
Guidelines for Monitoring and Evaluation of Knowledge Sharing Networks and Communities

May 2012

Prepared by Nadejda Loumbeva and Gauri Salokhe

We are very much grateful to Max Blanck, Lisa Cespedes, Marina Cherbonnier, Renata Mirulla, Laurence MoraPalumbo, Michael Riggs, John Ruane and Massimiliano Terzini for their contributions which led to the assembly of this guide.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

1. Prior to Designing the Monitoring and Evaluation Exercise

Prior to planning and carrying out the monitoring and evaluation of your knowledge sharing network/community, take time to contextualise it. Ask yourself these questions:

- Why do I need to monitor and evaluate my network/community? What do I aim to achieve from this exercise? Who and what will benefit?
- Who is the target audience of the monitoring and evaluation results? What are the target audience information needs? How much do they already know about networks/communities? How committed are they to my network/community?
- What are the aims and objectives of my network/community, and how does that affect the design of the monitoring and evaluation metrics?
- How does the network/community focus on brokering of partnerships among stakeholders, one of the key goals of FAO? What metrics will I use to monitor and evaluate for this?
- What resources are available for carrying out the monitoring and evaluation? How frequently can I realistically do it versus how frequently would it be appropriate to do it? How does the frequency affect the design of the monitoring and evaluation metrics?
- Was similar exercise carried out before for your network/community or other networks/communities in the Organization? What were the tools/techniques used as well as lessons learned? Has the network/community been monitored since the beginning? If not, what would be the tools/techniques needed to gather as much as possible from past performance/activities.

In addition, and as you answer the above questions, keep in mind knowledge sharing networks/communities are all different from one another. Some are external (i.e., involving stakeholders outside of the Organization), some are internal (i.e., involving stakeholders only within FAO), some are predominantly face-to-face, and some are predominantly online, not to mention the large array of topics all of them focus on. All of these inevitably affect the design of your monitoring and evaluation exercise.

In other words, and as you consider the guidelines that follow below, adapt these guidelines to the particular context and specific needs of your network/community. In this way, you will ensure the outputs of the monitoring and evaluation exercise are of most value to you and any other concerned stakeholders.

2. How to Design the Monitoring and Evaluation Exercise

You can do the design and planning of the monitoring and evaluation of your network/community in four major steps. These are:

- **Define the characteristics** of your network/community progress against which you will measure. These should be as concrete and tangible as possible. A suggested mix of characteristics follows in the table below. You can pick and choose the ones that are most relevant to your network/community, and add in new ones in order to contextualise the exercise for your own and stakeholders' needs.
- **Define the indicators** you will use to measure progress alongside each already defined characteristic.
- **Define the tools and methods** you will use to gather qualitative and quantitative data for each indicator.
- **Define your baseline indicators.** Once you have defined the above, take a moment to define your baseline indicators. These are the very minimum of performance you would expect on each indicator. For example, if you choose to measure the number of documents that are posted on an online platform in a month's time, you may determine that the very minimum you would expect is 10. Therefore, 10 is your baseline for this indicator. Baselines should be specific to each network/community and reviewed at regular intervals.

Below follows a table summarizing a set of possible characteristics, indicators, and tools and methods for measurement. The framing of those is left deliberately general and unspecific in order to leave room for adaptation and contextualisation.

Characteristic of the Network/Community	Indicator(s) Via which to Measure Progress	Tools/Techniques for Gathering Data
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of what has been achieved to influence the formulation of policies and actions of FAO and FAO partners • Quantity and quality of discussion summaries, policy briefs, reports, papers and other knowledge products taken into account in the formulation of policies and actions of FAO and FAO partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After Action Review • Anecdotal Information • Appreciative Inquiry • Desk Reviews • Focus Groups • Interviews and Observations • Questionnaires, Surveys and Checklists • Storytelling and Case Studies
Achievement of the network/community goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of action plan • Quantity and quality of people trained, aware, and reacting according with the network/community goals • Quantity and quality of discussion summaries, policy briefs, reports, papers and other knowledge products produced by the network/community • Quantity and quality of views and downloads of content from the online network/community Web site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After Action Review • Anecdotal Information • Appreciative Inquiry • Desk Reviews • Focus Groups • Interviews and Observations • Questionnaires, Surveys and Checklists • Storytelling and Case Studies
Return on investment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost of online vs. face-to-face training/events on specific topics • Savings in travel costs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Reviews

Usefulness of network/community information/discussions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of satisfaction with information available via the network/community Website and discussions • Quantity and quality of quotations of network/community content by FAO donors, partners and colleagues • Relevance and quality of discussions/content • Level/degree of subscription to different types of content provided (Newsletter, Blogs section, RSS feeds, etc.) • Online activity around clusters of content 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After Action Review • Anecdotal Information • Appreciative Inquiry • Desk Reviews • Focus Groups • Interviews and Observations • Log File Analysis • Questionnaires, Surveys and Checklists • Storytelling and Case Studies
Membership diversity and geographic coverage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Belonging of members to target audience/group, in terms of countries, region, domain of work, age, gender 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Reviews • Questionnaires, Surveys and Checklists
Membership growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demand for area covered by the network/community • Quantity and quality of new members/growth and increase of the network/community • People joining and leaving the network/community every month • Quantity and quality of referrals (i.e., "pick up'-s) on the web, in emails, person to person 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After Action Review • Anecdotal Information • Appreciative Inquiry • Desk Reviews • Focus Groups • Interviews and Observations • Log File Analysis • Net Promoter Score • Questionnaires, Surveys and Checklists • Storytelling and Case Studies • SWOT Analysis
Network/community accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ways in which potential members learn about the network/community • Platform (Web site, Online Group, etc.) accessibility and usability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After Action Review • Anecdotal Information • Appreciative Inquiry • Focus Groups • Interviews and Observations • Questionnaires, Surveys and Checklists • Storytelling and Case Studies
Interaction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantity and quality of posts/messages • Quantity and quality of comments • Quantity and quality of contributors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Reviews
Networking effect of community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantity and quality of opportunities gained due to network/community participation; • Quantity and quality of requests for connection/networking 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After Action Review • Anecdotal Information • Appreciative Inquiry • Interviews and Observations • Questionnaires, Surveys and Checklists • Storytelling and Case Studies
Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantity and quality of suggestions for topics and activities by the members • Quantity and quality of suggestions taken on board • Quantity and quality of members running the network/community • Return visits (visit frequency, visit length) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Reviews • Log File Analysis

Innovation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beneficial change in products/processes • Innovation(s) emerging from the actions and learning of the network/community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After Action Review • Anecdotal Information • Appreciative Inquiry • Focus Groups • Interviews and Observations • Questionnaires, Surveys and Checklists • Storytelling and Case Studies
------------	--	--

3. Techniques and Tools

Here are short descriptions of the techniques and tools provided in the above table.

- **After Action Review**

After Action Review is an approach that seeks to evaluate what has been going well, what hasn't been going so well and what should be improved in a project or task, in this case a network/community.

- **Anecdotal Information**

Anecdotal information is information not based on facts or careful study. The approach seeks to capture opinions about the network/community that do not stem from careful research. The approach adds value to understanding and interpreting data provided by other more rigorous tools and techniques. In M&E of networks/communities, it can add value to the information provided by any other M&E approaches and techniques.

- **Appreciative Inquiry**

Appreciative Inquiry is a technique that focuses on discovering and evaluating the positive, creative and catalytic aspects of a project/initiative. It involves guiding a group of or individual participants through a set of questions seeking to uncover what has worked, what may be, what would be ideal to happen and how to make it happen.

- **Desk Reviews**

Desk Reviews are carried out to study and investigate issues by reviewing information about them. This information may be found on the Internet, in a database, and/or it may also exist only on paper and be in a library.

- **Focus Groups**

Focus Groups are facilitated group discussions during which questions aimed at focusing the discussion on specific issues are asked.

- **Interviews and Observations**

Interviews seek to uncover aspects about a project/initiative by asking a series of questions to people who are involved with it. They can be structured and semi-structured. Structured interviews adhere to pre-defined sequence of questions, whereas semi-structured allow freedom and flexibility to the pre-defined sequence.

- **Log File Analysis**

Log file analysis is a form of Desk Review. It is usually supported by software that parses a log file from a web server, and based on the values contained in the log file, derives information about who visits the Web server, when and for how long. Usually the reports are generated from the log files immediately, but the log files can alternatively be parsed to a database and reports generated on demand. Log file analysis is useful to establish the number of network/community Webs site visits, by whom, when, etc. It helps to inform us about the interest and usefulness of different aspects of the network/community online space and infer about the network/community member interests and learning motivation. In the case of FAO, the two tools used for monitoring of web usage statistics are Google Analytics and Awstats.

- **Net Promoter Score**

Net Promoter Score is a technique that seeks to uncover how well the Network/community has been doing and how satisfied Network/community members are with it. The technique asks a number of questions to Network/community members which aim to uncover member satisfaction, such as:

How likely is it that you would recommend the network/community to a colleague?

How likely is it that your manager would recommend the network/community to other staff?

Responses to the questions are situated on a dimension. The average score along each question dimension sums up the progress and performance of the network/community on the indicator addressed by the question.¹

- **Questionnaires, Surveys and Checklists**

Questionnaires, surveys and checklists are useful for gathering numerical data by collecting answers to questions. Because of the relative ease with which they are distributed, they are particularly useful for gathering data from large groups of people.

- **Social Network Analysis**

Social Network Analysis is a technique that identifies the connections and connectedness among people within network/community. More information is available at: <http://www.kstoolkit.org/Social+Network+Analysis>

- **Storytelling and Case Studies**

Storytelling and case studies seek to compellingly describe progress, success, failure and evolution within a project/initiative. Storytelling and case studies can bring together a number of otherwise isolated qualitative and quantitative metrics and thus help to understand their significance and meaning.

- **SWOT Analysis**

SWOT Analysis is a method via which strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of an initiative (such as network/community) are captured and evaluated.

4. References

FAO Director-General Bulletin, 2012/08:

http://intranet.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/FAO_Communications/dgb/DGb12_08.pdf

“Lurker Demographics: Counting the Silent”, by Nonecke and Preece, CHI’ 00, 2000:

<http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?doid=332040.332409>

“M&E” (Unit 9, Lesson 4), Building Electronic Communities and Networks Module, Information Management Resource Kit (IMARK), FAO 2007 http://www.imarkgroup.org/moduledescription_en.asp?id=10#content

“Net Promoter Score”, Anecdote http://www.anecdote.com.au/archives/2009/02/assessing_the_h.html

“Next Generation Network Evaluation”, Innovations for Scaling Impact and Keystone Accountability, June 2010

http://www.scalingimpact.net/files/IDRC_Network_IPARL_Paper_Final_0.pdf

“KS Toolkit”, a joint initiative of CGIAR ICT-KM Program, FAO, KM4Dev, UNICEF and UNDP:

<http://www.kstoolkit.org/KS+Methods>

¹ More information about the Net Promoter Score approach is here:

http://www.anecdote.com.au/archives/2009/02/assessing_the_h.html

Annex A: Sample Questionnaire from Biotechnology Forum
[\(http://www.fao.org/biotech/biotech-forum/forum-home/en/\)](http://www.fao.org/biotech/biotech-forum/forum-home/en/)

Biotechnology PAIA Stakeholder Survey

As part of an overall strategy of enhancing interdisciplinarity within FAO, a number of Priority Areas for Interdisciplinary Action (PAIAs) were identified. Biotechnology is one of these PAIAs and your views on the Biotechnology PAIA activities would be greatly appreciated.

1. What is your full name and title? (optional)					
2. What is your country of residence?					
3. In what area of activity are you working? (more than one box can be X'd)					
Administration					
Research					
Education					
NGO					
Producer					
Other					
4. How often do you consult the following materials on the web (www.fao.org/biotech/index.asp)?					
	Never	One to several times a year	Monthly	Weekly	Daily
a. FAO Biotechnology website					
b. FAO Biotechnology Glossary					
c. FAO-BioDeC database on biotechnology products/techniques					
d. FAO-BiotechNews webpages					
e. FAO Biotechnology Forum					
f. FAO Statement on Biotechnology					
5. What are the major problems encountered in consulting the material in www.fao.org/biotech/index.asp ?					
No problems					
Slow internet connections					
Relevant material is difficult to locate					
Language problems					
Too little time					
Other problems (specify)					
6. How often do you consult the following e-mail materials?					
	Never	One to several times a year	Monthly	Weekly	Daily
a. FAO-BiotechNews newsletter (in any of its languages)					
b. FAO Biotechnology Forum (e-mail messages, background or summary documents)					
7. How often do you consult the following books in hardcopy?					
	Never	One to several times a year	Monthly	Weekly	Daily

a. FAO Biotechnology Glossary (in any of its languages)					
b. FAO-BioDeC publication (Dhlamini et al, 2005)					
c. FAO Biotechnology Forum publication (Ruane & Zimmermann, 2001)					
8. Is the information included in questions 4, 6, and 7 your primary source of information on biotechnology?					
	No	Mostly	Yes	No opinion	
9. How often do you consult the following non-PAIA publications?					
	Never	One to several times a year	Monthly	Weekly	Daily
a. "Agricultural Biotechnology: will it help?" (2003, part of FAO's on-line "Focus on the Issues" series)					
b. The 2003/2004 edition of the FAO publication <i>The State of Food and Agriculture: Agricultural Biotechnology: meeting the needs of the poor?</i>					
c. "Preliminary review of biotechnology in forestry, including genetic modification" (2005, FAO Forest Genetic Resources Working Paper 59)					
10. What is your overall assessment of the information supplied by the biotechnology PAIA?					
	No	Mostly	Yes	No opinion	
Useful					
Credible					
Science-based					
Relevant to developing country needs					
Easily available					
Easily understood					
Up-to-date					
11. Impacts of the PAIA information on biotechnology					
	No	Sometimes	Yes	No opinion	
a. Has the information created better awareness of issues of biotechnology in your organization?					
b. Has the information created better awareness of issues of biotechnology in your country?					
c. Have you passed on the information to others who lack direct access to it?					
d. Has the information encouraged new partnerships among colleagues in your organization?					
e. Has the information encouraged new partnerships among colleagues in your country?					
f. Has the information encouraged new partnerships with colleagues in other countries?					
g. Do you think the information has affected policy-making in your country?					
h. If the information had any other practical impacts, let us know in your response to us					
12. Please suggest some improvements that could be made by FAO to provide better information on agricultural biotechnology.					
THANK YOU!					

Annex B: Sample Questionnaire from Food Security and Nutrition Forum
(<http://km.fao.org/fsn/>)



FSN Survey for participants

- Why did you join the FSN-Forum?

- Out of personal interest
- To gain knowledge on a particular issue
- To find help with a problem
- To network
- To influence the global FS debate

- How do you rate the topics discussed

- Very relevant
- Relevant
- Mixed
- Irrelevant

- How do you rate the level of the contributions?

- Advanced
- Moderate
- Mixed
- Low

- When do you actively participate in a discussion?

- Whenever I am interested in the issue
- Whenever I am an expert in the issue tackled
- Whenever I read an interesting contribution
- Never

- For what did you find the discussions useful?

- Personal interest
- Study

- Work
- No useful
- Please specify

▪ How do you prefer to take part in a discussion?

- Web based forum
- Mailing list

▪ Regarding your FSN Forum user profile, please let us know with which statements do you agree most

- I regularly read the topics and contributions
- I only read when the subject is related to my work or interest
- I find it handy to receive everything through my email account
- I receive too many emails from the Forum
- The web based forum should play a bigger role

▪ Being a Member of the FSN Forum helped you

- Gain a deeper knowledge and understanding of Food Security issues
- Improve your capacities to find solutions
- Get in touch with experts
- Nothing of the above

▪ Would you like to share a particular experience you had involving the Forum?

▪ How often do you visit the Forum's homepage?

- Often
- Seldom
- Only for registration

▪ What would you like to find on the Forum's homepage?

- An introduction to the discussions
- A web based online forum
- Background documents to the topics discussed
- News related to Food Security
- Documents and case studies related to Food Security
- Information on fellow Members
- Other (please specify)

▪ How do you access the Forum's web site and emails?

- Internet cafe
- Home computer
- Office computer
- Dial-up modem
- cable modem/ADSL
- Mobile connectivity
- Other type of connectivity

- If you could make one improvement to the FSN Forum what would it be?

.....

Annex C: Sample Questionnaire from Food Security and Nutrition Forum (<http://km.fao.org/fsn/>)



FSN Survey for facilitators

- Expectations: please let us know if the discussion met or not your expectations.
- Learning and knowledge sharing: has the online discussion offered you learning opportunities and have you been using / will you be using the outcomes in your work?
- Level of contributions: how do you rate the level of contributions, considering relevance to the topic, quality, variety, originality etc.?
- Drawbacks: please tell us what the drawbacks have been under any aspect of the Forum discussion (organisation / workload etc.).
- Added value: overall, what would you indicate as the added value of the discussion?
- Do you think you will be using the Forum in the future?
- How would you rate the Forum experience overall? (Excellent, Good Average, Disappointing)

Annex D: Sample monthly report from e-Agriculture Community (<http://www.e-agriculture.org/>)



<p>WEBSITE TRAFFIC</p> <p>Website visits</p> <p>Unique visits</p> <p>Pageviews</p> <p>Avg. Pages/Visit</p> <p>MEMBERS & VISITORS</p> <p>Membership</p> <p>Avg. visit duration</p> <p>New visits</p> <p>Returning visitors</p>	<p>KLOUT</p> <p>KLOUT Score</p> <p><i>(Scale is 1-100)</i></p> <p>e-Ag is influential about 17 topics</p> <p>Development, Africa, United Nations, Blogging, Activism, Agriculture, Technology, Community, Food, Smartphones, Kenya, magic, Facebook, Ethiopia, Gender, Management, China, Sustainability, climate change, social media.</p> <p>True Reach</p> <p>True Reach: number of people you influence, both within your immediate network & across their extended network</p>
<p>SOCIAL MEDIA</p> <p>Tweets</p> <p>Twitter Followers</p> <p>Twitter Retweets</p> <p>Facebook posts</p> <p>Facebook Likes</p> <p>Facebook Unlikes</p> <p>LinkedIn group members.....</p> <p>LinkedIn posts</p> <p>Delicious- Followed by</p> <p>Delicious bookmarks</p> <p>YouTube videos</p> <p>YouTube views</p> <p>YouTube subscribers</p> <p>TOP BROWSERS/ NUMBER OF VISITS</p> <p>1) Chrome</p> <p>2) Firefox</p> <p>3) IE</p> <p>4) Safari.....</p> <p>5) Mozilla.....</p>	<p>TOP CONTENT</p> <p>1) Homepage</p> <p>2) Key Topic: Mobile telephony in rural areas</p> <p>3) Key Topic: Agricultural value chains</p> <p>4) Knowledge Base</p> <p>5) Current forum page</p> <p>6) News item: Upcoming scholarship M.A in ICT4D</p> <p>7) Forum from Dec. " Strengthening Ag. Marketing.."</p> <p>8) Key Topic: BRDD</p> <p>9) Members page</p> <p>10) m.facebook.com ('mobile Facebook')</p> <p>REFERRALS</p> <p>1) t.co</p> <p>2) facebook.com</p> <p>3) paper.li</p> <p>4) 36ohk6dgmcd1n-c.c.yom.mail.yahoo.net</p> <p>5) LinkedIn</p> <p>6) Agrifeeds.org</p> <p>7) ictdev.org</p> <p>8) guardian.co.uk (They mentioned us!)</p> <p>9) Stumbleupon.com</p> <p>10) mfacebook</p> <p>TOP COUNTRIES/ NUMBER OF VISITS</p> <p>1) U.S</p> <p>2) India.....</p> <p>3) Italy.....</p> <p>4) U.K.....</p> <p>5) Australia</p> <p>6) France.....</p> <p>7) Colombia.....</p> <p>8) Kenya</p> <p>9) Nigeria</p> <p>10) Spain</p>

Annex E: Sample report from Young Professionals' Platform on Agricultural Research for Development (YPARD) Website/Community (<http://ypard.net/>)



Registrations

Number and gender of members

We count 1958 members' profiles end of January 2012, against 1 300 profiles middle of 2010 and 1 700 in January 2011. There were 1744 profiles in April 2011, before the creation of the Web and Communications officer position. Hence, we count 258 new subscriptions in 2011, including 1.6 times more registration from April (17% of new subscriptions in 3 months before April and 83% after April in 9 month). It makes it to an average of 1 subscription per working day from April (the traffic during the week-ends is few).

On a total number of 1958 members' profiles, 501 are female and 1146 are male. Note that 311 members didn't specify their gender.

We also register 3801 *subscriptions* (process of registering on the website, may it be followed by the creation of a profile or not) and therefore a gap of 1843 profiles. This might be due to the fact that people have not updated their registration when the website migrated and/or a failure in registering. This should be paid much attention in the future.

1876 members have chosen to receive the e-mailing by YPARD (near 96%).

How events impact on YPARD members number growing (on the website and social networks) should be more closely monitored.

Visits

Number of visits

We observe 687 visits in March 2011 against 2557 visits in January 2012. We note a drastic pick from March to May, a culminate point in July (2640) and a number of visits maintained above around 2200 visits from that time.

Analyze/ hypothesis:

- The creation of the Web and Communication position end of March seems to have supported the increased number of visitors.
- The pick in July might have been facilitated by the online event organized with e-agriculture from beginning of June. This series of blogs on "ICT, youth and agriculture" was run on e-agriculture website but might have increased YPARD visibility.

The number of **new visitors** follows approximately the same progress as the number of visits. In June, when the total number of visits is lower, the number of new visits is however higher (59% of new visitors against an average of around 50% of new visitors the other months). This shows a quasi constant increase of new visits from March to July.

The number of returning visitors has followed the same pick up from March to July but with a gap in June. The number has being constant between July and December but is promisingly going up in January.

Location

YPARD website visibility has covered **159 countries** in 2011.

End of 2010, views were mainly from India, Germany, the Netherlands and Italy. **Italy** shows now the most views followed by India and **Kenya** which battle from end of 2011 for the 2nd place. Kenya was in 2010 the 6th country with the most views. **United States and the Netherlands show increased views from end of 2011. Germany and Ghana** are then still following, from beginning of 2011. There are increasing views and particularly increasing new views in **Nigeria and Uganda**, from April. **Views in Ethiopia and South Africa proportionally slow down.**

Hypothesis: YPARD presences at the GCHERA in June 2011 and at the World Food Prize in November 2011 was the opportunity to meet many Americans. YPARD Web and Communications intern from September is a very active citizen from the Netherlands.

Considering continents, YPARD visibility is the highest in Africa (eastern Africa, with Kenya mainly and Uganda, the western Africa, with main presence in Nigeria and Ghana), then Europe (western) and Asia (south asia, with great presence in India). Visibility is limited in LAC, which illustrates considerations to provide more efforts to make YPARD more visible in South and Central America.

Pages the most viewed

Pages the most viewed besides the home page and register/login page are:

- The page of YPARD members: 3562 ; 2150 unique views.
- Job opportunities: 1817 unique views and funding: 1613 unique views on 2372+2243 total views
- information about who is YPARD : 1269 views; 887 unique views (line 9 from the table)

We could assume from this that YPARD seen as a community of people is fundamental.

The information services, particularly focused on giving opportunities are of great value. From April, there are more views on funding than on jobs. This might be due to the season proper to funding and due to the fact that we have more funding offers than jobs announcements.

There are more visits on the forum space (in comparison to other news), which shows the relevance of carrying on with more interaction on the website and the organization of on-line events.

Key words

Even though key words of research are not particularly significant, they might show the current matters: "Farming matters", "YPARD ASIA", "mentoring". YPARD itself is the main key word of research.

Views from external sources

Facebook, mailing and LinkedIn are the main doors to YPARD Website.

Ypard.net has been also viewed via the website of different other organizations; this shows the relevance of partnering and particularly organizing events/activities together for increasing YPARD visibility:

- ardyis has automatic links to YPARD website on its blog
 - e-agriculture is a close partner with which we organized online events ,and YPARD can publish directly on their platform
 - ACTS, our partner for the mapping training in Kenya has also driven views on YPARD website
- Follow agrinatura, agrtrain, vit, ring.ciard. aaa.africa, lct-km, to only site the first ones.

SOCIAL NETWORK PLATFORMS

YPARD channels through Facebook followed by LinkedIn and then by Twitter are generating traffic on the website. From January to middle of August 2011, we have 1482 visits from Facebook (501 in August), 421 from

LinkedIn (212 in August), 109 from Twitter (95 in August). A social media strong strategy will be implemented in April to boost these numbers.

YPARD is regularly active on these channels: every time a new article: news, event, or jobs is posted on the website.

Twitter

YPARD on twitter went from 36 followers on 10 April 2011 to 98 followers in 31 August and 182 in January 2012. (41 tweets, 358 tweets, 783 tweets)

Facebook

YPARD Facebook corporate page went from 3 “like” in April 28 to 71 “like” in August 31, in 5 months, 134 “like” in January, with more and more contribution: likes on post, comments, direct posting by individuals or partners, people talking about it.

YPARD has also a FB group: 17 members in April; 51 members in January

LinkedIn

YPARD LinkedIn group has shown from 43 members in 28 April to 124 members in August 31 and 279 members in January 2012. Comments and posts are also going increasingly. Posting of people expressing to be glad to belong to this group somehow confirms the assumption that YPARD members need to feel like belonging to a community: the human and social aspects are important.