

A Report on the Integration Workshop

held at Winrock, Arkansas

December 10-11, 1982

for the Small Ruminant CRSP

by Development Design Associates  
1192 Kains, Suite B  
Albany, CA 94706  
415-527-0120

FURTHERING INTEGRATION  
IN THE  
SMALL RUMINANT CRSP

*BEST AVAILABLE COPY*

## Contents

1.0	Why Integration?	1
2.0	Pre-Workshop State of Integration	2
3.0	Integration Workshop Goals	4
4.0	The Kenya PIs Integration Workshop	5
4.1	The Concept and Design of the Workshop	5
4.2	Workshop Highlights and Accomplishments	7
4.3	Appraisal of Workshop by Participants	11
4.4	Follow-up activities	12
5.0	Recommendations	14
6.0	Appendix	18
6.1	Arrangements for the Integration Workshop	18
6.2	Abbreviations and Terminology	19

## 1.0 Why Integration

Throughout this report, "Integration" is used to refer to the inter-relationships between the different disciplines working as separate components or sub-projects in the SR-CRSP. Used in this way, "Integration" refers to a process internal to the project, and is not concerned with how the SR-CRSP is related to other small ruminant or livestock projects in Kenya, that are conducted by other organisations.

The concept of the SR-CRSP envisions collaborative research in several disciplines, focused on the common goal of "developing and testing appropriate technologies and practices to improve productivity..." and aims to "expand the level of competence of scientists to conduct research on small ruminant smallholder production systems" (Grant Agreement, Attachment B).

Achievement of the objective of improved productivity clearly involves coordination of the research agendas, in both content and phasing, of the seven disciplines working in the SR-CRSP in Kenya.

Efforts to attain the sort of integration needed to produce a unified product have already been pursued by the ME and PIs. Some measure of success in coordinating inter-disciplinary efforts has been achieved. But there has been a growing awareness on the part of PIs, the ME, the EEP, the MLD, and USAID, that something more is needed if the project is to reach its objective and produce research results of direct significance to small ruminant production in Kenya. The Integration workshop was conceived partly as a response to this awareness.

The workshop was the first time that PIs, the ME, and the MLD had come together for the sole purpose of addressing the integration issue, and the management of program goals, as distinct from sub-project goals.

This innovation, including the involvement of an outside consultant specialising in program management, was intended to provide a new impetus to integration and to explore an approach which might be used on other occasions or for other sites. The workshop focused specifically on the research program in Kenya, which was seen as having progressed to the stage when a new thrust in the direction of integration could be most beneficial.

## 2.0 Pre-workshop State of Integration

From its inception, the Kenya SR-CRSP has taken significant steps towards coordinating the research efforts of its several sub-projects. Thus, from research agendas that were conceived originally in total isolation from one another, annual workplans are now prepared by joint consultation of PIs and their research staffs. At the Maseno worksite, research staff from different sub-projects regularly discuss their work schedules and coordinate their activities.

However, not all sub-projects are equally involved in these informal but necessary procedures, and there is no agreed operational framework that requires or provides for collaboration between disciplines. More specifically, there is lacking:

1. A statement of program objective or of specific program outputs;
2. A strategy for achieving program objectives expressed in terms of tasks to be undertaken in phased sequence;

3. A comprehensive understanding of the contributions to be made by each sub-project, their form and date by which they are required and how they are to be used;
4. Systematic provision for reviewing program strategy and timetable, for adaptive management of the program and for the involvement of PI's inputs, support and commitment to necessary changes.

While there is collaborative interchange between parts and clusters of PIs, this does not amount to the unified team approach in pursuit of program objectives which is vital by this stage if a unified output is to be expected.

That integration is less effective than required is largely because the SR-CRSP has not been structured to ensure effective integration. No one has the authority to speak for the program overall or the responsibility and authority to ensure adaptive program management. Yet, as the program proceeds, the findings of the sub-projects require decisions to be made about research directions and work program priorities. In addition, it is noted that:

- PIs have no incentive to guard programmatic goals, only incentives to ensure individual outputs.
- The ME devotes most of its time to fiscal management; it does not exercise the central program direction that is required of it.

- The BIR appears to safeguard the interests of the individual institutions, but speaks only weakly when it comes to ensuring successful program outcome.
- The MLD has not expressed its expectations of the program in firm, clear or concrete terms, or in ways that lead to single minded pursuit of objectives.

Though constraints on integration are to be found throughout the decision-making mechanism of the SR-CRSP, the PIs are the key to integration, since it is their individual outputs which need to be forged into a programmatic output. The Integration Workshop was designed to engage the PIs and, giving explicit recognition and understanding of their perspectives to encourage them to become a team committed to the pursuit of program objectives, rather than separate sub-project goals.

### 3.0 Integration Workshop Goals

More explicitly, the goals and approach of the workshop are set down in the consultants' scope of work as:

- "...development of an integration process which can incorporate all current research disciplines and provide for goal focused activities."

- "...to engage CRSP participants in a dialogue in which research plans are examined in relation to the project objective, and the needs of individual PIs."
- "...so far as possible...to secure agreement on how to proceed and commitment to agreed action."
- "...to initiate a process that leads to integration through:
  - improved definition of shared program goals;
  - improved understanding of the contributors of each of the project components;
  - commitment of the specific responsibilities to be undertaken by each project;
  - respect for and understanding of the particular professional and institutional goals of PIs and the institutions they represent;
  - improved provision for synthesizing research outputs so as to develop production system packages acceptable to farmers."

#### 4.0 The Kenya PIs Integration Workshop

##### 4.1 The Concept and Design of the Workshop

DDA was charged with the responsibility of designing and orchestrating the workshop. Pre-workshop activities involved:

- a comprehensive survey of project reports evaluations, minutes of meetings and seminars, and such technical reports as were available;
- in person discussions with Drs. Robinson and Weir (Management Entity), Drs. DeBoer and Fitzhugh (Principal Investigators), Dr. Chema (MLD, Kenya), and Dr. Russo (expatriate researcher, resident in Kenya);
- telephone discussions with Drs. DeBoer, Cartwright, Fitzhugh, McGuire, and Nolan, as PIs for the Kenya project; Dr. Chema, as Site Coordinator and as representing the MLD for the Government of Kenya;

These led to the conception of a workshop pursuing the following lines of inquiry:

- a. into the specific nature of desired program outputs;
- b. into the nature and adequacy of past and intended research and training activities for securing these;
- c. into the nature of the management provisions needed to secure coordination and integration of activities and outputs.

The detailed provision for integration of work at field level was not to be addressed. This was expected to follow the establishment of an integrating management framework.

The attempt should be made to catalyse the formation of a PI team with a clear commitment to produce an integrated output and with clear and effective procedures, authority and responsibility. The workshop

was intended to initiate a process which, being sustained, would provide a mechanism for continuous integration.

The content of workshop discussion was to be specific. Generalized discussions on "the meaning of integration" or "program goals" were to be avoided. The role of the external consultants was seen as catalytic rather than technical-advisory.

#### 4.2 Workshop Highlights and Accomplishments

At the opening of the workshop, it was postulated that there was a shared responsibility for decision making by the PIs for program direction. The reaction to this indicated clear recognition that responsibility could not be accepted without authority; that authority could not practically be vested in all PIs and that the field workers should also be party to planning discussions. The discussion also revealed lack of clarity, and accord on program goals except at a most general and non-specific level.

The discussion proceeded to examine where the program was, where it was going, and what was felt to be still lacking for the achievement of program goals. This raised questions about program goals, and there was acceptance of the idea that the program should, briefly stated, (a) develop a new or improved dual purpose goat technology package: a system of goat production for intensive smallholdings and a strategy for introducing this to smallholders; (b) support MLD in building Kenyan capability for inter-disciplinary applied research into mixed farming systems. From this basis, an appraisal of the present state of the program produced expressions which conveyed a sense of: "Sure, things could be better, but generally, what is

necessary is being done." Nevertheless, a number of specific gaps or weaknesses were identified. Among them, an inadequate provision, to date, for an animal health component was most conspicuous, but there were also queries about several other aspects. Above all, the possibility was raised that there may not be a system of goat production suitable for integrating into smallholding farming systems in Maseno and Kakamega.

These concerns brought the discussion back to questions about how the program should be managed, and how these concerns should be addressed, which raised again questions about the adequacy of the management structure and procedures for dealing with them, as well as about the roles of PIs and field investigators.

Instead of pursuing these directly at the start of the second day, time was taken to assess the likely program outcome and performance if things continued as they were. The general tone of the discussion on this theme was, "We shall be able to say that we have done our best." But there were doubts and some cynicism: "We shall define success so that we can't fail." The doubts included doubts that the program will have initiated an on-going process of productive applied research that will be sustained in Kenya; doubts that packages will be designed within the span of the program which will be validated as practical and acceptable; doubts that it will be possible to say clearly that dual purpose goats don't work if that conclusion emerges; doubts that the scientific rejection of the "dual purpose goat" hypothesis would be seen as a satisfactory result of the research; doubts that there really will be anything to offer farmers; doubts that team members will share turf and credits and accept the

risks of team work, necessary for effective program performance; doubts that the outcome of the program will enhance the reputation of interdisciplinary applied research.

Under the weight of these doubts and concerns, the workshop recognised the need to assign responsibility (1) for ensuring program direction; and (2) for packaging the overall program output.

The Production Systems sub-project was seen by the PIs as the logical "packager", and in principle, the PI for that project (Dr. H. A. Fitzhugh) was willing to accept that role.

Two fundamental problems were faced at this point. First, it was evident that the "packager" would have to bear the responsibility for what went into the package, so as to ensure the adequacy of content in relation to its intended use. The problem faced on this issue was that the present structure of the SR-CRSP does not provide for the packager having authority that is commensurate with this responsibility. Without any such authority, the packager would be at a loss if a particular input from another sub-project was needed, and the PI for that sub-project was unwilling to provide it.

There was no willingness by PIs to relinquish control over their Kenya funds to the team leader. However, PIs did recognize and declare that their sub-project activities should be subordinate to those arising from pursuit of program goals. The PIs' commitment to this principle was formalised by a declaration by each PI of his preparedness to step aside from his involvement in the Kenya project, should he prove unwilling to make the inputs required and collaborate under the leadership agreed, in developing the output "package."

The Production Systems PI also agreed to step aside and be replaced if the consensus of the PIs team was that his leadership stood in the way of successful delivery of the program package.

The second problem which was faced arose out of PIs' (or their team members') need for publishable research results to meet their own institutions requirements. A PI could feel reasonably assured of such output so long as he pursued an independent definition of his research approach and agenda. But working as a member of a team of PIs, dedicated to developing a "package" output, publishable material may be a less assured product of the work. On this question, resolution of these problems was critical to making further progress, and both were tackled head on. Concerning the conflict between each PI's private agenda and the integrated program agenda, each PI in turn declared that he was able and willing to accept the risk of fewer publishable results, in the interests of working as part of a team to develop the "package." Each PI qualified himself for working as a team member to produce a team output, by disclaiming over-riding legitimate private needs.

In the final session of the workshop, the PI team was invited to retire to reach consensus on the terms of reference of the team leader, in particular on what authority he would have. This task was not brought to satisfactory completion, though the team did find agreement in principle on several issues. There was also agreement on a proposal to hire a coordinator with research supervisory and communications responsibilities for the Kenya site.

The final task undertaken by the PI team was to outline an agenda of tasks and procedures and action required for addressing these.

They were joined by the ME and MLD in discussion of the agenda and arrangement of the February 1983 meeting planned to take place in Kenya and critical to the further planning and management of the program.

#### 4.3 Reflections by Workshop Participants

All participants were contacted by telephone after the meeting and asked for their reflections on what had been achieved. Without exception, all were positive about the outcome of the workshop, though it was recognized that the ultimate test of its success would be how the project developed.

Among the first comments offered by most people were expressions about personal interaction at the workshop: how this had been positive and frank, and how it had helped people to gain an understanding of one another's positions. Enthusiasm and optimism were expressed for the program's future, but always recognizing the need for sustained goodwill and commitment. People were generally comfortable with the new working arrangements and were waiting to see how they performed.

A number of issues were seen as critical:

- the proposed appointment of a field coordinator was seen to be a major step forward (though it was hoped that this would not weaken the production systems project effort);
- the February 1983 planning meetings were seen as critical--the workplans resulting from this should show evidence of relating to explicit goals and to be integrated as a coherent program overall

(though there was concern that there might be inadequate pre-planning to bring them together);

- there was concern that, while a major step had been taken on agreement of program goals, these were not yet set down sufficiently explicitly to provide the focus for workplans: there was need for a statement (a "manifesto") which defined the overall work strategy and the contributions of the various projects;
- the support of the MLD was critical to the effective working of the new arrangements.

Overall, the workshop was judged to have made considerable progress; more progress than was thought likely or possible by most participants and, in the opinion of some, as much as possible given the structure of the CRSP.

The role of the consultants was assessed favorably. There was recognition that only outside consultants could have played the role that they did. One participant likened them to "father confessors"; another described them as "very, very effective in conducting the meeting and getting the really important points out"; yet another described the workshop, and the consultants' management of it, as a "unique" and "very interesting personal and professional experience." Two participants felt that such workshops would be worthwhile on other [CRSP] sites in future.

#### 4.4 Follow-up Activities.

A significant step forward was taken in the workshop when PIs subscribed to common objectives and agreed to work as a team towards

these. The agreement reached was on an important matter of principle. However, there is a need still to specify in concrete terms the intended outputs of the program--the outputs which will constitute the achievement of the program objectives. These should be developed by the PIs.

The PIs team should further establish the performance criteria by which it wishes to be judged and by which it can assess its own progress and assure others of its effectiveness.

Prior tasks for the PIs, however, are:

- a. to establish clearly the Team Leaders terms of reference with respect to the group as a whole.
- b. establish the modus operandi of the group, including how it meets, its lines of communication, its workplan and schedule.

Soon, too, it should develop a phased workplan which defines the sequence of outputs from project activities and what needs to be done when they are received. As reports are prepared on, say, fodder or the analysis of economic implications of integrating goats into existing farming systems decisions will need to be taken about the direction of new work. Unless what is learned from these studies can modify the direction of future enquiry, it will prove to have been of no significance. Yet new directions should not be determined by each project separately: they should be determined by the team, systematically, in relation to program goals.

As projects' specific contributions to program outputs are defined, they will need to be clearly understood and adhered to. It

will be an important function of the team leader to ensure that there is clear understanding and commitment. The team leader will need to watch for signs that the projects are behind time or off-track and bring these to the consideration of the team.

## 5.0 Recommendations

Understandably, the emphasis of the SR-CRSP in Kenya in its early years has been to establish effective research programs for each of the sub-projects involved. The MLD, the ME, the PIs, and the EEP have bent their efforts to this end. This concern has withdrawn attention however, from safeguarding the program output overall. At this stage of the project in Kenya, it is now vital that full responsibility for this be exercised. The PIs, on whom least contractual responsibility for this falls, have shown in the workshop their willingness to aim for a program goal. This now requires backup from the other components of the SR-CRSP corpus, the ME, EEP, and MLD.

We are aware that each of these entities has voiced concern for integration over the years, but this has rarely been translated into terms which generate or strengthen an integrating process. The following recommendations are designed to help correct this situation.

- a. The ME should acknowledge and accept responsibility for overall program output and central program direction, as laid down in the Grant Agreement between USAID and the University of California, Davis.

This should involve, at least:

1. insistence on the project leading to a unified output. This will require that program goals are specified at a level of detail that leads to operational decisions.
  2. providing resources (management expertise, funds, etc.) to PI teams to facilitate their efforts towards clearly specified program goals. In particular, when critical decisions can be speeded by granting extra resources for meetings etc., the ME should be responsive where possible.
- b. The ME's approach to management by consensus could usefully be enlarged to include building of consensus. This will require it to have a view of what the program output should be, and in terms that lead to helping other parts of the SR-CRSP body take essential managerial decisions.
- c. The ME and MLD should jointly nurture the newly established PIs group, by monitoring its progress so that assistance can be offered when problems are encountered.

They should also make appropriate demands. They should especially demand and assist with the amplification of program objectives and of the specific outputs designed to achieve these. They should press for:

- o program performance criteria;
- o effective statements of the commitments of projects to supplying program inputs;
- o a coherent statement of the overall research strategy which (a) provides the rationale for the workplan, (b) indicates how workplan activities cumulate in a sequence of description, analysis, design, and testing, and (c) reveals how biological perspectives are integrated into forming sub-system perspectives thence into whole farm and wider social perspectives.

It should also be concerned that the research program should be conducted in ways which support the development of sustained Kenyan research activity in this field.

In this last respect, the MLD needs to strengthen its own action to institutionalize the ongoing Kenyan research capability that the CRSP is designed to support. If there is nothing to support, the program cannot succeed in this objective.

- d. The MLD must resist the temptation to require diverse outputs from project resources, even though it may see good use for them in other areas of its portfolio. The primary object of the project in Kenya (--development of an improved goat production system package--) that was established firmly in the workshop should be adhered to, and secondary objectives, should be managed in ways that do not detract from the primary aim.

- e. The EEP, comprising a group of technical experts, cannot be expected to provide the ME with guidance on program management so as to secure an integrated output. Whilst they have frequently shown awareness of the integration difficulty, their comments have been statements of the problem which did not readily translate into management action. It is recommended that an expert in program management be added to the EEP at the earliest opportunity. The added cost of this will be more than compensated for by the savings from more focused efforts.

## 6.0 Appendix

### 6.1 Workshop Arrangements

The Kenya SR-CRSP Integration Workshop was held at Winrock International, Morrilton, Arkansas, on Friday and Saturday, December 10-11, 1982. The workshop was conducted in five 3-4 hour sessions. Those present included:

#### Workshop Facilitators

R. D. Blond	(Development Design Associates)
J. L. Joy	(Development Design Associates)

#### Principal Investigators

J. DeBoer	(Winrock)
T. Cartwright	(Texas A&M)
H. Fitzhugh	(Winrock)
T. McGuire	(Washington State)
M. Nolan	(Missouri)

#### Site Coordinator

S. Chema	(Ministry of Livestock Development)
----------	-------------------------------------

#### Management Entity

D. W. Robinson	(UC Davis)
W. C. Weir	(UC Davis)

Observers

C. W. Haines (USAID/Washington)  
R. Naliaka (ME, Kenya Worksite)  
S. Russo (Winrock Research Staff, Maseno)

6.2 Abbreviations

PI Principal Investigator  
ME Management Entity  
BIR Board of Institutional Representatives  
MLD Ministry of Livestock Development (Kenya)  
USAID US Agency for International Development  
EEP External Evaluation Panel