



USAID | INDONESIA
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Conflict Sensitive Monitoring and Evaluation Systems for the Field

Interim Training Report

**Master Training of Trainers
Conflict Sensitive Monitoring and Evaluation
The Field Tools for Practitioners and
Palu, Central Sulawesi, 26-30 July, 2010**



July - August 2010

This training was conducted for the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) for the SERASI Project. The training was conducted by the Peacebuilding and Development Institute in Sri Lanka.

Conflict Sensitive Monitoring and Evaluation Systems for the Field

Interim Training Report

October 2010

The training report was developed by the Peacebuilding and Development Institute in Sri Lanka by Sarah Cohen Wood.

The authors' views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

CONTENTS

- CONTENTS 1**
- ACRONYMS..... i**
- Background ii**
- 1.0 Training Overview 1**
 - 1.1 Regional and Policy Context..... 1
 - 1.2 Training Objectives 2
 - 1.3 Participant Selection 2
 - 1.4 M&E and Conflict Sensitive Approaches 3
- 2.0 Training Resources 4**
 - 2.1 About the Training Manual 4
 - 2.2 Other Resources 4
 - 2.3 Manual Orientation 4
- 3.0 Training Insights 6**
 - 3.1 Manual Development..... 6
 - 3.2 Participant Selection 6
 - 3.3 Training Methodology 7
 - 3.4 Field Observations and Follow on Training..... 8
 - 3.5 MToT versus a Standard Conflict Sensitive M&E Course 9
- 4.0 Recommendations for Improvement..... 11**
 - 4.1. General Recommendations 11

ACRONYMS

CAF	Conflict Assessment Framework
CS	Conflict Sensitive
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CBO	Community Based Organization
CMM	Conflict Mitigation and Management Office of USAID
CS	Conflict Sensitive
CSO	Community Service Organization
DANDIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DFID	Department of Foreign and International Affairs
DI	Democracy International
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
MToT	Master Training of Trainers
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
PMP	Performance Monitoring Plan
USAID	United States Agency of International Development

BACKGROUND

Evidence shows that humanitarian assistance, development and peace-building activities interact with the context they are taking place in and, in conflict-affected settings with the conflict. These interventions can aggravate the conflict and do harm or they can contribute in a positive way to a constructive conflict transformation. National governments, multilateral donors as well as civil society organizations therefore increasingly endeavor to design and implement conflict sensitive approaches that go beyond Do No Harm and coerce a positive impact on conflict transformation. In July and August of 2010 two master training of trainers (MToT) courses were piloted by USAID/ SERASI in Central Sulawesi and Aceh. This was the first time that a MToT course of this kind was delivered in these two areas. In October of 2009, a basic course in Conflict Sensitive M&E was given in Aceh, and this was an attempt to identify and assess the status and potential for replication with targeted USAID/SERASI local partners to enhance conflict sensitive approaches in program design, monitoring and planning.

This course, “Conflict Sensitive Monitoring and Evaluation for the Field”, is a practical course, and a MToT course must be targeted in order to be most effective. But one should not limit selection to only monitoring and evaluation (M&E) staff. The idea behind this type of course delivery is to assess and to encourage the dissemination of lessons learned from the field utilizing conflict sensitive approaches and to help local staff develop new skills in participatory approaches that allow local conflict analysis to be applied more consistently when implementing project activities. So participants were asked to share their experiences, listen to the stories of others, and reflect on ways to increase their field skills in tangible ways. Participants were both an instructor and a participant at the same time and their skills were assessed. By the end of this course the aim is for participants to develop a conflict sensitive mindset and be equipped with tools, approaches and experience as a facilitator as well as a practitioner for applying a conflict sensitive lens to development design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation.

This is an interim report that details the methodology and process of delivering two Master Trainer of Trainers (MToT) courses for USAID SERASI. Two five day courses were held, one in Central Sulawesi and one in Aceh. These courses provided complete training manuals and support materials to participants and assessed their training and replication potential both at the individual and organizational level. This report details the approach, tools, and lessons learned that we hope will be useful for future planning of skills development courses for conflict settings. Another MToT will also be conducted in Papua, and in August of 2010 a 5 day basic conflict sensitive course was done in Papua to identify participants for the MToT planned for early December 2010. This course and final impact of the training approach used by USAID/ SERASI and PDI-SL will be detailed in a report due end of December 2010.

1.0 TRAINING OVERVIEW

With funding from USAID/SERASI, the Peacebuilding and Development Institute (PDI-SL) designed and facilitated two five-day pilot workshops Central Sulawesi and Aceh to explore the relationship between conflict-sensitive programming and monitoring and evaluation. The workshops were held July 26-30th, 2010, in Palu, Central Sulawesi and August 9-13th, 2010 in Aceh with participants representing local civil society organizations from these areas who were direct grantees of USAID/SERASI. This was the first time that a MToT course of this kind was delivered in these two areas. In October of 2009, a basic course in Conflict Sensitive M&E was given in Aceh, and this was an attempt to identify and assess the status and potential for replication with targeted USAID/SERASI local partners to enhance conflict sensitive approaches in program design, monitoring and planning.

1.1 Regional and Policy Context

Few regions of the world have been more devastated by ongoing natural disasters as well as fragmented conflicts and separatist movements than Indonesia. Indonesia has been torn apart by internal conflict and, the human toll in deaths, displacement, and physical destruction—as well as in increased disease, poverty, social trauma, and alienation—has been immense. The gains from painstaking development efforts completed over many years have been lost in a matter of weeks. Underlying ethnic and religious tensions and open conflicts also have had enormous cross province impacts due to changing legal and political structures, and the proliferation of small arms, and legions of disenfranchised youth has impacted both economic as well as social development.

As the conflicts throughout Indonesia have proliferated, their impact on development projects has become more apparent. USAID and other donors have had to come to terms with the fundamental questions of whether and how their development programs can play a role in mitigating conflicts or preventing them, and whether development assistance sometimes unintentionally worsens conflicts. In the development field as a whole, this subject is widely discussed under the rubric of improving the “conflict sensitivity” of development programs. Conflict sensitivity involves the design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of development and humanitarian relief programs so they are better adapted to unstable environments and also can have some ameliorative impacts on them, or at least, not worsen them. It concerns the ability of aid programs to work more effectively not only “in” and “around” conflicts, but also “on” them.

A direct and practical way to tackle these priorities is to explore the specific interactions that occur between current aid programs and the unstable, conflict environments in which they sometimes operate. Such a review can alert practitioners more acutely to the threat that conflicts represent to development and also help them ensure that their programs are having the desired positive effects in these environments—not only in terms of particular sectoral objectives, but also in terms of conflict mitigation and peace building. A starting point for identifying these interactions is to look through a “conflict lens” at the M&E procedures used. This approach can uncover how programs have sought to adapt within their environments and where they may need to be modified to be more conflict-sensitive.

1.2 Training Objectives

USAID/ SERASI and PDI-SL held a pilot workshop in Indonesia to bring together representatives from civil society organizations throughout Aceh and Central Sulawesi. The purpose of this pilot training was to explore the ways that M&E can improve the effectiveness of development, humanitarian, and peace-building programs in environments affected by various degrees of conflict.



In particular, the workshop sought to:

1. expand the participants' understanding of how working in conflict environments affects programs, and how these programs can affect conflicts;
2. increase participants' appreciation of the value of doing conflict-sensitive M&E to inform ongoing program design and implementation;
3. identify ways that organizations can design and implement conflict-sensitive M&E plans and develop strategic partnerships through the use of monitoring and evaluation; and
4. examine how M&E can contribute to organizational learning and capacity building through training and replication with partner NGOs benefiting from USAID/SERASI grants.

The focus of the training was how USAID/SERASI and its partners might become more sensitive to, and thus effective in, conflict environments. As reflected in the expectations for the workshop that participants expressed at the outset, this raises issues at several policy and operational levels:

- How can we better understand the sources and dynamics of conflicts?
- How can assistance programs be designed so they reduce violence and destructive conflict?
- How can programs avoid creating new conflicts?
- How do we integrate conflict-analysis and conflict-management objectives into sectoral activities, such as agricultural development, food security, and other assistance?
- What is the relationship, for example, between economic reconstruction and peace building? Microfinance and conflict prevention?
- How can program designs and implementation be adapted to constantly changing and evolving conflict environments?

1.3 Participant Selection

USAID/ SERASI selected all participant organizations and this was done with USAID/ SERASI partner, Democracy International (DI) M&E staff. The selection was based on criteria established by DI staff and was meant to be representative of partner organizations receiving direct grant assistance in these two regions. Detailed analysis of participant selection can be found in this report as well as recommendations for strengthening future MTOT selection practices focusing on Conflict Sensitive M&E training for project staff and partners.

1.4 M&E and Conflict Sensitive Approaches

One of the most effective ways to do conflict-sensitive programming is to look at how M&E is done in conflict environments and how to fine-tune it to improve programming. Applying a conflict lens in M&E can improve the quality of programs so they are more effective at promoting peaceful development. That effort entails a number of specific technical and operational challenges. As noted by the training participants, some of these challenges include:

- How do we know the most important actions to take in a situation to promote peace?
- Which factors do we need to identify in order to be confident that our monitoring and evaluation is done correctly?
- What are appropriate performance indicators that can measure a reduction of conflict and effectiveness in peace building, particularly with various sectoral activities?
- In particular, how can we ascertain preventive impacts on conflicts to know if our efforts helped avert a crisis?
- When does monitoring start and who does it?
- How can we interpret inherently qualitative data, especially about peace-building effects and how can we best present that data?
- How do we redesign programs in a changing situation, and thus adapt program strategies and implementation to environments that are constantly fluid and evolving?
- How can we forge linkages with people working in conflict areas and become part of a network of conflict monitoring and evaluation experts that can share lessons?
- How can we strengthen our ongoing organizational capacities for integrating conflict analysis in cost-effective and time-efficient ways into program design, monitoring and evaluation?

This training is designed to assist USAID/SERASI partners to develop their procedures to deal with conflict. As highlighted in the following pages, the training had its challenges as well as highlighted some need for change within SERASI's approaches as well as partner activity design. Group discussions elicited examples of conflict-sensitive programs, useful indicators, data collection methods in conflict contexts, and so on. USAID/Washington is addressing conflicts more explicitly through the adoption of a conflict policy and providing technical leadership and field support through USAID/ CMM. Established in late 2002, CMM is sponsoring conflict assessments, supporting activity design and M&E through issue-specific toolkits, and managing a small fund to test innovative approaches. USAID/SERASI is further supporting these approaches by piloting new ways to share information more directly with beneficiaries of USAID funding and looking at learning lessons from the challenges that these organizations face in the field by operating both in conflict contexts as well as working directly with conflict affected populations in Indonesia.

2.0 TRAINING RESOURCES

2.1 About the Training Manual

The training itself is designed for professionals working on development, humanitarian, or transition activities in conflict affected environments and are meant to provide an opportunity for them to improve their skills in project measurement and design. This course is a training course and all materials are meant to be adapted as necessary for individual staff and project needs. Each module was fully supported with participant information, trainer materials, facilitation activities, and background presentations and handouts. This training manual was designed as a Master Trainers Course, but can easily be adapted for local and organization level training. All materials have been field tested and are fully supported by current design and guidance from such donors as USAID, the World Bank, DFID DANIDA, CIDA and others. This enables the materials to be used for multiple sectors as well as partner needs and settings. At the end of each module section is a ***Training Resource Section***. This section has specific exercises and group activities that can be used to support the presentations for each module.

This manual was developed by Sarah Cohen Wood, the lead trainer who has been providing this training for over 6 years in locations around the world. This training has been conducted in countries in Asia as well as in East and West Africa and the United States. It is designed to provide participants with a comprehensive overview of conflict sensitive M&E and conflict analysis. Modules were designed to address field based realities and current local partnerships and networks. The training was developed to try and meet the expectation of participants selected by USAID/SERASI. The manual itself is designed to mirror a basic conflict sensitive M&E course, the MToT course is designed to provide opportunities for participants to learn new training skills, but to also observe a training on conflict sensitive M&E so that they can develop skills in delivering the modules themselves and for their organizations.

2.2 Other Resources

A CD is included with this manual that has the presentations, guidance documents, and handouts for participants. This CD provides the trainer with all the materials needed to disseminate and conduct this course locally. These materials can and should be adapted for specific language and local context needs. For this course, all materials have been adapted to support a South East Asia context, Indonesia. Materials and the training course itself will be conducted both in English and in Bahasa Indonesian. Some training materials on the CD will need to be translated based on need.

2.3 Manual Orientation

This manual has six modules, meant to be trained over a period of five days. The modules themselves provide a framework for practitioners working in conflict affected areas and with conflict populations to improve their ability to design, implement and measure activities and interventions. The modules are designed to be delivered in coordination with a series of presentations, facilitation exercises, and a practical group exercise designed to identify the level of comprehension and understanding of the participants trained. Each module is designed to build on the one previously delivered, so they should be delivered in order. The modules outline the presentations for that topic, and each includes exercises and learning objectives meant to be achieved by the participants that guide the facilitator.

The modules are as follows:

Module	Title	Learning Objective (s)
Module One	What is Conflict Sensitive M&E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants are able to define the difference between traditional and conflict sensitive M&E.
Module Two	Technical Tools and Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants are able to identify and apply the terms necessary to apply conflict sensitive M&E to project design and implementation. • Participants are able to define these terms for staff and stakeholders • Participants understand the format for a Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) Framework.
Module Three	Conflict Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants are able to define conflict analysis tools relevant for field based project interventions. • Participants are able to identify the appropriate conflict assessment and analysis tools for project interventions across sectors.
Module Four	Program Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants discuss whether, when, how and why they should use impact tools in their work. • Participants can identify the steps of project design based on conflict sensitive considerations.
Module Five	Tips for Facilitators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants develop new skills in facilitation. • Participants learn to apply new tools for training and facilitation that encourage more understanding and application in small groups.
Module Six	Resources for the Field	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants are exposed to various resources to improve M&E skills in the field. • Participants understand the various resources to improve conflict analysis and assessment.

3.0 TRAINING INSIGHTS

3.1 Manual Development

The Manual will be finalized in November 2010 and will include improvements suggested by participants during the July/August trainings as well as some reformatting to reflect a training document more useful for the Indonesian context. The manual was drafted in May and June and was meant to be revised after the training sessions were conducted. All layout and improvements have been done in coordination with the trainers as well as PDI-SL and will be approved by USAID/SERASI. Feedback on the training modules was helpful in revising some of the sections. The manual will be in English and Bahasa Indonesia. The terminology and reflection of definitions was revised based on participant feedback and translation needs from English to Bahasa.

Some challenges still exist in making this manual and the tools most effective for the NGOs. There was not enough time in the field with the partner NGOs to get feedback on the CD organization and materials. As most materials, such as donor conflict analysis frameworks and background materials are in English there was not sufficient time to get a list of what materials on the CD should be translated.

Here are some suggestions for manual improvement as well as material improvement for USAID/SERASI to consider:

- Manual translation takes time from English to Bahasa as the terminology of some terms cannot be translated in Bahasa and should remain the same.
- NGOs chosen to provide feedback had minimal experience in some cases with standard M&E terms which made designing the manual challenging.
- CD materials were not able to be developed in Bahasa and getting some of the framework tools translated during the course made this much easier for participants in later courses.
- USAID/SERASI may want to consider giving a small grant to a local education or research institution that would be able to adapt the background resources and CD materials in to Bahasa for future use by USAID partner organizations.

3.2 Participant Selection

The selection of all participants and NGOs was done by USAID/SERASI. In Central Sulawesi the participants seemed to be well selected. Participants were representative of grantees who provided direct support for activities directly relating to conflict mitigation or conducting programs with populations affected by the conflict in Central Sulawesi. BAPPEDA representation on both the Central Sulawesi and the Aceh course provided insight on local government policies regarding M&E and conflict mitigation and analysis of local partner coordination practices. The selection on the Aceh course was not appropriate for an MTOT course. About 30% of the participants had a background in M&E and training and two of the organizations were replaced at the last minute which caused some serious inconsistency with training norms. The Aceh course also fell at the very start of Ramadan and this was challenging to fit in as much material as was necessary. As the Aceh course was designed to be a MTOT course and not a basic Conflict Sensitive M&E course it was difficult as much of the material and presentation had to be adapted to support certain participant needs. This put other participants at a disadvantage. In the Palu course USAID/SERASI and DI staff took part in the

training and in Aceh there was no participation by USAID/SERASI staff at all during the entire training and the DI staff member was there for less than 3 hours the entire week. When asked about participant selection for the A course, DI staff did not seem to have a clear criteria for the selection process. In Palu it was clear that the DI staff members had chosen the participants and were familiar with the organizations as well. This made for a more appropriate setting for a MTOT course. PDI-SL was surprised that the participants chosen in Aceh were not selected from the October 2009 Aceh basic course as there were several participants on this course that would have been appropriate for the MTOT training.

Here are some suggestions for participant selection improvement for USAID/SERASI to consider:

- The Palu course had good participant selection for an MTOT course. It is not always necessary that participants have a background in M&E, but they must have sufficient field and programming experience and also have additional skills as a trainer.
- In Aceh, participants should have been partially selected from the October 2009 course. As about 30% were selected appropriately this would have allowed more skills transfer for a course of this nature. The majority of the participants in the Aceh course needed a basic course first and although some adaptations were made it was difficult on the participants who wanted a training course geared to skills transfer.
- Participant selection should be done in closer collaboration with USAID/ SERASI program staff. DI is an external partner with USAID/SERASI and was on a short term contract to provide M&E support. Long term program staff may have had a better perspective on appropriate participant selection.
- A MTOT is specific and participant selection is 80% of the effort. The inconsistency in participant selection made the experience less powerful for participant transformation and professional skills development for some of the partner NGOs.

3.3 Training Methodology

An MTOT is different than the standard Conflict M&E course that PDI-SL offers. An MTOT is designed to provide a framework of materials and skills for participants to be able to adapt the basic course materials and use this material for organizational improvements and to enhance the skills of the partners they work with. The participants are essentially learning how to deliver the basic course materials, but they need to have a strong background in training, program design, management and also some background in M&E. The training conducted built upon this basic course, but also included examples from the field and training methodology that is more interactive than the basic course and is designed to go into more depth with the participants.

The two trainers, had considerable experience, Sarah Cohen Wood has been a lead trainer on conflict sensitive approaches in courses around the world and is also an adjunct faculty member at American University in Washington, DC where she teaches Conflict Sensitive M&E for the Peace and Development Institute. Zafarullah Hassim, was a participant on a Conflict M&E course in 2005 in Sri Lanka and has several years experience working in Indonesia and over 10 years in post conflict environments. He provided training support, is helping with manual improvement and development. Mr. Hassim is also a strong trainer and a



filmmaker and provided examples of programming that can be done in post conflict settings to enhance messaging on impact.

Participants were asked to design a conflict sensitive performance monitoring plan for project activities that they designed. This allowed participants to test their knowledge of M&E, but to also do a formal presentation in which we could assess their presentation and training skills. This presentation is an important part of the methodology as it allows participants to feel more comfortable with their training skills. Both trainers have different training styles and approaches and this also helps to provide the participants with some examples of how the material can be presented. An MToT course needs to both assess a participant's knowledge of the information, but also assess their ability to engage and interact as a trainer.

Here are some suggestions for participant selection improvement for USAID/SERASI to consider:

- The MToT methodology was not appropriate for all participants and this made the course adaptation challenging for the trainers.
- In the Aceh course the Ramadan practices made it difficult for people to attend all sessions making retention of information challenging for these individuals.
- Some of the participants in the Aceh course had no experience in M&E and this made the training for them not relevant in many ways. As stated previously a basic course was more appropriate for most Aceh participants.
- The methodology for this course would benefit from more effective field follow on. This was designed by DI staff and the method chosen should be strengthened for the Papua course. The point is to help people feel confident in their training abilities. A more appropriate method for the field observation period would have been individual work with the organization to be sure the proper support was in place for further training and dissemination of the material by the individual organization.

3.4 Field Observations and Follow on Training

This MToT was designed to provide follow on support to USAID/SERASI partners by providing a week of field based observation to partner organizations. In Central Sulawesi these observations were not able to be completed as planned for all organizations as a landslide prevented the team from being able to travel to observations. The Lead Trainer spent 2 days with WASANTARA, a NGO based in Tentena, but was unable to visit the other 3 organizations. These were visited by the co trainer, but the period of time allowed for work with the team was insufficient. In Aceh the observations were done in coordination with DI, but as the participant and organization selection was weak these were not as effective as the trainers would have liked. Ideally organizations would have had 1 day of targeted assessment and work with the trainers to allow agendas to be designed to conduct internal training based on the course for the organization and to provide an overview of the course to other staff members.

Here are some recommendations for improvement for USAID/SERASI to consider:

- For the Papua MToT have the trainer spend one complete day with each organization to help them identify opportunities for dissemination within their organization and assist them with simple training agenda development.
- Field time should be used to strengthen training skills by having participants identify local resources and networks that they can immediately connect with.

- Participant organizations could be given small follow on grants to conduct 1 to 2 day training of the material to local partners and small CSO organizations.
- In Central Sulawesi there is a new Conflict Sensitive Policy being developed which is being piloted re nationally. This is a real opportunity for this type of training and work being done by some of the participant groups and BAPPEDA staff who attended should be tracked by USAID/SERASI staff.



3.5 MTOT versus a Standard Conflict Sensitive M&E Course

An MTOT course is not a basic M&E course, but it covers many of the same elements as this is what the trainers are being asked to disseminate in the field. A MTOT course differs only in delivery and follow on. The follow on activities and field observation design is critical and this should be done in close collaboration between PDI-SL trainers and USAID/SERASI staff. The basic Conflict Sensitive M&E course contains the elements described in the manual, but also covers examples from the field that are given by the lead trainers and shared by participants from their experiences. The course itself focuses on many of the major elements of a standard course and is an essential step in training dissemination. Participants ideally would have either received the standard course prior to the training or be chosen based on established criteria that shows experience with M&E and field based implementation and programming.

The role of conflict-sensitive M&E is to track the results and compare them with intended objectives to assess the program performance. M&E identifies why programs met their objectives, fell short, or worsened the situation. One implementation challenge subject to conflict-sensitive M&E, for example, is whether programs took place at the right time. M&E criteria need to be defined that deal with ethical messages, resource transfers, and the other impacts that programs have on the deep and structural, as well as more manifest, aspects of conflict. The conflict may be escalating or diminishing, thus calling for rethinking about which underlying conditions or more immediate behaviors are the most needed entry points for gaining the most leverage in moving toward a sustainable peace. Data collection procedures need to be integrated into program implementation and operations, and the feasibility in a turbulent situation of data availability and various methods of collection has to be addressed. These steps are needed also to consider whether the basic objectives and methods of intervention—as well as the daily operational practices that may be sending out certain ethical messages—need to be modified in order to continually “update” the program’s conflict sensitivity in response to a still changing environment.

To integrate M&E into program implementation, methodological challenges arise such as:

- establishing a baseline for determining the status of the situation before a program was put into effect
- defining appropriate impact criteria
- finding appropriate indicators to responsibly measure impact
- collecting reliable data in environments that may be insecure or at least are highly politicized and thus subject to serious information distortions
- deciding whom to involve in designing M&E plans
- adjusting the definition of program objectives or even the nature of the intervention in response to changes in the environment, and thus the criteria for measuring impacts and deciding when monitoring leaves off and evaluation begins
- covering enough sites to draw valid generalizations
- interpreting the qualitative data that may be all one can obtain in conflict environments

These methodological challenges are often related to practical challenges such as:

- lack of funding and support for M&E
- insecurity that poses threats to clients and staff
- a shifting population that is supposed to benefit from a program but is leaving or moving about in reaction to the conflict
- a changing, largely unpredictable political and military context
- cultural and language barriers that affect both access to information and its meaning.

All these challenges present themselves to varying degrees in these two provinces where the training took place. This training has a strong place in the current Indonesia context across provinces, but the participant selection must be targeted and the follow on activities designed in closer collaboration with USAID/SERASI core program staff.

4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

4.1. General Recommendations

- Manual translation takes time from English to Bahasa as the terminology of some terms cannot be translated in Bahasa and should remain the same.
- NGOs chosen to provide feedback had minimal experience in some cases with standard M&E terms which made designing the manual challenging.
- CD materials were not able to be developed in Bahasa and getting some of the framework tools translated during the course made this much easier for participants in later courses.
- USAID/SERASI may want to consider giving a small grant to a local education or research institution that would be able to adapt the background resources and CD materials in to Bahasa for future use by USAID partner organizations.
- The Palu course had good participant selection for an MTtoT course. It is not always necessary that participants have a background in M&E, but they must have sufficient field and programming experience and also have additional skills as a trainer.
- In Aceh, participants should have been partially selected from the October 2009 course. As about 30% were selected appropriately this would have allowed more skills transfer for a course of this nature. The majority of the participants in the Aceh course needed a basic course first and although some adaptations were made it was difficult on the participants who wanted a training course geared to skills transfer.
- Participant selection should be done in closer collaboration with USAID/ SERASI program staff. DI is an external partner with USAID/SERASI and was on a short term contract to provide M&E support. Long term program staff may have had a better perspective on appropriate participant selection.
- A MTtoT is specific and participant selection is the majority of the effort. Inconsistency in participant selection made the experience less powerful for participant transformation and professional skills development for some of the partner NGOs.
- The MTtoT methodology was not appropriate for all participants and this made the course adaptation challenging for the trainers.
- In the Aceh course the Ramadan practices made it difficult for people to attend all sessions making retention of information challenging for these individuals.
- Some of the participants in the Aceh course had no experience in M&E and this made the training for them not relevant in many ways. As stated previously a basic course was more appropriate for most Aceh participants.

- The methodology for this course would benefit from more effective field follow on. This was designed by DI staff and the method chosen should be strengthened for the Papua course. The point is to help people feel confident in their training abilities. A more appropriate method for the field observation period would have been individual work with the organization to be sure the proper support was in place for further training and dissemination of the material by the individual organization.
- For the Papua MToT have the trainer spend one complete day with each organization to help them identify opportunities for dissemination within their organization and assist them with simple training agenda development.
- Field time should be used to strengthen training skills by having participants identify local resources and networks that they can immediately connect with.
- Participant organizations could be given small follow on grants to conduct 1-2 day training of the material to local partners and small CSO organizations.
- In Central Sulawesi there is a new Conflict Sensitive Policy being developed which is being piloted nationally. This is a real opportunity for this type of training and work being done by some of the participant groups and BAPPEDA staff who attended should be tracked by USAID/SERASI staff.

U.S. Agency for International Development

1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20523

Tel: (202) 712-0000

Fax: (202) 216-3524

www.usaid.gov