



Coaching VNFU's FACT trainers

Back to Office report

14 to 20 March 2016, Vietnam

**Christian Gouët
Jun Virola**



Agriterra
P.O. Box 158
6800 AD Arnhem
Willemsplein 42
The Netherlands

T +31 26 44 55 445
F +31 26 44 55 978

agriterra@agriterra.org
www.agriterra.org
Rabobank Arnhem
IBAN: NL91 RABO 0155 2971 63

*Foundation Agriterra
Chamber of Commerce
41 048542*

Member of AgriCord



Data AgriStudies™

Authors : Christian Gouët
Jun Virola
Title : Coaching VNFU's FACT trainers
Publisher : Agriterra
Number AgriStudies : 11_54522
Country : Vietnam
Category : Training

CONTENTS

SUMMARY	1
1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. ACTIVITIES AND RESULTS	5
3. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FOLLOW-UP.....	7
ANNEXES	9

Summary

The main purpose of the mission was to coach selected trainers from those trained in the FACT ToT done in Hanoi in 2015.

The mission was carried out by Christian Gouët, Jun Virola & Nguyen Thi Viet Ha from VNFU, accompanied by colleagues from VNFU central office, for them to observe the workshops and the coaching, improving their level of understanding of the FACT approach.

The objectives and expected results of the mission were fairly achieved: The trained trainers facilitated the workshops under the close coaching of the consultants and received our comments and suggestions. Further, we have produced notes with detailed suggestions and comments for the trainers –to be translated into Vietnamese by VNFU.

Participants' enthusiasm and quality of participation was obvious in all the workshops observed. The methodologies were correctly used –and in some places well adapted with extra dynamics. Leaders and staff at provincial level showed a high level of commitment and interested in successfully using FACT as a method of work.

The trained trainers showed good level of understanding of the content they were delivering and the facilitation was in general terms quiet fine. In few cases some details need to be check and further work out by some trainers. They received coaching in this direction during the workshops. Our observation on their facilitation work and suggestions for improvement in points that can be improved are included as annex in this report.

Now, the work of learning by doing will be done for 6 to 8 months after these preparatory workshops. The ToT for delivering de second workshop should then be done beforehand.

It is recommended that VNFU colleagues from Hanoi do a follow up of the actions being carried out in the province level. Whatever doubt that exists is most welcome by us for clarification and suggestions that shall be made.

1. Introduction

“FACT Coaching mission: training advocacy in Vietnam regions” is an assignment within the framework of project 16vu-6486 “Cooperative awareness-raising and skills enhancement in farm organisations” in Vietnam.

Background

For farmers’ organisations, Agriterra specifically supports advocacy and advisory services by training, exchange and advise. But also organisational development is being supported as advising on governance and financial systems.

The FACT tool is provided to farmers’ organisations by initially doing a FACT training trajectory, guided by Agriterra. In a later stage Agriterra advises Farmers Organisations how to institutionalise FACT in day-to-day advocacy work.

In 2016, the Vietnamese National Farmers Union is rolling-out the use of Agriterra's FACT methodology in 10 provinces in Vietnam after piloting this tool for systematization of advocacy in farm organisations in 2014 and 2015. A group of 40 people has been trained and the VNFU organisation is supportive to roll-out the FACT approach in Vietnam to improve advocacy skills and break into public funds and positive policy changes for Vietnamese farmers.

As the newly trained FACT trainers (leaders and staff farm organisations) will start performing the FACT workshops in the province it is important to support these new trainers by coaching by experienced FACT trainers.

2. Activities and Results

Activities

The activities of the missions followed the initial mission's plan with no inconvenient or changes.

Basically, the experts observed and coached trained facilitators and supported them during the final preparations of the workshop and during the workshop sessions. A close work with Mrs. Ha was done with a view of improving her abilities as master trainer.

During the workshops, the coaches provided tips to the facilitators, assisted them in the facilitation when necessary, added comments when needed and provided feedback on the spot to the trainers. Further, coaching note were prepared for the facilitators (see Annex 1).

The detailed activities included:

- Meeting between the Jun Virola and Christian Gouët for planning and fine tuning the approach of work.
- Meeting with VNFU team for discussing the approach of work and program of visits to workshops.
- Coaching the trainers of each workshop (providing tips, commenting issues and providing insights / examples during workshop when needed, debriefings with trainers indicating strong and weak points in their facilitation and providing suggestions, meetings / dinners with trainers and leaders).
- Preparing notes on the facilitation in each workshop.
- Producing this report.

Results

In general terms, the expected results of the mission were fairly achieved, basically including the following:

- *Observation and analysis of the quality and execution of the FACT workshops:*
It has being observed and confirmed an excellent quality of facilitation, beyond our expectations. Together, the organization and logistics of the workshop were very well done: good meeting rooms, correct disposition of tables / seats in the room, correct workshop programs, correct and good materials.
As commented to leaders by Jun Virola: "some of the trainers can do it better than us"...
- *Progress in the FACT roll-out phase:*
Discussions with leaders at province level showed that the enthusiasm for rolling-out FACT at province level is even higher that what we observed and perceived last year during the ToT sessions. The level of participation in terms of number of participants and in terms of quality of participation clearly shows that participants were correctly selected and that the rolling-out is promising.
- *Selection of master trainers:*
Almost every trainer observed show a good level of understanding and convincement on the FACT approach, together with good facilitation skills. Only 2 or 3 trainers showed some confusion in the facilitation. However these last ones were provincial leaders who during the trainings were playing a role of introducing the methodology and the purpose for using it in their province. They are not intended to become master trainers. Therefore, our perception is that with the right ToT process all the trainers who will be active as such could become a master trainer for Vietnam. Language barrier will limit their possibilities to act as master trainers internationally.

3. Conclusions and Recommendations for follow-up

Conclusions

A basic conclusion of this mission is that most of the leaders and staff participating in the workshops express their interest in working with the FACT approach for its institutional use in VNFU.

The trainers showed a good disposition and commitment. The level of understanding an compromise with the concepts / ideas / purpose of the FACT methodology is by far more than sufficient. In most of the cases the level of facilitation is outstanding to be just the first time they deliver this workshop. As coaches we were positively surprized and satisfied.

Each team of trainers in the different provinces showed a particular style, but following the workshop's facilitation methodology and the instructions of the facilitators guide in a good way. The need for interventions from the side of the experts were few, mostly for further 'clarifying a point' than for 'correcting an action done' by the facilitators. Therefore, we expect that the FACT rolling-out process in Vietnam must be successful.

From the side of future master trainers for Vietnam, almost all the trainers we observed showed enough abilities. However, still is needed to see how the results of the FACT trajectories in each province, the number of trainings they carry out and their performance in the ToT for the second workshop. After that we will be able to identify names to be proposed for becoming master trainers.

Mrs. Ha worked close to us in the coaching process, planning the caching, translating and providing explanations and insights. It is clear that her mastering of the approach and methodology for the workshop allows her to be a master trainer. Ti have her as co)facilitator for the ToT to come will be a plus.

Suggestions for follo- up

The following are our suggestions for follow up by VNFU, which has being discussed with the trainers, the VNFU team and the Agriterra's advisors for Vietnam:

What to do	How to do it
Commenting the District level follow up plans and advising details for implementation.	The organizations' teams should share with VNFU central office the last follow-up plans via email. We can comment details that might appears to be relevant when the plans are translated into English.
Support for planning the consultations.	Provincial teams must share the plan for the consultations (www.how) with VNFU. And again, we can comment on a translated version when needed.
Support for the analysis of the consultation results.	Once the consultation is done (C), the results are registered (R) and ordered (O), VNFU can advise in the way of processing the information (P) getting the conclusion from the results obtained so far, for ensuring a consistent CROP in the FAFCT trajectory.
Advise for defining the type of experts needed.	Depending in the type of data that will be collected in the participatory research, VNFU could give some ideas about the type of experts and probably some contacts.
Advise for the lobby mapping and stakeholders analysis	This stage that it seems to be easy, in fact is a crucial point to be work out. VNFU can check the stakeholders analysis and verify that there it is a correct translation of the analysis of stakeholders into a definition of how to communicate with each group of them (as explained in the FACT Reader).
The writing of smart draft proposals	VNFU needs to check that the draft proposals, with an overview-review checking that the SMART criteria is applied in line with the what is explained in the document 'Guideline for preparing SMART proposals.

The basic suggestion for Agriterra is to continue with plan of supporting VNFU for rolling-out FACT in Vietnam

Annexes

1 Terms of Reference

2 Coaching notes for Facilitators

Annex 1 Terms of Reference

"*FACT Coaching mission: training advocacy in Vietnam regions*" is an assignment within the framework of project 16vu-6486 "Cooperative awareness-raising and skills enhancement in farm organisations" in Vietnam.

The Agriterra business advisor responsible for this assignment is Luc Groot. In case of changes in the assignment and / or programme the business advisors have to be consulted immediately.

Background

In 2016 Vietnamese National Farmers Union will roll-out the use of Agriterra's FACT methodology in 10 provinces in Vietnam after piloting this tool for systematization of advocacy in farm organisations in 2014 and 2015. A group of 40 people has been trained and the VNFU organisation is supportive to roll-out the FACT approach in Vietnam to improve advocacy skills and break into public funds and positive policy changes for Vietnamese farmers. Last year 600.000 euro has been obtained in the pilot phase.

As the newly trained FACT trainers (leaders and staff farm organisations) will start performing the FACT workshops in the province it is important to support these new trainers by coaching by experienced FACT trainers. In this way Agriterra can ensure the quality of the trainings and the roll-out in 2016. The plan is to visit 4 workshops in different provinces.

The coaches will be accompanied by VNFU staff so they can give the gained knowledge during the coaching to the other provinces as well.

Agriterra

Agriterra is a development agency founded and steered by the farmers' organisations and agricultural cooperatives in the Netherlands. Its mandate is to strengthen producers' organisations worldwide. Agriterra mainly acts as a facilitating agency and provides advisory services to farmers organisation to enable them to:

- Systematize their advocacy efforts
- Improve their lobby skills
- Access to public funds
- Achieve policy changes with economic benefits for members

For farmers' organisations, Agriterra specifically supports advocacy and advisory services by training, exchange and advise. But also organisational development is being supported as advising on governance and financial systems.

The FACT tool is provided to farmers' organisations by initially doing a FACT training trajectory, guided by Agriterra. In a later stage Agriterra advises Farmers Organisations how to institutionalise FACT in day-to-day advocacy work.

Mission

- *Composition of the mission:* Christian Gouet, Jun Virola & Nguyen Thi Viet Ha will execute this mission.
- *Duration of the mission:* the mission will take place for 7 days from 14 to 20 March 2016.
- *Execution of the mission:* During the mission the workshops will be visited and the trainers will be coached by the two executors of the mission. Furthermore a selection for the Master Trainers in Vietnam in June 2016 will be made on the basis of this first coaching mission.

Objective(s)

The assignment aims:

- To coach 8-16 newly trained FACT trainers in Vietnam in three different provinces (in total 10).
- To select the best trainers for the FACT Masters Trainers meeting in June in Vietnam.
- To analyse how the roll-out of FACT is progressing.
- To further improve the coaching capacities of Master Trainer Nguyen Thi Viet Ha.

Activities

- Workshop visits
- Debriefing with trainers

Expected results

One mission report containing the following information:

- Analysis of the quality and execution of the FACT workshops
- Progress in the FACT roll-out phase
- Selection of master trainers

Annex 2 Coaching notes for Facilitators

Notes for facilitators fact preparatory workshop – Hue, Vietnam

General comment on program

In the program, sessions 1A and 1B have only one hour each session. This is difficult. Originally the workshop is planned to have 1 hour 30 minutes for each session. It will be very difficult to do the two sessions 1A and 1B in two hours only. Particularly, session 1B has only 30 minutes in the program. This is very difficult because there we have an important presentation on what the FACV methodology is, plus a group work and plus the debriefing of the groups' conclusions.

Before facilitation

Opening words took a bit too long time according to the program. Facilitators can tell before hands to the speakers to use little time during the opening.

FIRST FACILITATOR

Good initial words, made participants to feel well and smile. The time for defining the rules also is taking a bit too long. Always be taking care of timing.

Participants' presentation

Well introduced indicating the page where the table for introducing each other is. Good that peers of participants were made with focus on seating together two persons that does not know each other.

The time for interviews between pairs was OK. The presentation of each other is taking a bit long time. Always remember that this exercise takes time. That is also why you need to be careful in the time needed for the opening of the workshop.

1st PowerPoint presentation

Good that is mentioned that more knowledge comes later. Something to point out more clearly is that FACT is based in preparing good proposals that really reflect farmers' needs and feelings.

One detail that was not correct: it was said that "FACT is divided in three steps of workshop – piloting - workshop". But this is not "FACT" as the methodology but the "FACT capacity building process" in which participants will learning about the methodology and will practice. More attention is needed here: to make the difference between the "FACT capacity building trajectory" and the "FACT methodology" that is what participants learn during the capacity building trajectory. After two slides the facilitator started talking clearer about the "FACT trajectory", what was very good!

The PowerPoint was correctly presented. But one detail: the program of the workshop presented in the slide is the normal one that we use. But this time, the program has being modified, so the program people has in their hands is not the same of the program in the slide of the PowerPoint.

Note:

To directly go from session 1A to the presentation of session 1B can put people tired. That is why in the original program we have the coffee break planned between these to sessions.

2nd PowerPoint presentation

The key points of each pillar is expressed well. Still, more examples can be provided. You can use the example of the chair with four legs: fact has 4 pillars that are like the 4 legs of the chair: all are needed!

Group work session 1B

Groups were well formed, with one facilitator in each group.

More instructions mentioning that they need to use the reader can be done before dividing the groups.

But the instructions were given one the groups were formed, what was OK: it was indicated that the fact reader need to be open to read a part, etc.

Note:

The exercise of EXPECTATIONS was combined with the group work. By doing this you miss the moment in which EACH participant write one expectation and then these are analyzed in plenary. That brings a moment in which all expectations are seen together and give a peter idea of expectations and that normally this can be grouped in three groups of expectations: knowledge about fact, use fact ad get results... that is the moment in which the facilitator can say that the 2 first ones will be met during the first workshop and piloting and that the final use of fact will be after the capacity building trajectory.

However, it was good that the facilitator did a summary of expectations from the groups after all groups presented their work!!

SECOND FACILITATOR

Session 2A. Consultations

PowerPoint presentation

Good introduction to the session, remembering we are in the first workshop what is the first step pf the FACT capacity building trajectory... asking participants.

He started by explaining what a consultation is about, using the definition from the reader: good.

The PowerPoint is not yet projected in the screen, this should be done before start talking.

In the first slide: talking about the 3 objectives of consultations something was missed: that consultations for the purpose of collecting data is a specific type of consultations and that one we called participatory research, which in FACT we take it as a separate pillar.

The discussion on slides 2 and 3 are fine but taking a bit too long: always be careful with time management!!

Participants are too far away in the tables, this makes that some of them are losing attention.

The last slide need a bit more of detailed explanation with examples.

Advisors game Consultations

The summary of the consultations' key words was very useful for reminder participants.

The initial guidance about the steps to follow during the advisors game need to be a bit more in detail, explaining that the checklist is for following the presentation of the example BUT that the gaps between fact and the example are not only coming from that checklist but basically from the ideas of the consultation and the keywords.

In the future, explain very carefully that the template for gaps and how to bridge them is to be used first individually by each participants, in personal work. Then, they share in the group and the presenter takes notes in the flipchart.

Second Day

The energizer at the start of the morning was excellent, bit a bit too log for the time management. This need to be take into consideration for the future.

Advisors game

The explanation for the advisor game was done from a side of the room: the facilitator needs to be in the center, talk loud and get the attention of people.

The second facilitator came in and explained with louder voice and more details, that was good.

Summary and key points facilitation FACT preparatory workshop in Hue

Part	Comments
Mar 14 Mon	
Session 1-B Introducing the FACT Preparatory Workshop	
Theoretical input	Good presentation. Trainer looks confident and knows what he's doing. All major points of the presentation were clearly delivered. Good addition by Christian on illustration of 4 pillars using chair. The analogy made the concept clearer. (Later affirmed by one participant over lunch that the additional information was very useful.)
Group work – Why FACT?	Steps 2 and 3 were combined.
Plenary discussion on expectations	According to Christian: because the steps were combined, we miss the opportunity to summarize the expectations and say that understanding will be achieved in the first workshop, use will be done in the follow up phase, and improving can be done in lessons learned workshop
Session 2-A Consultation to Membership	
Theory Input	Did not bring back pax to u-shape. Some pax are in faraway tables. Not clearly engaged with the presentation. Pax do not see each one's faces. Good interaction from pax on the slide on ways of doing consultations.
LUNCH BREAK	12:15-13:45
Advisory Game	Mr Tuyen gave clear instructions on advisory game Christian intervened and repeated the instructions with a different approach (Let us be careful. Might lead to loss of confidence. Loss of face.)
First presentation	Good report: Gaps identified: -
Second presentation	Good report Gaps identified: -not included in report -not well documented
Third presentation	Good report Gaps identified: -there was research but there was lack of ideas from farmers
Fourth presentation	Case: enhancing effectiveness of supporting fund for farmers Gaps: -did not get feedback. Did not have a meeting. Just got ideas from leaders. No research from farmers on why they want to borrow. -did not process information. Did not gather information to process. Bridges: -set up management for processing information
Summary	Trainer summarized the main gaps and main bridges from the reports He emphasized the importance of consultation to members and reminded pax of the main ideas behind the pillar That the point of consultation is to find out the needs and demands of farmers

Step 2-B Group Work: The Consultation Drawing	3:52 PM Recapped the 3 purposes of consultations: -raise new issue -gather information -validate existing proposal FACT is basic tool for farmers To make good consultation and have enough data Can enhance work of FU Will find out real demand from farmers
	Pointed pax to page in the workbook Gave a review of what and how to do consultation to members (Just need to give instructions on game. No need to repeat the steps. The confusion might be from the facilitator's guide: "Group Work/ Provide clear instructions with the help of the participants' task sheet/ S2-B/ 30 minutes." 30 minutes is for the whole advisory game. Instructions should only be 5 minutes.)
	During the group work, it became apparent that pax were "writing" not "drawing". Important to make sure that instructions, it is stated that the pax should draw a picture or diagram, not write. This will force them to think visually and of the elements of a good consultation to members. (Coaching: whispered to co-trainers and asked them to explain to the pax in groups.)
Session 3-A Participatory Research	
Step 1 Theoretical Input	Good presentation covered main points Jun added 3 points: participatory research is collecting data from members (most important data), overlaps with consultation and consultation/validation is integrated in 6 steps, overlaps with writing SMART proposal as first proposal is defined at the end Christian added some points:
March 15 Tue	
Energizer and recap	One person from the team led a quick energizer. Pax were asked to follow what he does and does and not what he says and vice versa. Another game was the "airconditioner game."
Step 2 Advisory Game	Trainer started to give instructions but appears not very confident. He needs to be encouraged to stand in the center and speak confidently. (Coaching: Jun and Christian asked him to come to the front.)
	Another member of the team followed through with more detailed instructions.
Plenary reporting	Group 1: enhancing effectiveness of supporting fund GAPS (SOLUTIONS) -not getting feedback (organize to get feedback and ideas) -not validating data (get the comments of leaders to validate project) -no consultation from expert (invite expert to have advise and finalize them) -not registering the result when gathering data & info (establish group of secretary to register the info) Group 2: collecting garbage GAPS (SOLUTIONS) -no advise of experts (solution not clear) -no feedback and validation from membership (organize to get advise of experts – from top leaders to grassroots leaders; analyze data based on idea of experts & farmers; organize to get feedback from farmers) Group 3: finding solution for deforestation (finding jobs for those who deforest) GAPS (SOLUTIONS)

	<p>-no feedback from farmers/more than 1,000 IPs (organize to get ideas from farmers)</p> <p>-no ideas/consultations from experts like forestry (carry out research, get advise from experts)</p> <p>-not using results to make proposals (finalize results and data from farmers and experts to build up document for more specific proposal)</p> <p>-no questionnaires to get data & info from farmers</p> <p>Group 4: collection and treatment of agri waste GAPS (SOLUTIONS)</p> <p>-no link with farmers and experts/so no advise from experts (find link betw experts & farmers)</p> <p>-have not collected enough info from farmers/so not enough info/results not suitable (organize meeting to get ideas from people in the area)</p> <p>-after submitting draft proposal, did not get feedback from farmer in the area/not easy for local leaders to accept project (conduct deep research on real situation in the area including cultural, social and economic so project will be more feasible)</p>
Group Work	<p>Another trainer gave a recap of the advisory game and related it to the presentation (a little bit dragging but fine for it reviewed main points)</p> <p>He went on to introduce the next activity but made the mistake of going straight to the reflection session. The participants pointed out that he missed the group work so he corrected himself. <i>(Coaching: Jun told the trainers to take care of the situation when something like this happens. Accept the mistake, apologize and thank the participants for point out, then regain composure quickly so as not to lose their trust and confidence.)</i></p>
Plenary Reporting	<p>(Coaching: Christian asked Ha to tell the trainers to focus on the use of experts in Steps 1 and 3 and make interventions with each report on this)</p>
Session 4-A Writing SMART Proposals	
Step 1 Theoretical Input	<p>Presentation was fine. Major points delivered.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>-vice president shared how SMART can help them make more effective proposals</p>

Notes for facilitators FACT preparatory workshop – Quang Tri

Good start asking participants to open the workbooks in the correct page and explaining the participants' introduction.

First PowerPoint

The presentation was a bit too fast. But it was very good that participants were asked to comment.

Note: the time management of session 1A was very well done.

Second PowerPoint

Again it was a bit too fast... for the future take more time for the more relevant points.

First group work

Instructions were well done and the presentations of the group showed that the learning is going fine.

Comments after group work

The facilitator makes a good summary of main points.

Something that still is lacking in this session is to mention very clearly that FACT has 4 pillars that needs to be done all... use the example of the 4 legs of the chair: FACT needs the 4 pillars as a chair needs the 4 legs.

Plenary with cards on the expectations

Instructions need to be more clearly regarding the number of words per card... participants wrote too much and too little size of letters, then it became very difficult for the trainer to make the summary.

For this part of the session 1B, in the future, check the facilitators guide: it says that each participant write only 1 expectations (with few words in big letters do

Session 2A -Consultations

PowerPoint presentation

Well presented. Sometimes a bit too fast, but it was clear. For future, takes a bit more time in the more relevant points.

The last slide of the presentation was too fast. This slide is very important and needs more time for explaining each point very clear. You need to explain in detail that a consultation is for getting the AIR in a proposal and that for doing this there are two parts: (1) planning the occultation (www.how) and (2) doing the consultation and ordering data, etc. (CRPOP)

Advisors game

Instructions were fine. But people were not all using the workbooks for writing. During the debriefing of the groups, the complete PowerPoint of the group was presented... this is too long and takes times. The original idea is just to comment shortly what the example of each group was about and to focus on the gaps (between examples and fact) that the advisors founded out and how to bridge the gaps between the example and FACT.

Workgroup drawing

When giving the instructions, pay attention to say that the drawing needs to be with little words, only the key words of consultation and that the drawing needs to focus in the process of the consultation not in the subject or the project they are thinking in.

Summary of learnings of consultations

Well done: good instructions and good comments from participants.

Only point: time management can improve by asking participants to comment in only few words each one.

The final summary of the facilitator was well done.

One think lacking was to mention difference with participatory research

Session 3A - Participatory Research

PowerPoint presentation

The explanation of the 6 points needs to be a bit more in detail.

Explain that participatory research ends with a DRAFT proposal but not yet the final document. The final document of the proposal is done in pillar 3.

It is necessary to repeat a couple of times that steps 1 and 3 need experts: step 1 for preparing the methodology for data collection and for analyzing the data collected in step 3.

The questions answers and explanation after the presentation was well done.

Advisors game

The instructions was just mentioning that is the same than yesterday.... It is better to repeat the instructions again, so that there will be no confusions from participants.

Group work

Very careful in waiting that ALL groups finish their work before start the presentations. This because when one group is resenting the rest will stay be concentrated in finishing their work and will not pay attention to the one that is presenting.

Summary of learnings

The summary was good. But, It will be more effective if the facilitator uses some slides of the powerpoint on the pillar, for maintaining better attention of people.

Summary and key points facilitation FACT preparatory workshop in Quang Tri

Part	Comments
Mar 16 Wed	
Session 1-A Introducing the FACT Preparatory Workshop	
Step 1 Opening & intro of pax	Province FU pres, Christian and Dinh gave opening speeches Group photo was taken The trainers took over. One introduced himself as trained last year and called on his team mate who was assigned as monitor. The monitor gave ground rules for the training including silent mobiles and active participation. (responsibility to learn as adults not mentioned)
Step 2 FACT trajectory	Delivered well according to Christian (Jun went out to take a call)
Session 1-B Introducing the FACT Preparatory Workshop	
Theoretical input	On second slide, trainer asked participants to share what their idea of a good proposal is For participants took turns to give their ideas (good way to engage pax and introduce FACT concept of AIR) He then went on to introduce the concept of AIR in the next slide
Group work – Why FACT?	Trainer gave instructions and correctly reminded pax to read the relevant FACT reader chapter. The trainer gave a good explanation of FACT. Christian added a demonstration of the 4 pillars of FACT using a chair with 4 legs as analogy.
Session 2-A Consultation to Membership	
Step 1 - Theory Input	Trainer gives a strong introduction (strong voice) and encouraged participants to be actively involved in the training He correctly asked them to go to the relevant page in the workbook to take notes. He begins to deliver the ppt He stimulates participation at the slide on aims of consultations by making around of answers to the questions why when and what to consult Jun intervenes in the end to add more explanation about the last slide where all the acronyms are exposed with the purpose of summarizing the pillar. This slide needs to be delivered with more attention.
Step 2 – Advisory Game	Participants were presenting the cases from the powerpoint before presenting the results of the advisory game. It was taking much more time and pax should be reminded to focus more on the gaps and recommendations. Christian intervened through Ms Ha who relayed the message to the trainers
LUNCH BREAK	

Step 2-B Consultation to Membership	
Step 1 – Summary on Debriefing Game	It was done fine and according to facilitators guide.
Step 2 - Group work: “The Consultation Drawing”	Instructions were clear, the group work had a good yield of results and the plenary debriefing was well conducted, showing the enthusiasm from participants.
Step 3 - Summary of learning from session 2-A and 2-B	Participants showed deep understanding and appreciation of FACT pillar one, showing different aspects that they find new or unforgettable like: -the use of the key words -importance of methodology of collecting information -using drawing to show the pillar on consultation -the CROP steps that need to be followed
	Trainer summarized by saying that the steps of consultation need to be followed (maybe need to go deeper on this) And to pay attention to key words Emphasized the importance of ordering and processing info that are often missed
	Christian was asked to comment and he gave the following points: -consultation gives accountability to your proposal -makes your proposal credible -participatory research is also consultation to get detailed information and data while consultation to members is to get opinions and general information from members -in pillar one you can ask: what is your problem here? Answer: our cows have disease -in pillar two you ask: how many cows have disease? Etc. -the more important gap is the use of validation of the result of consultation.
March 17 Thu	
Session 3-A Participatory Research	
Energizer and recap	Trainers asked Jun to lead an energizer. Trainer recapped the activities of the previous day on pillar one. Reminded pax: -remember the key words AIR www.how CROP
Step 1 - Theory input: Aims of Participatory Research in the context of preparing positions and proposals (by the facilitator).	The presentation was fine and covered all the major points Important to emphasize next time the meaning of KSK, the use of experts and the role of validation The final step does not produce the proposal but just an initial definition of the argument for writing the proposal
Step 2 - Advisory Game on Participatory research	usual gaps identified: -no validation from members -no advise from experts -collecting and processing data / informaton

Notes for facilitators FACT preparatory workshop in Binh Duong

Introduction of participants

Good that before the presentation the facilitator asked to participants to open the workbook in the page for the interview between pairs for participants’ introduction. The pairs were asked to be made just with the person close to each other. For the future: take care that the pairs are made between persons that don’t know each other or at least not much. This makes the exercise more interesting and ice-breaking. There it was a bit of confusion between most tables have 5 participants. Then it was needed to make pair with people from different tables: this type of small details should be taken in consideration for the future.

PowerPoint presentation on FACT Trajectory

For this presentation it is very important to mention that this presentation is about the FACT capacity building trajectory... not yet about details of FACT, which is the following presentation.

To make more clear the difference between presentation 1 and 2, the original agenda has the tea break in between the two presentations. Today tea break was before presentation 1, therefore the two presentations came together... this is not the most recommended. It is easier for participants when the tea break is between the presentations.

The introduction before the presentation was too long (were 25 minutes until starting the presentation itself) about the usefulness of FACT and mentioning some pillars, etc.... this was all correctly said, but it is a bit confusing for participants to go too long about FACT in general at this point of the workshop (just starting). This first presentation should be focused in how the FACT capacity building trajectory will be, so that they understand that they are in the first workshop, that then a period of practicing fact will come and then a second workshop for learning lessons from the period of practice.

At the end, it was a confusion between presentation 1 and the presentation 2: in the screen it was projected the presentation 1 and the trainers was talking about presentation 2. It took around 40 minutes until the presentation 2 was projected and then what was being said matches with what was projected. BUT, presentation number one was skipped. Still, the order of the ideas that were said was not matching with the order of the slides in the PowerPoint.

Important for the future: follow the slides in the screen and explain looking what is in the slides instead of following just the facilitator's guide; A problem that happened today is that the facilitators' guide book got opened and the pages got mixed and then the trainer had problems in finding the pages in order.

Starting to explain that fact has 4 pillars, the trainer asked to show the last slide of the last presentation of the workshop, which shows the keywords for the pillars... a problem is that participants need to be introduced little by little into the subjects. The facilitator can't jump to the slide that summarize all the methodology before going through it. This slide is for showing it after the sessions of the pillars.

Group work session 1B

Very good idea to use color cards for evaluating the presentations.

The results of the group work was fine and showed that participants got the messages of sessions 1A and 1B

Day Two

Sessions on Consultation

The presentation is taking a bit long: for the future, try not to come again and again to the same slides. And also, when asking opinions to participants you need to try to be brief.

Take into consideration that this PowerPoint presentation should be done in 20-25 minutes. Now, we have already 30 minutes but we still are just in the second slide... this is a problem for time management.

Advisors game

Instructions can be done more in detail.

While the groups are working, facilitators should be more engaged in looking what each group is doing and asking to focus in the check list and in finding the gaps. Never be afraid of giving too many instructions: it is better to give one instructions too much than one instruction too little.

The debriefing was ok but not commented in detail by the facilitators. For the future: after the debriefing by the groups, facilitators should summarize which are the more important gaps, so that what should be changed in the future of work by the organizations is clearer.

Group work on the consultation drawing

Work was well done and well explained by groups.

Final summary of learnings

Participants had too little time to write their comments in the workbook. Next time give them more time.

However, the points made were fine.

The final remarks by the facilitator was focusing in FACT in general... but in this session 1B the summary should be only in Consultations: this is a session to focus deeply in the first pillar. To talk now about all things of fact might be confusing for participants.

Notes for facilitators FACT preparatory workshop in Son La

Notes by: Jun Virola (FACT Master Trainer)

MARCH 18, FRI

Jun arrived in Son La around 10:00 AM

PILLAR ONE

Trainer: Mr Minh, Vice Chair, Son La FU

THEORETICAL INPUT

Mr Minh explained CROP. Emphasized that there are lots of info so they need to be ordered.

Explained the memory aids in the last side. Did not ask questions for clarification.

ADVISE: Would be good to ask a few questions to check understanding

ADVISORY GAME

Mr Minh asked one person to present a case in front while others become participants. Did not tell them to present in groups. Coach intervened by whispering through translator.

INTERVENTION: Presentations should be done in groups to save time and to allow each one to participate.

LUNCH BREAK

Mr Minh invited the participants to lunch and come back at 1:30 PM to continue the presentations of cases in the advisory game.

ADVISORY GAME (CONTINUED)

REPORTING BY ROUP THREE

GAPS

No feedback

No interview

SOLUTIONS

Organize discussions about problem in fertilizer, how much farmers lack fertilizer

Interview and discuss with leaders, get feedback from president of FU

Organize meeting with farmers at grassroots

Get feedback about price and sources of fertilizer

SUMMARY

Mr Minh asked for clarification on how the consultation was conducted. The reporter replied that they organized the consultation in the meeting of the standing committee.

Mr Minh correctly pointed out that consultation should not only be one time with the standing committee but it should be made with farmers, so we can get real fact from farmers.

He also reminded participants to match the gaps and solutions.

ADVISE: Consultation can help clarify the problem with fertilizers. Is it lack of fertilizer? Or high cost of fertilizer? Or ill effects of fertilizer? This is something that only farmers can tell you if you consult them.

REPORTING BY GROUP FOUR

GAPS

No conference text for the consultation

No document and no data from annual meeting

SOLUTIONS

Base on the guidelines of VNFU

REPORTING BY GROUP TWO

GAPS

No clear objective, content

No legal text for proposal

No information

SUMMARY

Use keywords AIR

REPORTING BY GROUP ONE

Control activities of farmers for the nation

GAPS

No feedback

No consultation to farmers

Idea only from FU

SUMMARY

INTERVENTION:

Added that in the advisory game, participants should compare the theory presented very well by Mr Minh with the experiences presented. Then the gaps can be identified and solutions can be suggested.

Advised to remember this in the next advisory games.

GROUP WORK ON DRAWING A CONSULTATION

SUMMARY

Mr Minh reminded participants that when they do the drawing of consultation, they should use WWW.HOW to plan a consultation

FINAL KEY NOTES ON CONSULTATION

Mr Minh

TEA BREAK

PILLAR TWO

TRAINER: Ms Thuy, Director, Vocational Training Center for Farmers, Sonla FU

THEORETICAL INPUT

Ms Thuy presented the theory very well, mentioning all the important ideas.

ADVISE: Emphasize that participatory research is done to collect evidence for the proposal and that information from members is most important. And that role of expert is in designing research and analyzing data. Desk research is to supplement info from members

Error in Slide: KSKS is missing in the last slide on memory aids

ADVISORY GAME

GROUP ONE

GROUP TWO

No advise of experts

Info not processed

GROUP THREE

No research

No interview

No advise

GROUP FOUR

No validation

No advise from experts

No conclusion

Analysis not clear

SUMMARY

No validation means no basis

No expert advise means hard

No clear analysis and conclusion

Info not registered

ADVISE: Better to summarize common gaps rather than go through each group report again

GROUP WORK ON PARTICIPATORY RESEARCH

GROUP ONE

Cow breeding

6 steps mentioned!

GROUP TWO

Coffee tree

6 steps mentioned!

GROUP THREE

National sport

6 steps mentioned!

GROUP FOUR

Type of corn for farmers

6 steps mentioned!

SUMMARY

Ms Tuy recaps the main points in each report.

ADVISE: Better to just summarize common points from all reports rather than go through them again one by one.

MARCH 19, SAT

Session started promptly at 8:00 AM. Ms. Tuy led a morning energizer.

PILLAR THREE: WRITING SMART PROPOSAL

ADVISORY GAME

GROUP ONE

Supporting fund for farmers

GAPS

GROUP TWO

Coffee growing in hong village

GAPS

Not specific – mention how many households, scale

No advise from experts – invite

Not time bound – give time frame

GROUP THREE

Supporting fund for farmers – used for breeding cow for farmers

GAPS

No expert advise

No validation from farmers

Proposal not suitable

Not time bound – money still not received

GROUP FOUR

Supporting fund

GAPS

Not specific – how many farmers need how much – have detailed plan for production (number of borrowers, which animals to breed, when)

No expert advise – how much money and how to produce products – get advise

No discussion and validation from members, just opinion of one leader – commune to discuss and validate

SUMMARY

Ms. Tuy made a quick summary of common gaps identified and proposed solutions and emphasized the main messages.

GROUP WORK ON WRITING SMART PROPOSAL

GROUP ONE

Proposal to visit Phils to look at good agri model

To be done in 2016

FU will tap expert Jun Virola

GAPS

What kind of animal?

What kind of trees?

Who are the presenters?
Who are the target decision makers?
We propose standing committee

GROUP TWO

Buy equipment for processing coffee
2015-2016
Specific place
Time for buying April 11 2016

GAPS

Time for buying not suitable – coffee suffers from fogs
Must ensure amount of equipment
Fee for buying equipment

GROUP THREE

Proposal to breed pig in forest
For 23 households with experience in building
Invest 30 M VND for each crop
Capital from supporting fund for farmers in district
Some households in commune had success in breeding this _____

GAPS

Scale and area
Lack of capital – supporting fund not feasible
In 20 HH, 500 square meters
Propose capital from district SFF

GROUP FOUR

Ad: sunshine wine produced from a small apple
Lots of benefits, good for health
Beautiful skin
Contact us
March 2016 – buy 3, get 1

GAPS

Technique of producing sunshine wine
Business license
How many branches
Resource materials
Price of products

SOLUTIONS

Invite experts