UNA.</p> <p>c.- Memoria Taller SAS; junio 2004</p> <p>d.- Propuesta del proyecto; feb 2005</p> <p>e.- Informe Final sobre: “ Discusión Sobre Tres Métodos de Medición de Pobreza a Partir de la Experiencia de Vida de las Personas Pobladoras de la Comunidad de Los Pinos, Tegucigalpa Honduras”; mayo 2006</p>	<p>13,530.00</p> <p>39,200.00</p>
	Género	Apoyo por parte de la consultora C. Sánchez para la integración del enfoque de género en el estudio y asesoramiento sobre investigación (102418-005)	<p>a.- Reporte de Consultoría</p> <p>b.- Observaciones sobre los talleres y las herramientas aplicadas para recopilar la información</p>	
CURLA	MAC	Dos personas del equipo de la CURLA (Julio Lino y Rafael Carias) participan en el comité de MAC de la Costa Norte	Actas del comité MAC en Costa Norte- Arriba mencionado	
	MA	Fortalecimiento de la Metodología Investigativa del CURLA (No. 102418-022)	<p>a.- Propuesta Fortalecimiento de la Metodología Investigativa del CURLA; junio 2005</p> <p>b.- Informe “ Fortalecimiento de la metodología Investigativa del Centro Universitario Regional Del Litoral Atlántico”; agosto 2006</p>	16,700.00

		Fortalecimiento de la Comunidad de Practicantes de Mapeo de Alcances en Honduras (No. 103977)- Apoyo en Capacitación y Seguimiento sobre la metodología a Alcaldes de la costa Norte para su aplicación en la preparación de los proyectos a presentar al fondo de la ERP	<p>a.- Propuesta Fortalecimiento de la Metodología Investigativa del CURLA; junio 2005</p> <p>b.- Memoria del Primer y Segundo Taller de Capacitación</p>	16,730.00**
	SAS	Participación en diversos eventos de capacitación de SAS tanto evento especialmente realizados para CURLA como otros de proyecto Río San Juan etc.— referirse a cuadro de capacitaciones SAS financiado por el No. 102418-002 y la línea de consultores del proyecto Sistemas de Aprendizaje. Formación de la CoP de SAS en el CURLA	a.- Memorias de Talleres de Capacitación e Intercambio	
	Sistematización	Mediante una alianza con el proyecto FISDER, se llevó a cabo en el CURLA el Diplomado de Sistematización por Alternancia.	a.- Fotomemorias Diplomado de Sistematización CURLA Módulo I y II; 2004—arriba mencionados	
Centro de Desarrollo Humano de Honduras	Investigación	Financiamiento de la investigación “Impactos del Tratado de Libre Comercio Estados Unidos y Centroamérica (mejor conocido como CAFTA por sus siglas en ingles) sobre el sector rural de Honduras” No. 102116	a.- Informe: “Impactos del Tratado de Libre Comercio Estados Unidos y Centroamérica (mejor conocido como CAFTA por sus siglas en ingles) sobre el sector rural de Honduras”; abril 2005	30,000.00**
Vecinos Mundiales	Mapeo de Alcances	Organización de Segundo Taller Nacional de Capacitación en Mapeo de Alcances (102418-011)	a.- Memoria del Segundo Taller Nacional de Mapeo de Alcances; agosto 2004	9,830.00
		Seguimiento a Segundo Taller Nacional de Capacitación de Mapeo de Alcances (102418-014)	b.- Memoria del Taller de Seguimiento Vecinos Mundiales/UNAH	1,750.00*
UAP /PRO-MESAS/Cooperación canadiense en Honduras	Mapeo de Alcances	Participación de Stephen Potter en primer taller de Mapeo de Alcances, Guatemala; 2003 Participación en el primer y segundo taller de MA	<p>a.- Memoria del primer mini-taller de MA; marzo 2007</p> <p>b.- Memoria del Segundo Taller de MA para la UAP, mayo 2007</p>	
	Sistematización	Integración de Sistemas de aprendizaje a PRO-MESAS mediante procesos de sistematización de experiencias (No. 103069). Este proceso se vió interrumpido por la salida del consultor que lo lideraba y la salida del personal de PRO-MESAS por lo que se decidió replantearlo de la forma siguiente: Se estan financiando procesos de auto-sistematización en proyectos financiados por la cooperación Canadaiense en Honduras. Ene ste proces, el consultor capacita y acompaña a socios de la Cooperación Canadiense en Honduras en la sistematización de una experiencia	<p>a.- Memoria Taller de Socialización y Análisis del proyecto; abril 2005</p> <p>b.- Cronograma inicial del proyecto; junio 2005</p> <p>c.- Informe de Avances y Marco de Planificación del Proyecto; junio 2005</p> <p>d.- Segundo Informe de Avance:junio-octubre 2005</p> <p>e.- entrevistas de Salida con Asesores Técnicos de PRO-MESAS</p> <p>f.- Documentos de aportes sobre los conceptos de armonización y apropiación; oct 2005.</p> <p>g.- Documento: ropuestas para el sistema de planificación de PRO-MESAS; octubre 2005</p> <p>h.- Documento “Propuestas para el seguimiento del primer taller de análisis”;oct 2005</p> <p>i.- Memoria Taller de Análisis de PRO-MESAS</p>	66,400.00*

		<p>Proceso de Auto-sistematización y Meta análisis de al menos 6 experiencias de la Cooperación Canadiense en Honduras (No. 103674)</p>	<p>g.- Reflexiones Finales del Proceso de Consultoría; enero 2006 j.- Presentaciones varias: conceptos de la gestión de información y el intercambio de conocimiento, avances del proceso, propuesta metodológica.</p> <p>k.- Fotomemoria del Primer Taller de Capacitación en Sistemastización; mayo 2007 Nota: Lo productos de la menos 5 experiencias estan en proceso de elaboración.</p> <p>l.- Propuesta “ Escuela de Aprendizaje por Alternancia”; may 2006</p> <p>m.- Informe de Avances “ Procesoso de Aprendizaje a través de la Autosistematización”; dic 2006 n.- Fotomemorias del Primer Taller de Aprendizaje por Alternancia: Conceptos, métodos y planifiacción de la sistematización”; agosto 2006 o.- Fotomemorias del SegundoTaller de Aprendizaje por Alternancia: Reconstrucción y análisis participativo de la experiencia” oct 2006 Nota: Lo productos (sistematización y meta-análisis) estan en proceso de elaboración.</p>	<p>59,230.00*</p>
--	--	---	--	-------------------

*: Presupuesto compartido entre esta institución y otras

**.: Recibió dinero de otras iniciativas del CIID/otras instituciones

El proyecto de Disseminación No. 104100 no ha sacado sus productos aún. Entre las organizacioens beneficiarias de este proyecto estan: RDS, Sula- Batsu (publiacción de los estudios de caso liderados por Bellanet), FISDER, PLAT´s, REMBLAH, CURLA entre otros.

ANNEX 5: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE STUDY

Terms of Reference for IDRC External Review: Building Learning Systems for Honduran Development

1. Background

The 5-year Project “Building Learning Systems for Honduran Development” came into effect June 13th, 2002 as part of Canada’s cooperation with Honduras. Developed by the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), the Project intended to complement the Canadian International Development Agency’s (CIDA) Pilot Program “Pro-Mesas” (Pro-Sector Tables). The CIDA Bilateral Program for Honduras built on a process of donor co-ordination created in response to the challenges of national reconstruction and transformation following Hurricane Mitch. Sector Tables comprised of government, civil society and donor representatives were established to share information and perspectives on development priorities and options, guided by the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP).

The Pro-Mesas Program sought to increase aid effectiveness by using sector-wide discussion tables and regional forums to build a consensus on priorities between the government and civil society actors and to plan Canadian cooperation.

The Learning Systems Project was designed to complement CIDA’s programming by building research into development projects and by enhancing the capacities of Hondurans to learn from doing, especially in relation to sector-wide discussions and regional forums. In close cooperation with the CIDA Pro-Mesas team and various IDRC Program Initiatives, the Project focused on building capacities:

- To plan and act through discussion forums (centralized or regional);
- To use new and improved applied research methodologies as learning tools;
- To create internal mechanisms for capturing lessons relevant to decision making;
- To monitor and evaluate behavioral changes in addition to measurements of outputs and impacts;

The working assumption of the Project was that broad-based dialogue and power sharing in decision-making fora, combined with research and collaborative learning, significantly improve project and policy planning and implementation.

The Project is slated to end in September 2007. In 2004, IDRC suggested that a final evaluation take place as part of the Project’s Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy. IDRC in its latest report to CIDA (pg. 8 Annual Report 2005-2006) confirms that a final external evaluation of the Project will take place in 2007.

During the course of the Project, IDRC has been proactive in reflecting and documenting outcomes and lessons; and has also carried out an internal evaluation to assess capacity building activities related to Social Analysis Systems (SAS), Outcome Mapping and knowledge systematization. The external evaluation will offer an outsider’s perspective on the overall effectiveness of the project while at the same time will draw lessons that can inform future programming.

2. Users and Uses of the External Evaluation

2.1 Intended Users

An evaluation user is one who has the 'willingness', 'authority', and 'ability' to put learnings from the evaluation process or evaluation findings to work in some way. The primary intended users are those particular individuals or groups who are affected by the outcome of the evaluation, are in a position to make decisions about the evaluation, and intend to use the evaluation process or findings to inform their decisions or actions.

<http://www.idrc.ca/uploads/user-S/115645001817Guideline.pdf>

The primary users of the external evaluation are IDRC managers. CIDA staff in the Policy and Americas Branches will be approached to provide input into the design of the external evaluation so their perspectives and questions can be built into the review (when and where it makes sense to do so). CIDA's approach is very different to IDRC's and it is unlikely the design of the evaluation could meet both organizations' needs. For that reason, IDRC is identified as the primary user and efforts will be made to make the evaluation as useful as possible to CIDA colleagues.

2.2 Intended Uses

This evaluation will be both summative and formative. The evaluation will clearly document the results and influence the Project is having and the extent to which it has achieved its objectives.

The external review will also provide information and reflection from which IDRC and CIDA managers can learn in order to improve programming. Although the reviews may provide some information on substantive issues, what is learned will primarily relate to how and in what ways learning systems contribute to making development more effective and efficient.

4. Objectives and Questions

3.1 Objectives:

1. To assess the extent to which the project has met its objectives, as set out in project documents taking into account any evolution in objectives.
2. To assess the outcomes of the project and identify strengths, challenges and lessons.
3. To offer reflections on the strengths and weaknesses of the project's approach and strategies in relation to capacity development and suggest ways for improvement for future capacity development projects and activities.
4. To evaluate how and in what ways the project has added value to CIDA development programming in Honduras.

3.2 Review questions:

For objective 1 - Assess the extent to which the project has met its objectives, as set out in project documents, taking into account any evolution in objectives:

- 1.1 Describe and assess the progress of the project towards reaching its objectives;

1.2 Identify any evolution in project objectives, and any adaptations that the project has made to changing contexts, risks, opportunities and constraints;

1.3 Assess the effectiveness of the risk mitigation strategies put in place to support the achievement of project objectives and comment on how risk mitigation strategies evolved during the life of the project.

1.4. Review and comment on the sustainability of the activities initiated by the Honduras project (i.e. have core activities initiated by the Project succeeded in carrying on?).

For objective 2 - Assess the outcomes of the project and identify strengths, challenges and lessons:

2.1 Describe and analyze the influence of the project through its **outcomes** to date (e.g. the project's contribution to changing the actions, behaviours and relationships of the project's partners); the **strategies** which contributed to the project's outcomes; any **constraining or facilitating factors or risks (internal and external to the project)**; and **key lessons** for future IDRC programming in Honduras. This should take into account, but need not be limited to, the following:

2.1.1 The effectiveness of the project at promoting the dissemination and utilization of research results;

2.1.2 the contributions of the project to influencing policies and institutional arrangements and practices.

2.1.3 any changes in relationships, actions or behaviours of project partners and other project stakeholders (individual, organizations, groups, etc.), including any relationships that the program effected which contributed to development results (e.g., formation of networks, involvement of stakeholders, collaboration among researchers, etc.) and,

2.1.4 any other outcomes observed.

2.2 The analysis of results should take into account **gender** and **social** dimensions wherever possible.

For objective 3 - Offer reflections on the strengths and weaknesses of the project's approach and strategies in relation to capacity development and suggest ways for improvement for future capacity development projects and activities:

3.1 Identify and analyze the contributions of the project to building or strengthening capacities of people and institutions in Honduras to plan and implement development projects and policies;

3.2 Describe and analyse the strengths and weaknesses of the project's approach to capacity building and suggest ways to improve future capacity building activities.

For objective 4 - Evaluate how and in what ways the project has added value to CIDA development programming in Honduras.

4.1 Describe and analyze how and in what ways the Project supported CIDA's Pro-Mesas Program;

- 4.2 Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the partnership between IDRC and CIDA in the context of development programming in Honduras and provide suggestions for improving future partnerships;
- 4.3 Assess how and in what ways learning activities supported by IDRC have strengthened CIDA programming in Honduras; and
- 4.4 Comment on the potential of learning activities to strengthen future programming at CIDA.

4. Methodology

The methodology will be determined through discussions among the project team, the Evaluation Unit, the reviewer(s), and senior management.

The section below offers some **preliminary ideas**:

- Review of program and project documentation: including, at a minimum, (i) the project proposal, PAD, workplans, annual progress reports, Tracer Study, the Position Paper, evaluation reports, meeting minutes; (ii) project abstracts; and (iii) other key documents recommended by the team;
- Interviews with program team members and senior managers;
- Interviews with key CIDA staff and managers;
- Interviews with a sample of project leaders;
- In-depth case studies of a sample of projects. This will entail:
 - (i) review of key project documents (including Project Approval Document, progress and final technical reports received, publications and other outputs, trip reports, etc.);
 - (ii) interviews with the relevant program staff;
 - (iii) interviews with project researchers and other participants, and those said to or expected to have been influenced by the project; the latter will be done through travel to visit field sites of the projects.

For the in-depth case studies, 2-4 projects will be selected in consultation with IDRC managers, RPE staff, the Evaluation Unit (EU) and the reviewer(s).

Using data collected from each of the above sources, the reviewer(s) will establish a baseline on the situation in Honduras when the project began in relation to learning systems (i.e. Outcome Mapping, SAS and systematization of knowledge) and will address questions related to: (1) progress towards meeting program objectives; (2) project outcomes; (3) strengths and weaknesses of the project's capacity building approach; and, (4) the partnership with CIDA.

The expected output of the external review is:

- ♦ report prepared by the reviewer(s) of no more than 20 pages that responds to the 4 objectives;
- ♦ an executive summary of no more than 4 pages;
- ♦ appendices with details on the methodology and findings of the review

5. Process and Timeline

The evaluation will be coordinated by members of the project team in consultation with senior managers and the Evaluation Unit.

The Evaluation Unit (EU) will comment on:

- I. the review's terms of reference;
- II. the methodological integrity of the review;
- III. the review's adherence to evaluation standards for utility, feasibility, accuracy and propriety; and
- IV. the clarity and organisation of the final report.

Program managers/Team Leaders, with input from their teams / staff as appropriate, should comment on:

- I. Any of the above;
- II. accuracy and/or interpretation of the data and analysis; and,
- III. comments and suggestions to reviewer(s) intended to improve the report's usefulness for programmatic decision-making and learning for programmatic improvement.

DPA and Regional Director should comment on:

- I. Any of the above;
- II. Comments and suggestions to reviewer(s) intended to improve the report for the defined primary uses of the external reviews (i.e. fulfilling information needs for accountability for program results; and informing management decisions about future programming directions).

Timeline: this evaluation will take approximately 4 months starting in mid March

Activity	Dates
Terms of reference shared with CIDA	Early March
Reviewer(s) are selected	Early March
Reviewer(s) are contracted	By March 20
RPE staff provide reviewer(s) all selected documentation to review	By March 30
Reviewer(s) submit preliminary external review workplan to evaluation coordination. This is shared with management and CIDA	By April 10
Reviewer(s) select with Program Manager, TL, the EU and IDRC-Honduras staff the projects for project leader interviews and for in-depth review	By April 15
IDRC and reviewer(s) arrange field visits	By April 15
Field visit to Honduras	2 first weeks in May
Reviewer(s) conduct data collection: i.e. document review, interviews with IDRC and CIDA team members and with project leaders, and visits to field for in-depth studies; Analysis; Report writing	March 22-June 1
Reviewer(s) submit draft report to IDRC	By June 4
DPA, Regional Director, Program Manager, TL and Honduras staff provide comments. These are sent to evaluators.	By June 22
Reviewer(s) submit revised final report and draft brief to IDRC	By July 6

7. Documents to be Provided to External Reviewer(s)

Project documents:

- Proposal and/or planning documents (e.g., logframe, Learning planning strategy)
- Any Project evaluations (Tracer study)
- Project Workplans
- Annual project reports
- The Position Paper
- Project portfolio and pipeline
- Project Approval Documents (PADs)
- Minutes of Project meetings
- Project outputs
- Relevant correspondence, communication materials, presentations, conference materials, websites, publications, press reports, trip reports, financial analysis, strategy reflections, multi-media materials, etc.
- Any other documents, references, and/or websites the program deems important.

Project documents [for projects to be reviewed in depth]:

- PADs and all interim and final technical reports of projects
- copies of project outputs and relevant websites
- contact information for project leaders and project partners to be interviewed
- full project file (all information and correspondence)

ANNEX 6: BIOGRAPHIES OF THE EVALUATORS

William (Bill) Edwardson hails from Scotland. He gained his PhD in Food Science and Technology at Massey University in New Zealand in 1975. Bill began his career in international development with IDRC in 1979 where he worked on post production in the agrifood sector, especially related to agroenterprise and value chains development in Latin America, but also Asia and Africa. Since he moved on to work as an independent consultant in 1998, Bill has focused on project design, feasibility studies and evaluation with international agencies such as FAO, IADB, IFAD, CIDA; NGOs such as CHF and CARE and the private sector. He has recently had assignments with oil companies on community development and corporate social responsibility. He has broad experience working at all levels in many developing countries and has lived in India, Colombia, Ecuador and Sudan. Bill is fluent in Spanish. Bill can be contacted in Ottawa, Canada at wmedwardson@rogers.com.

Brenda Bucheli is a Peruvian Social Psychologist specialized in project planning and evaluation, information and knowledge management, and organisational development. She has more than 15 years of experience in the development field in different sectors, mainly in Peru and other Latin American countries. She has worked as a trainer, process facilitator, advisor, evaluator, and in direct project implementation. Brenda also gained intensive managerial experience as Director of Pact Peru, an NGO specialized in capacity building. She has been a member of the Advisory Committee/ Support Group of different global and regional initiatives for networking among capacity building practitioners like The Pelican Initiative, Praxis Programme, Impact Alliance, and Fortaleza. She is very active in global and regional networks related to M&E like PREVAL, EvalPeru, AEA and IDEAS. Brenda can be contacted in Lima, Peru at brenda_bucheli@yahoo.es

ANNEX 7 EVALUATION PLAN

<i>Who will use the evaluation? How? When?</i>	<i>Objectives and Questions</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>	<i>Evaluation Methods</i>	<i>Who? When? Remarks</i>
IDRC Managers >To improve programming in Honduras and elsewhere	<p>1. Objectives</p> <p>1.1. To what extent has project met its objectives; what has been achieved?</p> <p>1.2. How have objectives evolved and project has adapted to changing contexts, risks, opportunities and constraints</p> <p>1.3. How effective have been risk mitigation strategies to support achievement of project objectives; how have risk strategies evolved during the project (examples)</p> <p>1.4. How sustainable are activities initiated by the project?</p>	PAD, Project reports. Sub project reports. Trip reports. IDRC program staff, Honduras project staff, CIDA staff and Honduran field staff (past and present). Project Outcome Mapping Journals, Reports. Key stakeholders	<p>Document review.</p> <p>Compare before and after states, expectations, results and outcomes.</p> <p>Key informant interviews or focus groups with IDRC, CIDA staff, sample of sub project leaders, GOH, community organizations</p>	<p>April 2 -20 by Lead consultant (Bill Edwardson) (Ottawa/Gatineau)</p> <p>April 20- May 18 (Ottawa, Gatineau, Tegucigalpa and Honduran field sites).</p> <p>Evaluation team</p>
	<p>2. Outcomes</p> <p>2.1. Which are the main outcomes on project partners related to actions, behaviors, institutional orientation, relationships and policies attributable to the project?</p> <p>2.2. Which methodologies/strategies proved to be more effective for achieving the outcomes?</p> <p>2.3. How sustainable are the outcomes achieved with project partners?</p>	Project reports, Trip reports, Formative Evaluation, project partners, key stakeholders, peer organizations, other secondary data.	<p>Document review</p> <p>Interviews and/ or focus groups with project team, project partners, key stakeholders, peer organizations</p> <p>Observation in the field</p> <p>Triangulation of</p>	<p>April 20 – May 18 (Peru and Honduran field sites). Brenda Bucheli will lead</p>

Who will use the evaluation? How? When?	Objectives and Questions	Information Sources	Evaluation Methods	Who? When? Remarks
	2.4. How have other project participants been impacted by the project's activities? 2.5. What are key lessons for future IDRC programming in Honduras?		information sources Network analysis	
	3. Capacity Development 3.1. What are the contributions made by the project on building and strengthening the capacities of people and institutions to plan and implement development projects and policies? 3.2. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the projects approach to capacity building ? Were they relevant/ pertinent? 3.3. What capacity will remain in Honduras as a result of the project?	Project reports, Trip reports, Formative Evaluation, project partners, key stakeholders, peer organizations, other secondary data.	Document review Interviews and/ or focus groups with project team, project partners, key stakeholders, peer organizations Observation in the field Triangulation of information sources	April 20 – May 18 (Peru and Honduran field sites). Brenda Bucheli will lead
	4. Added value of project 4.1. How and in what ways has the project supported CIDA's Promesas Program? 4.2. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the IDRC-CIDA partnership in the Honduras development programming? How could future partnerships be improved? 4.3. How and in what ways have IDRC supported learning activities	CIDA and IDRC field staff (past and present) CIDA and IDRC field program staff (past and present). Key stakeholders in Honduras development incl recipients and beneficiary community participants Progress , final reports,	Semi-structured interviews Stakeholder workshop(s) in Honduras Document review and semistructured interviews with field project and	April 23- May 6. Ottawa, Gatineau May 6-18 Honduras. Lead consultant (Bill Edwardson). May 6-18 Honduras Evaluation team

<i>Who will use the evaluation? How? When?</i>	<i>Objectives and Questions</i>	<i>Information Sources</i>	<i>Evaluation Methods</i>	<i>Who? When? Remarks</i>
	strengthened CIDA programming in Honduras? 4.4. What is the potential of learning activities to strengthen future programming at CIDA?	publications, impacts of 2 field projects CIDA Americas, Policy , Performance and Program staff (incl present and past Honduras program staff)	IDRC/CIDA field project staff. Semi structured interviews or focus group meeting Interviews	May 6-18. Honduras . Evaluation Team May 6-18 Honduras Evaluation Team May 21-25. Gatineau Lead consultant (Bill Edwardson)

ANNEX 8: FIELD TRIP SCHEDULE

May 5. Travel. Ottawa/Montreal	Overnight Montreal
May 6. Travel. Montreal/Miami/Tegucigalpa	
Tegucigalpa, Honduras. Hotel	Working session with co-evaluator Brenda Bucheli. Review of plans and documentation
May 7. Tegucigalpa. Project Office (UAP)	Meeting with IDRC Honduras Project Team - Raul Zelaya, Markus Gottsbacher y Sofia Méndez . Introductions. Presentation of Project by team. Review of plans and logistics for evaluation.
	Meeting with professors from Universidad Nacional de Agricultura (Olancho) - Ana Mireya Suazo, Amilcar Colindres, Kenny Nágera. Discussions on experiences in project SAS II.
May 8. Tegucigalpa. Office of ANAFAE (Asociación Nacional para el Fomento de la Agricultura Ecologica)	Discussions on experiences with projects Farmer Schools – Werner Valar and Mateo Ganas; Alternative Conflict Management: Jaqueline Chernier, Francisco Paredes: Utilization of methodologies: Outcome Mapping and SAS
Tegucigalpa. Project Office (UAP)	Interview with Laura Suazo, consultant. Training and support on SAS methodologies to IDRC project partners.
	Interview with Manuel Hernandez , Local Technical Advisor on Forestry in PROMESAS from 2003. Discussion regarding IDRC -PROMESAS relations.
May 9. Tegucigalpa. Project Office (UAP)	Meeting with staff of COHCIT (Consejo Hondureno de Ciencia y Tecnologia)- Ivette Castillo, Elena Maria Freije: Discussions on PRIDE Project (Programa de Investigación para el Desarrollo) supported by IDRC-Honduras in its pilot stage.
	Brief visit to the Outcome Mapping workshop for CIDA – UAP team run by IDRC-Honduras team.
	Meeting with Wilfredo Cardona, Former Coordinator, FISDER Project, Direccion Nacional de Desarrollo Rural Sostenible, Tegucigalpa (DINADERS): Experiences and results of this first Project funded by the IDRC Honduras Project.
May 10. Consulate of Canada in Honduras, Tegucigalpa	Meeting with Josee Fluet (Consul and Head of Aid) and Lorena Silva (Development Officer) Perceptions of the project by new CIDA team, potential and review of files.
Office on SNV (Dutch Development Cooperation Service), Tegucigalpa	Meeting with Louis Beijer, SNV consultant on staff. Discussions on his experience on the research committee

	of Alternative Conflict Management project and potential for future financial support.
Tegucigalpa. Project Office (UAP)	Meeting with team of consultants who worked with the projects funded by IDRC-Honduras Project. Marco Antonio Martinez (systematization and development of PRIDE); Cecilia Sanchez (Gender); Ruth Varela (Systematization). Judith Contreras (Outcome Mapping) had recently moved to Chile. Discussions on methodologies and learning systems and experience on the IDRC Project.
May 11. Travel Tegucigalpa/La Ceiba (air)	
Balfato, near La Ceiba	Meeting with 4 community members on their experience with Alternative Conflict Management Project managed by ANAFAE.
La Ceiba	Meeting with Rafael Carias and Freddy Sierra of CURLA (Centro Universitario Region del Litoral Atlantida). Discussions on their experiences with Outcome Mapping and SAS training and application.
May 12. La Ceiba	Meeting with staff of REHDES (Red Hondurena para el Desarrollo Sostenible): Juan Carlos Carrasco, Director and Bestalina Martinez Discussions on application of Outcome Mapping in Rio San Juan project.
Office of MAMUCA (association of 5 communities) , Masica, near La Ceiba.	Discussions on MAMUCA and the stakeholders monthly round tables (mesa de dialogo) with Guillermo Rosales (Promesas link at MAMUCA), Maximino Caceres (community leader) and Mario Roberto Ayala (mayor of Masica, President of MAMUCA).
May 12. Travel La Ceiba/Tegucigalpa.	
May 13. Tegucigalpa.	Review of notes and drafting of reports.
May 14 . Office of UNDP, Tegucigalpa	Meeting with Juan Jose Fenando, Environment Program, UNDP-Honduras.(formerly with PROMESAS). Experience with UNDP role on research committee of Alternative Conflict Management Project and IDRC/Promesas relations.
Clarion Hotel, Tegucigalpa	Launch of Project PRIDE (Programa de Investigación para el Desarrollo/Program of Research for Development
Travel to Catacamas, Olancho by road	National Agricultural University : meeting with team on Project Desarrollo Económico Local (DEL)/Local Economic Development project supported by IDRC-Honduras. Meeting with municipal council and chamber of commerce, Catacamas on DEL project
May 15. Nacional Agricultura University (UNA), Catacamas	Meeting with Rector (Ing Gustavo Lopez) and Vice Rector (Ing Reyes). Discussions on capacity building at UNA through IDRC-Honduras project support

	Meeting with Ing Wilmer Reyes, UNA team on experiences on SASII Project
Field trip to Flor del Café community, River Talgua Watershed	Meeting with community members on experience with SAS methodologies provided through UNA/IDRC-Honduras Project.
May 16. , UNA, Catacamas	Alternative Conflict Management (ACM) Seminar. Meetings with staff of 3 field projects: Melissa, Lisa and Edgardo and Stefan (DED) and Francisco Paredes coordinator (ACM) on experiences in ACM project
Return to Tegucigalpa by road	
Tegucigalpa. Project Office (UAP)	Meeting with GTZ (Germany) staff Andreas Gettkant & Maria Delfina Flores. Discussions on their experiences with Alternative Conflict Management, Systematization and Local Economic Development projects in which GTZ collaborated with IDRC-Honduras
May 17. Tegucigalpa	Meetings with Eric Lapalme (Director, PSU, Marten de Groot (Environment/Water program), CIDA, Honduras Perceptions of IDRC role in PROMESAS and future potential for IDRC-CIDA collaboration and utilization of IDRC project results.
	Meeting at Red de Desarrollo Sostenible (RDS) with Pedro Torres, Field Manager. Experiences on Remittances and DEL projects and training activities supported by the Project
	Debriefing meeting on initial impressions of Evaluation Team with S. Carter, R. Zelaya, M. Gottsbacher y S. Méndez
May 18. Tegucigalpa . Canadian Consulate	Meeting with Warren Kidd (Cooperation), CIDA . Discussions re CIDA Promesas-IDRC relations
Travel to Miami/Montreal	Overnight Montreal
May 19 Travel. Montreal/Ottawa	

ANNEX 9: EVALUATION OF TWO SUB-PROJECTS

Social Analysis Systems Phase II - Honduras component

Sub-project N° 102600 - 003

Total Investment: CAD 995,700⁴⁶

Completion date: 2008/01/14

Recipient Institution: Carleton University in Canada and in Honduras the Universidad Nacional de Agricultura.

Background:

The sub-project N° 100836 “Doing Stakeholder Analysis” generated a solid prototype of participatory social analysis techniques and approaches called the Social Analysis System (SAS). Sub-project N° 101752 supported a training workshop about stakeholder analysis, introducing SAS. This sub-project N° 102600 supported the application of SAS in case studies of natural resource management problems in Honduras, Bolivia, Canada, Honduras, India and Nepal, and the capacity building through the project to a broader network of researchers. Specifically in Honduras, the sub-project supported the institutionalization of SAS in the Universidad Nacional de Agricultura (UNA) in the eastern state of Olancho.

Objectives and achievements:

Objectives ⁴⁷	Achievements ⁴⁸
General: To improve UNA’s social management.	Professors and directors of different levels in the UNA believe that SAS allowed them to be more responsive to the demands of local actors. The incorporation of SAS in the curricula, the research carried out by UNA, and the efforts for gaining individual and institutional certification are evidence of the added value that UNA finds in SAS. Peer organizations and the communities supported using these new methodologies (eg Flor de Café in Catacamas) appreciate this capacity in the UNA and value it.
Specific: 1. Develop the capacities of professors and students to apply and assess participatory social analysis in the context of technical agricultural research.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • About 340 people from different institutions (students and professors from UNA, students and professors of basic education, producers, communal leaders, etc.) were trained. • 7 systematizations regarding SAS were carried out by UNA: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SAS Project experience in the Talgua Watershed. 2. SAS Project experience at the institutional level, 2005. 3. Participatory evaluation of common beans

⁴⁶ \$165,000 from CIDA, the budget for UNA directly was \$96,920 (Source: Project Approval Document, approved September 2004).

⁴⁷ Source: Project Approval Document, approved September 2004.

⁴⁸ Source: Proceso de Institucionalización de Sistemas de Análisis Social (SAS) en la UNA (2007), Listado de Instituciones Socias del Proyecto Sistemas de Aprendizaje, Mayo 2006.

Objectives ⁴⁷	Achievements ⁴⁸
	using SAS. 4. SAS applied in dairy sector , Guayape valley, Olancho. 5. SAS in Local Economic Development. 6. SAS in Adaptation to Climate Change 7. Institucionalization of SAS at UNA. • 14 undergraduate theses were supported by this sub-project.
2. Introduce participatory social analysis curriculum into university courses in agriculture.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 13 of 42 UNA professors used SAS in their university courses. • UNA has a team of 7 leader professors, all very committed to promote SAS within the university. They are in the process of getting certification as expert practitioners from Carleton . • 20% of the student’s research theses in the period 2004-2005 incorporated social elements to complement their technical work • SAS tools were included in the courses of two new degrees initiated in the university: Food Technology, Natural Resources and Environment. • UNA is in the process of gaining institutional certification as training centre for SAS, which could provide for future resource mobilization .

Perspectives

The institutionalization of SAS within the UNA is on its way. Mainstreaming of the methodology is encouraged from the top to the bottom of the institution, and the professors are motivated to use SAS in their work because they see it helps them to do better work in accordance to the needs of their community and municipality partners. SAS has become part of UNA’s identity. With the support of IDRC’s PBDD group, UNA is elaborating a business plan considering SAS and the certification as a key milestone in the coming years.

Name: Natural Resources Conflict Management Program (ACM)
Sub-project N° 103304
Total Investment: 253,500 CAD
Sub-project completion date: 2007/10/01
Recipient institution: ANAF AE

Background

In 2004, a multi-institutional partnership held several events that culminated in a proposal for a conflict management program in Honduras. This grant enabled the National Association for the Promotion of Ecological Agriculture (ANAF AE) to create such a program. The sub-project focused on training key actors in conflict management techniques and developing a strategy for influencing decision-making in the area of natural resource management (NRM).

Objectives and achievements:

Objectives ⁴⁹	Achievements
<p>General</p> <p>Promote participatory research processes in conflict management using the ACM methodology that allows stakeholders to develop their skills for participatory and equitable management of their natural resources.</p>	<p>This general objective was partially achieved. The processes using ACM methodology in natural resources conflicts were started but not concluded. Conflicts are still unresolved and skills recently developed are not yet consolidated. The ACM methodology was improved with some reflection based on practice and on new methodologies promoted by the LS project. OM has effectively been employed for monitoring of progress of the sub-project..</p>
<p>Specific</p> <p>1. To use action-research Natural Resources Alternative Conflict Management as the main methodological tool for the satisfactory solution of conflicts.</p>	<p>Eight case studies were approved in 2006 for the application of ACM:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Participatory management of the Bejucales watershed b) Land tenure in the natural protected areas of Colon. c) Mechanisms of distinction to reduce the effects of illegal logging. d) Conflict management in the implementation of the Land Management Plan for the Tocoa watershed . e) ACM proposal for the participatory construction of a vision for the integrated management of the Cagrejal Watershed f) ACM: mechanism for the integrated management of the Catacamas.Watershed. g) ACM applied in the community management of forests in concessión areas.. h) Concesións on rivers in water production zones, Sah Esteban, Olancho. <p>The progress in each case is not clear. The latest sub-project report for October 2005 – September 2006 (October 2006) explains the preparatory activities and plans for implementation of each case study. The evaluation team could confirm the situation of the cases of Tocoa, Balfate, Catacamas, and Cangrejal. None of them reported that the process was concluded and a satisfactory solution was achieved. The Balfate case seems to be the most advanced of these 4,; community members reported they were close to find a solution and had a final negotiation date scheduled with the electricity company, with whom they were in conflict over the building of a dam..</p>

⁴⁹ The source of these objectives is the proposal presented by ANAF AE and the base for their reporting. The Project Approval document of the Natural Resources Conflict Management Program (September 2005) has 4 different objectives.

Objectives ⁴⁹	Achievements
<p>2. To validate the appropriateness and efficacy of the ACM methodology in the Honduran context, thereby generating a community of practice that shares the learning derived from practice.</p>	<p>The ACM methodology was built collectively and some lessons learned were extracted from the practice:</p> <p>a. The ACM framework considered 5 types of conflicts. It was found that those categories are not isolated and some conflicts might fit into more than one of them.</p> <p>b. Prevention of conflicts is an area that deserves attention and an opportune intervention., in order to reduce the potential for major conflicts. This finding increases the scope of action for ACM..</p> <p>c. Conflicts arise in territorial units like natural protected areas and watersheds Thus the ACM framework was enriched with the concepts of integrated management of watersheds.and sustainable management of protected areas.</p> <p>The ACM methodology was also improved with the SAS methodology. Technical accompaniment was provided by the Project to support training and application..</p> <p>These lessons learned and other information about ACM are widely shared through a web site, www.manejodeconflictos.org, and face-to-face spaces like forums and seminars.</p>
<p>3. To promote the sustainability of ACM in the Northern and Eastern parts of the country, institutionalizing the process with strategic partners in each region, to ensure continuity.</p>	<p>It is premature to say the processes are consolidated. As mentioned before, the ACM cycle were not concluded in any of the cases, and without an active role of a facilitator like Popol Nat Tu or REDHES it is difficult to envision continuity. German cooperation (DED, GTZ) and PNUD has shown some interest to continue using ACM, not necessarily related to the ongoing case studies. The ACM training cycle considers seven workshops, the sixth one has just finished. There is insufficient time left for the consolidation of the new skills.</p>

Perspectives

ANAFAE is well positioned and gained recognition on the area of conflict management, as a result of its leadership of this sub-project. New relationships were developed across the country that allow them to have new allies for future initiatives. New demands for training courses have emerged from this external recognition, which could become an important line for resource mobilization in the near future. The organization still is challenged to have a sufficient number of qualified facilitators to lead ACM processes in each zone of conflict to complete ongoing work, as well as to respond to these new opportunities. Partnerships with UNDP, SNV, DED and GTZ in the Research Committee are expected to continue after project completes, although potential funding was not confirmed.

