

Chapter 6 Overseas Study

6-1 Outline of Study in Cambodia

1) Background

We have conducted the “Study on the Livelihood Improvement Program in Rural Japan and the Prospects for Japan’s Rural Development Cooperation” since FY2001. This study was intended to put the experience Japan has gained through the “efforts to extend livelihood improvement that were made in rural villages following the end of World War II” to use in the agricultural and rural development of developing countries, while at the same time contributing to poverty reduction and the improvement of women’s status. We have conducted studies across Japan, and worked to classify and systematize the experiences and results of livelihood improvement extension activities carried out in Japan. In addition, we have attempted to collect and classify materials that were used to extend those activities. This includes reprinting, copying and translating into English when necessary. In FY2002, we also performed the study in Laos and Malaysia, with continuously exploring and considering the possibility to put those experiences and results to use in the agricultural and rural development in developing countries.

2) Objectives

- (1) Based on the experiences gained through the study conducted in Laos and Malaysia last fiscal year, the team will verify that the findings of the study will be applicable at the sites of international cooperation.
- (2) The team will perform verification of practicality of useful training materials that the Study Committee prepared.
- (3) The team will examine how Japan’s rural livelihood improvement experiences as well as the results of a study regarding the experiences will serve village development in Cambodia.
- (4) The team will examine the prerequisites and points to be noted when offering assistance to developing countries based on Japan’s rural livelihood improvement experience.

- (5) Through a study, workshop, and seminar on site, the team will introduce the outline and examples of Japan's livelihood improvement. Suggestions will be offered regarding project activities and rural development in Cambodia by demonstrating an extension method.

3) Reason why Cambodia and BAPEP (Battambang Agricultural Productivity Enhancement Project) was selected.

- (1) The area is in Asia of which extension worker system works to some extent;
- (2) The project's activities include an element of extension;
- (3) The project is in the initial stage (due to the objective of the study offering suggestions about extension); and
- (4) The project side has some understanding about Japan's livelihood improvement movement.

4) Participants:

Cambodian side = JICA Phnom Penh Office, experts and counterparts at BAPEP, relevant ministries and agencies in Cambodia and donors

Japanese side = Members of the study team

5) Dates:

Study: December 1 (Mon) to 11 (Thurs), 2003

Seminar: December 9 (Tue), 2003

6) Details:

(1) Study

The team will conduct an interview survey and focus group discussion with residents at the villages where the project has been implemented to know their current situation, and examine where Japan's livelihood improvement experience will be applied.

JICA experts in charge of the project and counterparts will join the study.

(2) Workshop

Taking into consideration the characteristics, issues and needs of the villages that were identified through the survey and discussion, the team will introduce examples of livelihood improvement that are considered to correspond with the realities of the villages and to be useful to villages where the project has been implemented

(At the study of this time, a cooking seminar was delivered upon the request of the residents.)

(3) Seminar

<1> Introduction of history, outline and examples of Japan's livelihood improvement

<2> Presentation of general description and progress of BAPEP

<3> Report on a study at the site and offering of suggestions

<4> Colligation (Q & A, etc.)

7) Team members:

Hiroshi "Kan" Sato, in charge of colligation (Senior Researcher, Institute of Developing Economies)

Etsuko Seimori, in charge of livelihood improvement (Manager of Rural Village Livelihood Division, Yaeyama Agricultural Improvement and Extension Center, Yaeyama Office, Regional and Outlying Islands Promotion Bureau, Department of Planning and Development, Okinawa Prefectural Government)

Masami Mizuno, in charge of administration (Policy Research Coordinator, Policy Research Institute, MAFF)

Masao Watanabe, in charge of study planning, (Planning Division, Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries Development Study Department, JICA)

Tomoko Hattori, in charge of coordination, (Former Expert, JICA)

Miho Ota, observer, (Doctoral program, The University of Reading, UK)

8) Itinerary

Date	Schedule	Details
December 1 (Mon)	Narita at 10:55 A.M by JL717→Bangkok at 3:55 P.M. Bangkok at 5:30P.M by TG698→Phnom Penh at 6:45 P.M	
December 2 (Tue)	Meeting with JICA Phnom Penh Office	Explanation of aims of visit and arrangements for a seminar
	Phnom Penh→Battambang	Traveling
	Meeting with BAPEP office	Confirmation of detailed schedule during visit, etc.
December 3 (Wed)	Field study in areas where the project has been conducted	Key informant interviews with chief and his wife at Ta Kream commune, mayors, their wives and women farmers at Ta Kream and Ou Pong Moan villages (total 8 persons)
		Explanation of aims of study, ascertaining of situations at areas
December 4 (Thurs)	Field study in areas where the project has been conducted	Focus group discussion at Ta Kream and Ou Pong Moan villages Villagers being divided into two groups of men and women ¹
December 5 (Fri)	Work shop in areas where the project has been conducted	Presentation on Japan's livelihood improvement experience and study results at two villages to mayors, their wives and other villagers of seven villages in Ta Kream commune ² Cooking seminar in the afternoon ³
December 6 (Sat)	Discussion with BAPEP team	Presentation on results of study (comments and advice from the study team) and discussion
December 7	Collation of data, preparation for	Wrap-up of activities from day 2 to day 6, sorting out

¹ A brainstorming session was held to discuss "what improvement was made in the village in the past ten years" Participants put on paper and identified changes and improvement in terms of livelihood and production to speculate about what brought about those changes and improvement. Increased harvest of rice, livestock husbandry, cooperation among villagers, and outside support were cited as factors that contributed to improvement

² Videos were shown along with presentation of outline and examples of Japan's livelihood improvement The team also mentioned the points it noted during the two-day study Participants were mayors and their wives of seven villages in Ta Kream commune, county officials, and villagers of Ta Kream and Ou Pong Moan villages.

³ Agricultural products produced and sold by a livelihood improvement group in Okinawa -- pickled papaya and papaya boiled down in soy sauce -- were shown by Ms. Seimori during a workshop in the morning and attracted keen interest from the villagers who strongly hoped to learn how to cook them This resulted in a cooking seminar held suddenly in the afternoon. The preparations of papaya which was soaked in soy sauce sweetened with sugar, boiled down in soy sauce, and pickled were tasted by villagers.

Date	Schedule	Details
(Sun)	seminar	of study results, preparation and arrangements for a presentation at a seminar, etc.
December 8 (Mon)	Courtesy visit to CEDAC ⁴ , Ministry of Rural Development and FAO	Report on results of field studies from day 3 to day 5 by the team and discussion
	Observation of WIN project ⁵	Visitation to the project site in Takeo
December 9 (Tue)	Seminar on rural area and livelihood improvement	Presentation on rural area livelihood improvement in Japan -, generalities of livelihood improvement activities, education of extension workers and their activities, outcome of livelihood improvement in rural areas, current situation, etc. -- and exchange of opinions
December 10 (Wed)	Report to JICA Phnom Penh Office and Japanese Embassy in Cambodia	Report on study and seminar in areas where BAPEP has been conducted
	Phnom Penh at 8 25 P.M. by TG699→Bangkok at 9:30 P.M	
	Bangkok at 10 55 P.M by JL704→(Mr. Sato moved to Indonesia for other purposes)	
December 11 (Thurs)	→Narita at 6:35 A.M	

9) Seminar

A seminar entitled “Japan’s Experience of Livelihood Improvement Program: Is it applicable to Cambodia?” was conducted as follows.

- (1) Name of seminar: Japan’s Experience of Livelihood Improvement Program: Is it applicable to Cambodia?
- (2) Date 8:00A M. to 0:00P.M., December 9 (Tue), 2003
- (3) Place Hotel Cambodiana (Phnom Penh)
- (4) Participants: Cambodian ministries and agencies, as well as donors related to rural development, those associated with BAPEP, and the study members

⁴ CEDAC=Centre d’Etude et de Développement Agricole Cambodgien (Center for Study and Development in Agriculture): NGO which has implemented SRI extension in Takeo and other various areas in Cambodia

⁵ WIN=Women in irrigation A project in Takeo that has been promoted by FAO

(5) Time table

- 08:00 Opening address by Mr. Mitsugi, Assistant Resident Representative, JICA Phnom Penh Office
- Explanation about outline of the study and aim of the seminar
- Self-introduction of the team members and participants
- 08:10 How Japan overcame poverty in rural areas (Mr. Sato, team leader)
- 08:40 Livelihood and productivity improvement -- From postwar Japan's livelihood improvement experience (Dr. Mizuno, team member)
- 09:10 Video shown on Japan's livelihood improvement: "People's Efforts for Brighter Tomorrow"
- 09:30 Break
- 09:50 Outline and progress of Battambang Agricultural Productivity Enhancement Project (Mr. Vachira)
- 10:10 Presentation of examples by the field study team (Ms. Seimori, team member)
- 10:30 Suggestions from the field study team (Mr. Watanabe, team member)
- 10:50 Open discussion (Facilitator: Mr. Mitsugi, Assistant Resident Representative of JICA office)
- 11:30 Summing up (Mr. Sato, team leader and Dr. Tokida, Chief Advisor, BAPEP)

(6) Details of presentations by Mr. Sato, Dr. Mizuno, Ms Seimori, and Mr. Watanabe

(7) Video shown:

Shown was video entitled "People's Efforts for Brighter Tomorrow" which was produced by Kagoshima Prefecture. This video depicts the postwar situations, efforts for a livelihood improvement movement, and its activities in rural areas in Kagoshima Prefecture, Japan.

(8) Colligation

Participants engaged in wide-ranging discussion during Q & A session based on presentations on Japan's livelihood improvement, a video shown, and reports on the field study

Current situations and issues in Cambodia that were identified at the discussion included (1) attentions concentrated on infrastructure and agricultural technology, (2) problems on distribution and marketing strategies, (3) farmers without land, and (4) capabilities and training of extension workers. Questions were asked regarding governmental involvement in livelihood improvement activities in Japan -- support system, funding, etc. Opinions were actively exchanged also on the fact that many NGOs started their activities at a village before the completion of coordination among relevant organizations, and on definition of an extension work.

6-2 Outline of Study in U.S. and Canada

1) Background and purpose

The team will transmit the information on Japan's development experience to those concerned with international cooperation and assistance in U.S. and Canada, and to the world, based on the results of this Study. This will include opinions exchange with the other donors and those concerned with development, which should be fed back to the study

2) Team member

Hiroshi "Kan" Sato, Senior Researcher, Institute of Developing Economies

3) Schedule

- March 2 (Tue) Narita at 10.10 A.M. by NH2→Washington D.C at 9.40 A.M.
Afternoon: Courtesy visit to JICA Washington D.C. Office/DC Forum (presentation)
- March 3 (Wed) Morning Courtesy visit to World Bank/Collection of information
Afternoon: Courtesy visit to USAID/Collection of information
- March 4 (Thurs) Archives of United States Department of Agriculture /Collection of information
- March 5 (Fri) Washington D.C at 8:30 A.M. by UA7857→Syracuse at 9:56 A.M
Morning: Meeting with those related to Cornell University

Afternoon: Presentation

March 6 (Sat) Syracuse at 10 15 A.M. →Boston at 11:44 A.M

Afternoon. Meeting with researchers related to Harvard University

March 7 (Sun) Boston at 4:50 P.M. by AC663→Ottawa at 6:06 P M

March 8 (Mon) Morning Courtesy visit to CIDA/Meeting/Presentation

Ottawa at 6:50 P.M. by AC139→Vancouver at 9:10 P.M.

March 9 (Tue) Vancouver at 11:20 A.M. by JL1→

March 10 (Wed) →Narita at 2:20 P.M.

4) Summary

Presentation was delivered to foreign people in North America on four occasions. On either occasion, explanation was made with using pictures for reference, about postwar situation in Japan and evolution of an agricultural extension system, which was introduced according to an instruction on democratization from GHQ (the U.S. government), adapted and rooted in Japan through various methods by livelihood improvement extension workers. Then, pointed out was the significance of those experiences for developing countries, where “democratization” and “empowerment of women” has been urged by international organizations and donors.

The first presentation was delivered at USAID (U.S. Agency for International Development). Audience there was mainly working-level officials. While showing interest in the presentation, they asked questions mostly about practical matters and know-how like “How can I use this method in my project?”

The second was at the Cornell University, where most of audience was researchers and foreign students. Questions were raised about concrete approach taken by livelihood improvement extension workers and relation between GHQ and Japan’s Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry.

The third presentation was offered to professors of Harvard Center for Society and Health, who had some knowledge of Japanese society. Many comments were given, including those about the necessity to view the livelihood improvement movement as something associated with other contemporary civic movements, like those of consumers, going on in urban areas, and also about the necessity to examine the correlation between the livelihood improvement movement carried out in respective prefectures and the rises in economic indicators thereof. Those comments were academically to the point and noteworthy.

The fourth was a presentation at CIDA (Canadian International Development Agency) with the audience of about 25, the largest during the trip of this time. After listening to the presentation with absorbed interest, they made comments and asked questions from various angles. The diversity of interest shown in the questions asked could be attributed to the fact that CIDA is a relatively small-scale organization and has a lot of staff with both academic and practical viewpoints.

Audience at every presentation had a keen interest in "Japan's experience", which allowed to reaffirm that the transmission of the experience in English adequately met the needs of donors and development researchers in North America, and that the progress of our "Study on the Livelihood Improvement Program in Rural Japan and the Prospects for Japan's Rural Development Cooperation" reached a level to make the results deserving of transmission to those people. It is necessary to pay attention to detail when delivering a presentation in the future. This includes the question where the emphasis should be placed depending on a type of audience -- working-level officials, researchers, etc., and fine adjustment of direction of a message. At the same time, we need to thrash out the question how to transmit Japan's social development experience to donors in U.S. who tend to be more "practical" and "short-term-results"-oriented than ones in Europe. It would be desirable to have an opportunity to offer a presentation to the World Bank at the earliest possible occasion, because, although reporter was unable to give a presentation this time, the Bank was holding sort of an annual assembly for training those persons associated with social development.

Chapter 7 Verification Training

Study Committee on “Study on the Livelihood Improvement Program in Rural Japan and the Prospects for Japan’s Rural Development Cooperation” project, which has been conducted since FY2001, has been discussing what a training course should be for trainees from developing countries, as one of ways to use Japan’s livelihood improvement experience in rural development in developing countries. In order to verify outcomes of the discussions through an actual training course, it was decided to implement “Participatory Training Course on Community Development with the Rural Life Improvement Strategy” in the second half of FY2003. This chapter will summarize the outline, innovative ideas, evaluation of, lessons learned from, and issues in the future of the course.

7-1 Outline of the Training Course

JICA and AICAF conducted a training course entitled “Participatory Training Course on Community Development with the Rural Life Improvement Strategy” together with the Asian Productivity Organization (APO) at JICA Tsukuba International center for 15 days from February 2 to 16. All of 15 participants were from APO member countries; namely, one from Bangladesh, Taiwan, Fiji, Iran, Korea, Laos, Nepal, Pakistan and the Philippines, and two from Sri Lanka, Thai and Viet Nam. Of participants, being around 40 years old on average, nine worked for the ministry of agriculture/rural development, four for the ministry of industrial economic development, and one for NGO and a university. Most of participants had some experiences in an extension project, and were administrative officers of the central government at the time of their participation in the course. Five out of 15 participants were women, and one from Korea was a former livelihood improvement extension worker and involved directly in a livelihood improvement project¹

The 13-day -- excluding two holidays -- training course was composed of five-day classroom lectures, a three-day field visit, one-day presentation country by country, and four-day preparation and presentation of

¹ The participant worked at Korean Institute of Rural Livelihood Science to which Ms. Taeko Kiyota, who served as lecturer in the training course, and some other livelihood improvement extension workers were dispatched as JICA experts.

reports, policy recommendations and KAIZEN action plans for their workplace in respect of livelihood improvement. The classroom lectures, which were delivered for the first five days, had two sessions; two lectures in the morning, and a group discussion -- workshop -- of participants in the afternoon. One lecture -- nine lectures in all -- was basically paired with another, that is, one lecture by a former livelihood improvement extension worker based on her experience, and another by a researcher based on a detailed explanation of the former lecture. The central theme of each classroom lecture was: the generalities of livelihood improvement for the first day; the regulatory system that supported livelihood improvement for the 2nd day; the roles of extension workers and methods of extension for the 3rd day; the livelihood improvement technology for the 4th day; the livelihood improvement and regional characteristics for the 5th day. The workshops were conducted so that participants could sort out information acquired through the lectures they took to identify issues and questions for themselves. Efforts were made to enable the trainees to organize information through showing a relevant video as needed or other means.

For a lecture by a former livelihood improvement extension worker, training textbooks were translated from Japanese into English and given to participants in advance. The one by a researcher was delivered with using a manuscript prepared in English and presentation software. In regard to the field visit after-mentioned, materials translated into English were given to participants before the observations. The materials were acquired when we visited the sites in the preparatory stage².

Participants visited and stayed two nights for observations in Daigo town, Kuji-gun, which is located in the northern part of Ibaraki Prefecture. The major reasons why Daigo town was chosen as the site for the field visit were as follows: (1) It is not included in the Tokyo metropolitan district, and still had characteristics of rural areas; (2) It had engaged in active livelihood improvement movement, and had worked to implement various regional development measures based on the movement; and (3) It effectively utilized local tourism resources such as waterfall and hot spring. The participants were able to make

² Lecture textbooks and materials for presentations and a field visit prepared for the training course were organized into an R-LIP training kit in the Report

meaningful and efficient observations in Daigo town, owing to members of livelihood improvement and regional development groups as well as staff at the town office, who fully understood the purpose of the training course and field visit and took meticulous care of it. The participants visited Omiya Area Agricultural Improvement and Extension Center, which was in charge of Daigo town, to comprehensively learn about what an extension project including livelihood improvement should be and its issues, and concluded their field visit.

The second half of the training course was mainly composed of works carried out by participants. On the day subsequent to their return from the field visit, the participants produced a report on Japan's livelihood improvement according to their own understanding, based on the information obtained through the lectures taken and the field visit (see "R-LIP Report"³). On the following day, participants offered a presentation country by country to compare a rural area development policy and its implementation in each country, with using basically common understanding of Japan's livelihood improvement among them as a benchmark. The last three days of the training course were spent on completion of an R-LIP report as well as preparation and presentation of policy recommendations for a rural area development policy and its implementation in each country, and KAIZEN action plan for their workplace, which was also an action plan for each participant after the completion of the training course.

Products of the training course were ①an R-LIP report, ②field visit report⁴, ③policy recommendations, and ④KAIZEN action plans for workplace. It was specified as one of objectives of the training course, as well as confirmed and agreed at the orientation on the first day of the course to consider them as the products of the training. The R-LIP reports, produced by participants on Japan's livelihood improvement according to their own understanding about it, indicate that participants had a keen interest in roles of

³ Report of the Understanding on Rural Life Improvement Program (R-LIP) in Japan

⁴ Report of Field Visit in Daigo Town, Ibaraki Prefecture, Japan

livelihood improvement extension workers, their self-sacrificing hard work, relationship of trust between residents and the extension workers, KAIZEN method, and empowerment of rural women, through R-LIP. On the other hand, the report barely mentions how livelihood improvement has historically evolved or has been positioned in rural society. The field visit report, which was based on analyzed results of observations in Daigo town in Ibaraki Prefecture mainly from economical, social and organizational aspects, show that participants had some correct understanding about Japan's rural areas, local administration, and measures for livelihood improvement and rural development, although their analyses were not deep. Policy recommendations and KAIZEN action plans for workplace were prepared as each participant's product of the training course, with taking into consideration each national origin and workplace environment after a group discussion. Although all participants prepared and made a verbal presentation of policy recommendations and KAIZEN action plans for workplace, they were not included in the documents as products of the training course. Some examples of those recommendations and action plans are as follows:

(1) Policy recommendations:

- Greater focus should be placed on human resource development to utilize sparse development resources more effectively for realization of rural area development. For this purpose, I would like to conduct a seminar within one month to make a presentation at my workplace -- university -- on my visit to Japan based on the R-LIP training course of this time, for arousing opinions on this issue. (Participant from Viet Nam)
- Resident- and community-led development actions should be appropriately evaluated by the government. (Participant from Fiji)
- The government should look at not only production but also livelihood to commit itself to nurture "thinking farmers". (Participant from Taiwan)
- Services of Productivity Institute, which center on promotion of industrial production improvement at present, should be expanded to include the improvement in agricultural production and livelihood in

rural society For this purpose, I will transmit the concept of R-LIP to inside and outside of my workplace (Participant from Thailand)

(2) KAIZEN action plan for workplace:

- I will implement “5S” at my workplace to tidy up there, and personally would like to learn how to use PowerPoint. An electrical hot water pot should be placed at my workplace for help-yourself in order to reduce the time for tea break during office hours In addition, I would like to hold a briefing session on R-LIP after my return from Japan and implement it at tea estates within six months. (Participants from Sri Lanka and Nepal)
- I will offer a briefing session on R-LIP to my superior and a presentation on my visit to Japan to my colleagues. I will assemble extension workers and conduct a domestic seminar to discuss about how to incorporate R-LIP into the current extension activities I would like to work for extension of improved “*kamado* (cooking stove)” on project sites. (Participants from Laos and Pakistan)
- I would like to discuss “thinking farmers” at my workplace to propose a joint study on “self-reliant rural women’s organization” between Japan and Korea. Based on the results of the study, an international symposium on R-LIP may be conducted in 2006. (Participants from Korea)

On the last day of the training course, a session was held to show the products of the course including presentations of above-mentioned R-LIP and field visit reports, policy recommendations and KAIZEN action plans, with attendance of Director of the Agricultural Department of Asian Productivity Organization (APO), Managing Director of JICA Tsukuba International Center, members of Study Committee on “Study on the Livelihood Improvement Program in Rural Japan and the Prospects for Japan’s Rural Development Cooperation” and lecturers of the course. This session, which was conducted by the participants on their own initiative from preparation of materials to master of ceremonies and presentations, indicated that the participants understood R-LIP as well as the significance of the training course which took Japan’s livelihood improvement as an example, and were eager to use those examples

for KAIZEN at each workplace and in each country. After the session, an opportunity was provided to APO, AICAF and JICA, which offered the training course, to listen to evaluations of the course and suggestions directly from participants

7-2 Innovative Ideas, Evaluation of and Lessons Learned from the Training Course

This section will summarize unique features and innovative ideas experimented at the training course, evaluation by the participants and those offered the course, lessons learned from the course and points to be improved in the future.

1) Inclusion of a lot of group discussions -- workshop

In this course, group discussions among participants -- workshops -- occupied the whole afternoon session for the first five days and the most part of training after the field visit. To put it the other way around, the input was offered only through lectures in the morning for the first five days and through the three-day field visit. Compared with traditional training courses, this one included less input and more group discussions among and work by participants. This composition and the flow of the course allowed the participants to gradually accumulate understanding about central themes and to tackle problem-solving on their own in the second half of the course. Encouragement and motivation for “understanding followed by actions” was successfully incorporated into the course design. That means information provided through the lectures were confirmed and organized through the workshops. Then participants deepened their understanding through producing an R-LIP report, analyzed and compared current situations in each country with using understanding of Japan’s examples as a benchmark, prepared policy recommendations, and devised KAIZEN action plans for their workplace which could be implemented at once. In this course, products of training were prepared based on information which were input by lectures and then organized by trainees themselves, offering a fairly appropriate balance among the activities. In order to enhance understanding of the participants about R-LIP, it would be better to offer lectures on livelihood improvement at the second half of the course, too. Actually some participants pointed out in their comments on the course, “It would

be more effective that the course included additional lectures and discussion with lecturers to verify the information obtained in the field". The issue we have to address from now on is the effective provision and verification of information by those other than participants at the stage of the second half of the course in order to enhance understanding. This should be effected by encouraging, not by checking, self-initiative of participants through inclusion of a lot of workshops.

The flexible course design of this training was enabled by the existence of an efficient facilitator who could appropriately respond to any situation. An Indo-German consultant served as facilitator of the course for almost the whole period, who had facilitated training courses for DSE and other development organizations as well as for private companies in Germany. The facilitator presided over a large part of the course including workshops in the first half, except lectures. When the participants prepared the products of training, the facilitator methodically explained about what work they should do specifically, how that work should be proceeded, what was each role allocated to an individual participant and what output was expected as a whole, successfully bringing out the initiative of the participants. This training course realized the participant-driven operation of the course owing to the capability of the experienced facilitator we invited. It is necessary to consider if an experienced facilitator can always be secured, and what alternative solution(s) should be taken otherwise.

2) Lectures by livelihood improvement extension workers and researchers

At the first half of the course, a morning session was composed of two lectures on the themes which were almost identical; the first lecture was given by a former livelihood improvement extension worker and the second by a researcher in the field of livelihood improvement to follow up the first. The course included nine lectures on the first five days, which were delivered in this format by four former livelihood improvement extension workers and four researchers in the field of livelihood improvement -- and one more researcher specialized in KAIZEN. The delay in the decision on the selection of the themes of lectures and lecturers caused some insufficient prearrangement, coordination of the contents of lectures,

and linkage between lectures by former extension workers and researchers. As a result, contents overlapped between lectures. Some participants said, “Many lecturers told a similar story”, and “I wanted to listen to a lecture not only by a former extension worker, but also by the one now in service”. Even with sufficient prearrangement and under the different themes, repetition of a similar story may be inevitable since the subject of “livelihood improvement” was common to all lectures. A one-hour-and-a-half lecture might be too short to have sufficient discussion. It might have been more effective if more time was allocated to a fewer number of more carefully selected livelihood improvement extension workers and researchers, who could have deepened the contents while delivering their lectures and having communication with the participants. In any case, nine lectures for five days might have been too many.

All former livelihood improvement extension workers except one offered lecturers in Japanese, which was translated into English word for word. This style takes time and may prevent the true meaning of lecturers’ messages from being conveyed. On the other hand, experienced professional interpreters include explanation of circumstances and background unique to Japan, which speakers take for granted and do not mention, in their translation impromptu to facilitate communication between speakers and audience. Many participants in a training course want direct communication with lecturers. It seems that even a little direct communication greatly strengthens a sense of closeness. For lecturers who do not speak English, it would be more effective to start their lectures with English, if possible, and then shift to Japanese which will be translated into English by professional interpreters. Another method experimented in the training course was that a researcher in the field of livelihood improvement presided over a lecture by a former livelihood improvement extension worker to facilitate mutual understanding between a former extension worker and the foreign participants who differed in cultural background. As mentioned, résumés of lectures were translated into English and given to the participants in advance, which also facilitated the understanding by the participants. Some participants read the résumés and prepared their questions before attending a lecture. This preparation work takes some efforts due to time constraints and

lecturers' tight schedule. However, proper textbooks should be continuously produced as before

3) Well-prepared field visit and exchange

The well-prepared field visit to Daigo town in Ibaraki Prefecture was greatly significant and efficient. Lectures and explanation at the site were generally to the point, and participants understood the profile of the community and activities of livelihood improvement fairly well. A luncheon meeting with members of a livelihood improvement group and a get-acquainted reception with community women at a closed school offered an occasion to eat a meal together and talk with them in small groups. Through those occasions, the participants obtained more in-depth information directly from residents of the community. Ms. Masako Usui, who lived in Daigo town and was a former livelihood improvement extension worker, made out the schedule for the field visit and accompanied the participants. This cooperation of her allowed the appropriate observation of various groups, people, and activities associated with livelihood improvement and rural development. Participants stayed two nights at a Japanese-style hotel with sharing a room with other participants. The shared rooms did not cause any trouble possibly due to advance notice, and seemingly bringing about stronger sense of unity and collaboration among participants. It seemed that this facilitated preparation of products by participants at the second half of the course. For the field visit, the points to be observed were identified at the workshops beforehand. Therefore, discussions rarely drifted to irrelevant matters such as commercialization and processing of agricultural products and other technical issues. The field visit was appreciated more highly by the participants than any other program of the course.

The well-prepared field visit was very informative and meaningful. This would be because those involved in the observations visited Ibaraki Prefectural Office, Daigo town and an extension center several times in the preparatory stage to ask for cooperation and fully explained about the purpose of the visit. One of key factors behind the success of the visit was a full cooperation in this stage from Ms. Usui who lived in Daigo town and was a former livelihood improvement extension worker.

The field visit provided several occasions for the participants to talk directly with people there. If there were more interpreters, more in-depth discussion would be held in a smaller group. For a field visit, it would be ideal if one can secure both a professional interpreter who conveys a message of a speaker without fail to whole participants and many volunteer interpreters who support communication in small groups of participants.

Timing of a field visit should be discussed from now on. At the evaluation session on the last day, one participant told that it would be more helpful if they could see actual agricultural work more -- agricultural work with actually using farm equipment, working farmers, agricultural products in the fields, etc. There is a difficulty to implement a field visit during a farming season. However, it would be necessary to examine if there is any way to make it possible.

4) Understanding of participants about R-LIP and issues in the future

During the training course, the participants summarized Japan's livelihood improvement experience according to their understanding, devised their country's rural and regional development policy and its implementation plans based on the summary, and offered the presentation of the plans for respective countries in a small group. By comparing the contents of the presentation of each country, the participants were able to understand well the institutional aspects -- central government - prefectural government - extension center - community -- of a livelihood improvement program. They also showed interest in the role of extension workers in which they functioned as an interface to link the formal organization of government and unorganized individual residents. Since the interface does not function well in development countries many projects and programs for residents in a village have been implemented directly by the central government or competent authorities. It was discussed that those development activities consequently often had not led to enhanced capability of the whole village, and probably rather brought about division or split among residents.

The participants, on the other hand, seemed to misunderstand or not to understand very well about historic backdrop in rural areas in Japan after the war. This included problems in rural areas and difficulty for livelihood improvement extension workers in carrying out activities in a village at that time. Similarly, they did not necessarily fully understand the connection, role sharing, characteristics, objectives, and the plurality of human resources, among or of various organizations in rural communities. They comprehended that livelihood improvement extension workers were very self-sacrificing through listening to the workers' experiences. However, the reason why the workers were so self-sacrificing did not seem to make sense to them. Although they were interested in the keys and concrete methods by which livelihood improvement extension workers successfully blended into communities, the participants could not obtain adequate answers or information about them. For extension workers themselves, those simple but essential questions seemed to be too obvious to answer appropriately. Some way(s) had to be considered to deepen the understanding of the participants, such as objective analysis by a researcher and exploration through a discussion.

Participants had a strong interest in depopulation and aging, difficulty experienced by men in finding marriage partners, low international competitiveness in agricultural sector, inadequate growth in agricultural income and other current issues in rural areas, which had not been solved even by longtime efforts of livelihood improvement. Those present problems, however, were not fully discussed mainly due to time constraints. Although the issues, in which the participants were keenly interested, scarcely concerned livelihood improvement, they should have been included in a discussion session. If participants discuss today's rural problems and measures against them after understanding past examples of livelihood improvement, they would get hints that are useful to developing countries facing with many problems.

Participants wished to have explanations also for the livelihood improvement, the explanations similar to those normally given for typical development projects and programs on their position in important political

issues, specific objectives; procedures; methods; expected impact; ways of M & E (monitoring and evaluation); and sustainability. Livelihood improvement is not a “project”, but a process of KAIZEN -- trial and error. However, they showed a strong tendency to look at it as a “project” The contention that livelihood improvement “is not a ‘project’, but a process of KAIZEN -- trial and error”, which was not necessarily made clear in the preparatory stage of the training course, manifested itself through the participants’ questions about livelihood improvement asked in terms of a project. It would be significant to introduce livelihood improvement as an alternative to traditional project-type development, with repeatedly discussing this point in detail

5) Work to prepare products by participants

This training course included participants-driven work to prepare products of training; namely, R-LIP and field visit reports, policy recommendations and KAIZEN action plans for workplace. For the work which was specified as one of objectives of the course, the concrete content and the way to produce were left to the discretion of the participants. They actively and enthusiastically worked to prepare R-LIP and field visit reports by cooperatively putting the reviews of lectures and the field visit into writing, seemingly achieving a certain success. Through preparation process of those reports, the participants reflected on Japan’s livelihood improvement again and were able to clarify the uncertain information each other, which resulted in deepened understanding about it Those reports, which were prepared as a product of collaboration among 15 participants from developing countries, represent the image of Japan’s livelihood improvement as viewed from the viewpoint of developing countries This includes indications as to which elements are useful, applicable and difficult to apply. It would be important to review “Japan’s livelihood improvement” from the viewpoint of developing countries in transmitting Japan’s experience to overseas in the future.

On the other hand, participants were not so active in devising policy recommendations and KAIZEN action plans for workplace. Some seemed to have their doubts about devising the recommendations and actions

plans with saying, “Policy recommendations relate to criticism against current policies”, “I do not understand what KAIZEN action plans for workplace mean”, and “How can you follow-up the recommendations and action plans?” Generally speaking, participants in a training course do not take so seriously the policy recommendations and the action plans corresponding to KAIZEN action plans for workplace. The participants in the course might have taken them rather too seriously, which caused their concern for the recommendations and action plans. In fact, the recommendations and action plans they devised were more or less more concrete than the conclusions of typical seminars, possibly because more time was spent on workshops in the first half of the course and for the preparation of the R-LIP report. However, the report as the ultimate product of the course was able to accommodate, as originally planned, neither the policy recommendations which could have been submitted to their offices, nor the KAIZEN action plans for workplace which could have served as their action plans after the completion of the course.

It was possible to encourage them to submit their policy recommendations and KAIZEN action plans for workplace to include them in the resultant reports even if there was some resistance to doing so. Since this course placed emphasis on the initiative of the participants, we did not ask them to submit the recommendations and action plans, which were just verbally presented. It might have been inevitable to resort to the arts of compromise, considering the tight schedule in the second half of the course. With a little more time, the recommendations and action plans might have been handled in a manner that was more satisfactory to the participants by strengthening individual coaching and consultation in the process of preparing those documents. This would have led to the enhanced self-assessment of the participants on their behaviors and duties, which was scarcely effected during the course

6) Diversity of the participants and grouping

Although this course focused on livelihood improvement, the participants were not necessarily experts in livelihood improvement or extension. They varied in background, being consisted of mainly administrative officers engaged in agricultural and/or rural development in the central government, as well

as staff of a university, NGO and local government, an expert in agricultural extension, and a researcher in the field of livelihood improvement. The diversity of participants is significant for the purposes of gaining various perspectives, promoting the understanding about Japan's livelihood improvement in each country, and obtaining broad support to livelihood improvement activities. As Japan's livelihood improvement has not been so widely known in the context of agricultural and rural development in developing countries, such attempt to transmit the information on it is important. On the other hand, most of those participants are not in a position to put in practice their experiences in and knowledge of livelihood improvement. Various perspectives among participants also tend to cause the discussions to diffuse incoherently, without being able to narrow the focus of the training. It is very likely that discussions become abstract and do not lead to concrete actions because there are few persons who have been engaged in actual field work. For this training course, it was known in advance that participants would vary in background, and that most of them would be policymakers and administrators of the central governments. Therefore, we made efforts to offer information and occasions to the participants so that they could reflect by themselves on the political aspect of livelihood improvement, on its positioning in the agricultural/rural development and extension, and on the question what a support system should be for residents-led development like livelihood improvement. The R-LIP report, which was produced by the participants, indicates that the participants' understanding and interests generally conformed to those directions. The policy recommendations and KAIZEN action plans include a lot of views expressing their willingness to hold a domestic seminar on livelihood improvement after return to their countries. If those participants really conduct the seminar in each country, examples of Japan's livelihood improvement will be more widely known in those countries. Only this kind of outcome would demonstrate the significance of the training course, which was conducted for various participants with stronger interest in policy

In the training course, 15 participants were often divided into a group of five or so to have a discussion and to do some tasks. Before the field visit, the composition of a group was changed each time so that they could exchange opinions with as many different participants as possible. During the field visit,

participants were initially divided into two by gender. Then men participants were grouped according to their country, with each group consisting of participants from countries having similarity in customs. The number of groups was three: Group 1 included participants from Fiji, Taiwan, Laos, and Viet Nam (two); Group 2 those from Bangladesh, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka (two); and Group 3 -- women's group -- those from Iran, Korea, the Philippines and Thai (two). All groups gradually forged relation of cooperation and trust within the group as they proceeded with their work. Their group dynamics were really impressive. However, sufficient cooperative relation was not necessarily established for the whole of 15 participants. As mentioned, each group was composed of participants from countries having similarity in the culture, which facilitated understanding and establishment of cooperative relation within the group. This, at the same time, prevented the international group training course from making full use of its characteristic of mutual learning through "different cultures and different backgrounds".

7) KAIZEN process of course operation by the participants

At this training course on the central theme of livelihood improvement -- improvement means KAIZEN in Japanese, an attempt was made to put KAIZEN into practice on the operation of the course by the participants in training. On the first day, the participants were provided with a notepad and instructed to write down on it what they noticed about KAIZEN on the course operation. They were supposed to discuss every day the points needing improvement in the course operation based on their notes, and to put into practice what they could do. Practically, the participants could not find any points to be improved after pointing out some for the improvement in the disposition of tables on the first day. During the first half of the course when they stayed at the same classroom, the room was getting tidier day by day, which showed that they tried to make minor KAIZEN without putting it into words. After the field visit or change in the venue, however, it seemed to be difficult for them to start some KAIZEN by themselves. There were some questions whether the participants became so accustomed to KAIZEN that they would intuitate some changes in their behavior after the completion of the course. Nevertheless, it is certain that the words and concepts of KAIZEN and "5S" have been put into the heads of the participants as knowledge

and experience which they have acquired through actual practice, regardless of howsoever temporary it was.

8) Evaluation by the participants -- based on evaluation sheets

Summary of training evaluation sheets filled in by the participants is as shown in the table below. The results of the evaluation show that the training course generally received a high evaluation as a whole. Relatively low evaluation was given to the schedule and time allocation. This would probably be because the 15-day training course was considered to be somewhat redundant. A close scrutiny of the program could have shortened the period of the course to 13 days -- within two weeks with one day-off in the middle -- by reducing the first and second half by one day respectively. The participants generally had a high interest in R-LIP, and evaluated fairly highly the theme of livelihood improvement. In the initial stage of the course, some expressed unfavorable opinions like "livelihood improvement is old-fashioned now" and "it was possible only in Japan". However, the participants seemed to have started thinking that they could learn something from Japan's experience, and such opinions were never heard in the second half of the course. On the other hand, national peculiarities in Japan and the historical backdrop of the postwar era were not discussed and analyzed much. KAIZEN, "5S", presentation skills and group discussion -- workshop -- were appreciated as practical techniques. Some participants commented that not only examples of success, but also those of failure should have been introduced to them. The field visit, which was well-prepared, received high evaluation with 85% of the participants rating it as "beyond expectation", showing the importance of detailed preparation for a field visit.

7-3 Issues in the Future

The training course verified that it was highly significant to transmit Japan's livelihood improvement experience to developing countries through a training course, and that the method tried this time was basically adequate. The method would be especially effective for a training course with the aim of rousing the interest in, and enhancing the understanding of, Japan's livelihood improvement in developing

Items of evaluation	Beyond expectation	Up to expectation	Below expectation
Theme	46 (38)	46 (59)	8 (3)
Schedule	36 (35)	57 (61)	7 (4)
Time allocation	21 (33)	71 (57)	10 (8)
Time management	50 (43)	50 (49)	0 (8)
Method of training	50 (35)	36 (56)	14 (9)
Lecturers	45 (50)	47 (47)	8 (3)
Field visit	85 (40)	15 (45)	0 (15)
Overall evaluation	61 (52)	39 (47)	0 (1)

Unit: % Numbers in parentheses are averages of evaluations for 17 projects in 2003 of the Agricultural Department, APO

countries, and also with the aim of creating the conditions there for expanding the support to the launch of a project by this approach for development. Lecturers, materials for lectures and the field visit, and the method of training in the training course of this time would be able to be adequately utilized in a training project in the future. A training course for staff in charge of livelihood improvement and extension is more focused on livelihood improvement itself and extension technology. It would be more effective to conduct those training courses as a domestic training project which is offered to the trainees with common cultural background and framework of policy and allows the use of the single language.

One of the things that have become evident through “Study on the Livelihood Improvement Program in Rural Japan and the Prospects for Japan’s Rural Development Cooperation” and the training course of this time is that it is impossible to bring postwar Japan’s livelihood improvement experience to a site of agricultural development without any adaptation, even if the experience includes a lot of essential and universal elements. The key is that people in developing countries understand “postwar Japan’s livelihood improvement” on their own way and put it into practice according to the circumstances on sites, just as livelihood improvement extension workers and rural women adapted and internalized the concept introduced from the U. S as the “livelihood improvement”. In order to expedite such a process of internalization of a new concept, the first step would be the presentation of Japanese experience in

livelihood improvement in the form of a training course like the one for this time. The second step would be to establish a long-term and mutual relation with the actors in developing countries who have been the participants of the course, to assist them in their efforts for development on their own ground, by applying the knowledge and experience gained through the training