



# Improving Productivity & Market Success of Ethiopian Farmers

Report on introduction to research and development for innovative  
extension systems

May 23-25, 2005



Canadian International  
Development Agency

Agence canadienne de  
développement international



በኢትዮጵያ ፌዴራላዊ ዲሞክራሲያዊ ሪፑብሊክ  
የግብርናና ገበያ ልማት ሚኒስቴር  
Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia  
MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND  
RURAL DEVELOPMENT

## Workshop summary

A workshop on extension system innovations was organized by the IPMS project from May 23 to 25 at the EARO campus in Addis. The workshop was facilitated by resource persons from IFPRI/ISNAR and ILRI theme 2. A comprehensive set of source materials were prepared by these partners for this workshop (see Annex 1 for an outline of the source material)<sup>1</sup>. The workshop was attended by Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MoARD) extension and TVET staff from the Federal level, heads of extension from four Regional States (Tigray, Amhara, Oromia and SNNPRS), woreda agricultural and extension staff from 8 Pilot Learning Sites and project staff (see annex 2 for the list of participants).

The workshop objectives were:

- Familiarize workshop participants with the challenges of the R&D systems and changing paradigms
- Familiarize workshop participants with the changing role and challenges of the extension system
- Familiarize workshop participants with components of innovative extension approaches i.e. methods, group formation and management, tools, participatory monitoring and evaluation
- Familiarize workshop participants with process monitoring:
- Propose innovative extension approaches to be tested in the IPMS project

A detailed program was developed to achieve these objectives (see Annex 3). On the first day, the scene was set for understanding the need for change in research and development -- in particular extension. Presentations were made on the existing extension system in Ethiopia and on the evolution of the research and extension systems world-wide was provided based on source material provided. These sessions were also useful to clarify some emerging concepts for extension innovation including innovation systems, agri food chain, and value-added production.

The workshop then moved into sessions for gaining knowledge on particular aspects of innovation systems including extension models/approaches, group formation and management and use of participatory tools and approaches. The four Regions and PLS had been sent source materials for each of the aforementioned topics in order to prepare themselves for presentations during the workshop. Monday afternoon was used by each Regional group to prepare the presentations and each group gave these presentations to the plenary on Tuesday. The sessions were useful in that they enabled the participants to share experiences on the existing systems. Participants emphasized that changes in the existing system should be based on a proper analysis of the perceived deficiencies in the current system. With regard to potential future models/approaches, most workshop participants agreed that a participatory extension approach would be desired. An important lesson for group formation and management was that the more successful groups were based on social and/or economic functions. Many of the externally facilitated groups lacked such focus which may hamper development and create dependency. The source material on the participatory tools and approaches was found to be rather complicated by most of the workshop participants. Dr Ananda explained that this was partly due to the fact that the tools and approaches had evolved over time and differences were therefore not always

---

<sup>1</sup> The source materials could be accessed in <http://www.ipms-ethiopia.org/docs/other-reports.htm>

clear. Furthermore, the fact that several uncoordinated “actors” had been involved in the development of tools and approaches, it had sometimes resulted in overlaps between some of the tools and approaches. It was further explained that the objective of presenting the participants with the source materials was to let the practitioners decide which approaches make sense and which tools are relevant in their specific situations, instead of giving a “recipe approach/method”. Given the fact that the role of extension will also involve linking the various “actors” i.e. producers, service providers, agribusiness etc, the actor analysis and tools were important to be considered for the extension service.

On the third day of the workshop, the IPMS knowledge management expert explained the project’s strategy for developing a knowledge management system linked to the extension system. It clarified some of the concepts used in knowledge management and the various activities i.e. identification of knowledge needs, creation of knowledge, storing of knowledge, sharing of knowledge and the use of knowledge that will need to be carried out during the implementation of the KM component of the project. Workshops, starting at the Federal level will be held to initiate the knowledge management activities of the Ministry in general and in support of the PLS activities in particular. Participants expressed great interest in the subject matter and realized the need for it. It was noted that at the Federal level, there are existing initiatives at the Ministry such as Business Process Reengineering (BPR), civil service reform and associated change management processes and that care should be taken to incorporate the knowledge management activities into this overall framework.

This session was followed by an overview of progress and process monitoring and evaluation, including participatory M&E and impact assessment. Considerable discussion took place on the terminology used and the project’s own results based management framework (PMF). The project staff explained that the survey instruments for the project monitoring had been tested and would be applied in all PLS in order to prepare a baseline. Some of the data collection will make use of participatory approaches, while other will be based on formal surveys. It is expected that the official project monitoring will be complemented by regular community based participatory monitoring and assessment of technologies and input and output marketing innovations. In the PLS, such monitoring is expected to become an integral part of the program of work of the development agents and subject matter specialists.

The last sessions on the third day was used to create a common understanding amongst the participants regarding the development of an innovative extension system, followed by an explanation of the tools for actors analysis and an example of process monitoring. Each of the Regions and the Federal participants were requested to prepare a statement on the present and desired (vision) status of the extension system by the end of the project. Although there was some confusion on the terms used, most groups made similar observations on the present and desired status of the extension institution. Frequently mentioned aspects were: increased participation, knowledge transfer rather than package transfer, reduced involvement of the extension system in input supply system, demand driven instead of supply driven. Some of the groups also highlighted the need for a more pluralistic extension system. Such pluralism may be created by encouraging private sector partners and cooperatives, which are involved in marketing of high value commodities to also build the capacity of the small scale producers in the

production of such commodities. Similarly, private and cooperative suppliers of inputs may also be engaged in providing technical advice on the use of such inputs to the producers.

It is envisaged that the now emerging Farmer Training Centers (FTC), will form the centre for these innovations. One general feeling of the participants was that we should start with the current system and gradually and selectively graft the desirable features of other approaches to address the deficiencies of the existing system i.e. should build on the existing system rather than trying to replace it.

The role IPMS can play in the overall strategy to reach the desired state was also discussed. Besides calling on research and development partners to provide the necessary technical assistance and knowledge on specific technical issues, the project will also assist in the capacity building of the public sector as well as empower farmer and agri-businesses to become development partners. Funds are also available for demonstration and training materials as well for some farmer experimentation. The project staff did however emphasize that the project was not a capacity building project per se; rather the capacity building takes place within the framework of experimentation with innovations complementing the selected learning events. It is hoped that the lessons learned from the PLS on extension innovations will be used by the MoARD to scale out to other districts.

Considerable debate arose over the integration of the project activities in the activities of the MoARD in the PLS. While it was acknowledged that the overall strategy of the MoARD is similar to that of the IPMS project, i.e. development and implementation of a market oriented agricultural development strategy, the extension approaches used may vary and the staff in the PLS require room to maneuver in order to experiment with innovations. Participants agreed that advocacy work is required at the regional and district level to convince decision makers on the need of such experimentation.

Process monitoring was illustrated on the basis of a plenary evaluation of the processes used during the workshop. In general participants' expectations were met with the workshop delivery; however several comments were received to improve the workshop process including use of case studies to illustrate concepts, adjustment of source material to reflect the level of workshop participants, more source material in particular on process monitoring, more time for presentations and discussions. The use of working groups to present basic concepts from the source materials was appreciated. Federal level participation in the discussions was found to be insufficient.

In the workshop summary at the end, it was emphasized that the workshop emphasis had been on providing knowledge to the participants rather than blue prints for change. Discussions will now take place in the Regions and PLS to determine the innovations which may be introduced and tested based on the specific needs of each PLS. The workshop participants will reconvene again in 8 months time to discuss the innovations and the experiences gained. This process of action learning will be continuous during the life of the project.

Attached to this summary report are also Annexes 4 and 5. These deal with the Region/Woreda experiences with different extension models/approaches and discussion session on current and future extension systems and the role of IPMS, respectively.

## **Annex 1. Source material for the workshop on introduction to research and development for innovative extension systems**

### **Chapter 1 ..... (Under preparation)**

- 1.1: Innovation systems perspective to agricultural research and development
- 1.2: Agri-food chain/value chain
- 1.3: Research for Development Continuum
- 1.4: Networks and Partnerships

### **Chapter 2..... (Draft)**

#### **Chapter 2 Past, present and future of extension service**

##### **2.1. Introduction**

##### **2.2. Historical Evolution of Agricultural Extension**

- 2.2.1 Introduction
- 2.2.2 Pre-independence:
- 2.2.3 Immediate post independence late 1950's and 1960's
- 2.2.4 Extension in the 1970s
- 2.2.5 Extension in the 1980s
- 2.2.6 Extension in the 1990
- 2.2.7 Current Scenario: Diversity in extension service provision and Institutional Pluralism

##### **2.3. Generic Problems and Approaches to address them**

- 2.3.1 Introduction
- 2.3.2. Generic problems of Extension
- 2.3.3. Overcoming Generic Problems – Experience and Promise

##### **2.4. Factors of success in knowledge/technology dissemination process**

- 2.4.1 Participation and empowerment of farmers and communities
- 2.4.2 Linkage between groups/institutions
- 2.4.3 Innovative learning and communication
- 2.4.4 Policy and political influence

##### **2.5. Factors affecting clients' access to extension services**

##### **2.6. Changed Role of Extension Agents**

- 2.6.1 Introduction
- 2.6.2. Extension Reform Strategies
- 2.6.3. New roles for extension in the new approach to extension
- 2.6.4. New roles of public sector extension

##### **2.7. Emerging Challenges and opportunities**

##### **2.8. The Future of extension services**

**Chapter 3..... (Draft)**

**Chapter 3 Extension Models and Approaches**

**3.1 Introduction**

**3.2 Extension Models**

- 3.2.1 Technology Transfer Model
- 3.2.2 Farming Systems/Participatory Methods
- 3.2.3 Participatory Extension Approach (PEA)
- 3.2.4 Innovative Linkage models

**3.3 Extension Approaches**

- 3.3.1 The Individual /Household Approach
- 3.3.2 The Group Approach
- 3.3.3 Mass media Method

**3.4 From Government owned research and extension to innovation systems**

**Chapter 4 ..... (Draft)**

**4.1 Introduction**

- 4.1.1 Why Focus On Groups
- 4.1.2 What is a Group?
- 4.1.3 Importance of Groups
- 4.1.4 Characteristics of Groups
- 4.1.5 Group Dynamics
- 4.1.6 Group Composition
- 4.1.7 Group Size and Participation
- 4.1.8 Classification of Groups
- 4.1.9 Research and development groups

**4.2 Group formation and development**

- 4.2.1 Formation of Externally Facilitated Groups
- 4.2.2 Stages of Group Development
- 4.2.3 Problems Encountered During Group Formation

**4.3 Group management**

- 4.3.1 Developing a Group Vision
- 4.3.2 Formulation of Group Goals and Objectives
- 4.3.3 Developing Work Plans
- 4.3.4 The Group Constitution and By-Laws
- 4.3.5 Organizational Structure of Groups
- 4.3.6 Leadership
- 4.3.7 Group Members Types and Roles
- 4.3.8 Group Members Profiles
- 4.3.9 Meetings

#### **4.4 Planning and implementation of group activities**

- 4.4.1 Planning
- 4.4.2 Implementation
- 4.4.3 Resources
- 4.4.4 Common Reasons for Activity Failure

#### **4.5 Group performance**

- 4.5.1 Groups Performance
- 4.5.2 Group Cohesion and Motivation
- 4.5.3 Conflicts and Conflict Management

#### **4.6 Farmer groups in extension**

- 4.6.1 Role of Farmer Groups in Extension
- 4.6.2 Lessons learned in farmer groups

### **Chapter 5..... (Draft)**

#### **Chapter 5 Tools and approaches for participatory research and development**

##### **5.1 Introduction to participatory approaches**

- 5.1.1 Participation and Participatory
- 5.1.2 Pros and Cons of Participation
- 5.1.3 Evolution of Participatory Approaches

##### **5.2 Toolkits**

- 5.2.1 Semi structured interview
- 5.2.2 Key informant survey
- 5.2.3 Formal/verification survey
- 5.2.4 Community interview
- 5.2.5 Focus group interview/discussion
- 5.2.6 Ranking
- 5.2.7 Diagrams
- 5.2.8 Maps
- 5.2.9 Trends/calendars

##### **5.3 Gender analyses**

- 5.3.1 Activity Profile
- 5.3.2 Access and control profile
- 5.3.3 Influencing factors profile

##### **5.4 Stakeholder analyses**

- 5.4.1 Introduction
- 5.4.2 Stakeholder Analysis Matrix (SAM)
- 5.4.3 Ownership Assessment Grid
- 5.4.4 Opportunities and limitation

##### **5.5 Actor linkage analysis**

- 5.5.1 Actor Linkage Map
- 5.5.2 Actor Linkage Matrix (ALM)
- 5.5.3 Actor Determinant Diagram
- 5.5.4 Actor Time Lines
- 5.5.5 Actor Learning and Response Analysis
- 5.5.6 Actor Tools and transaction costs (Biggs and Matsuert, 2004)

- 5.6 Participatory assessment and planning (PAP)**
  - 5.6.1 What is PAP?
  - 5.6.2 Processes involved in PAP
- 5.7 Participatory learning and action (PLA)**
  - 5.7.1 Introduction
  - 5.7.2 Concepts and Principles
  - 5.7.3 Techniques
- 5.8 Participatory farm management methods (PEM)**
  - 5.8.1 Introduction
  - 5.8.2 Rationale
- 5.9 Participatory rural communication appraisal (PRCA)**
  - 5.9.1 Introduction
  - 5.9.2 PRCA and conventional development communications methods
  - 5.9.3 Implementing PRCA
  - 5.9.4 Community Profile
  - 5.9.5 Needs , opportunities, problems and solutions (NOPS)
  - 5.9.6 Interaction Groups
  - 5.9.7 Information and communication resources and networks
  - 5.9.8 Indicators
- 5.10 Rapid appraisal of agricultural knowledge systems (RAAKS)**
  - 5.10.1 Introduction
  - 5.10.2. Principles
  - 5.10.3. Implementation
  - 5.10.4. Outputs

**Chapter 6..... (Draft)**

**6.1. Monitoring, Evaluation, and Impact Assessment**

- 6.1.1 Introduction
- 6.1.2 Monitoring
- 6.1.3 Evaluation
- 6.1.4 Types of Evaluation
- 6.1.5 Impact Chain
- 6.1.6 Types of Impact
- 6.1.7 Overview of Impact Assessment Methods
- 6.1.8 Multi-Criteria Analysis

**6.2 Participatory Evaluation**

- 6.2.1 Introduction
- 6.2.2 Functions of participatory evaluation
- 6.2.3 Key characteristics of a participatory evaluation
- 6.2.4 Participatory evaluation and conventional evaluation
- 6.2.5 Collaborative Evaluation Approach
- 6.2.6 Steps in participatory evaluation
- 6.2.7 Characteristics of an evaluator/facilitator

6.2.8 Group Dynamics

6.2.9 Measurement and Assessment of PM&E Indicators

6.2.10 Challenges for PM&E

### **6.3 Participatory Impact Monitoring (PIM)**

6.3.1 Introduction

6.3.2 Definition and Objectives of PIM

6.3.3 Key Elements in PIM

6.3.4 The Special Features of PIM

6.3.5 Steps in PIM

6.3.6 Limitations of PIM

### **6.4 Process Monitoring**

6.4.1 Key feature of Process Monitoring

6.4.2 Key steps in Process Monitoring

6.4.3 Developing Process Monitoring Indicators

## Annex 2. List of participants on extension training

No.	Name/Area Alamata	Position/title	Institution
1	Aynekulu Teklay	WALC Chair	Office of Agriculture and Rural Development
2	Gidey Redae	Head	Office of Agriculture and Rural Development
	<b>Atsbi</b>		
3	Ketsela Fisseha		Office of Agriculture and Rural Development
4	Hailay Berhane	Head	Office of Agriculture
	<b>Fogera</b>		
5	Debre Kassa	Team Leader	Extension
6	Ayehu Zerihun	Head	Woreda Office of Agriculture and Rural Development
	<b>Dale</b>		
7	Dr. Kebede Kanchula	Head	Rural Development Coordination Bureau
8	Futessa Shaga	WALC Chair	Rural Development Coordination Main Office
9	Admassu Mamo	Head	Dale Woreda Agriculture and Natural Resource Office
	<b>Alaba</b>		
10	Temesgen Kedir	WALC Chair	Head, Rural Development Coordination Office
11	Rahmato Negash	Head	Agricultural & Natural Resource Development Office
	<b>Ada'a</b>		
12	Assefa Diribssa	WALC Chair	Coordinator Agricultural and Rural Development Office
13	Bekele Soboka	Head	Agronomy & Extension Department
	<b>Metema</b>		
14	Mezgebu Tegegne	WALC Chair	Office of Agriculture and Rural Development
15	Daniel Tadesse	Head	Extension
	<b>Mieso</b>		
16	Sintayehu Shiferaw, Ato	WALC Chair	Office of Pastoralist and Rural Development
17	Aynalem Berhanu, W/o	Team Leader	Extension
	<b>MoARD.</b>		
18	Melaku Jirata	Team Leader	Dryland Agriculture
19	Berhane Gidey	Senior Expert	Technical and Vocational Training
20	Girma Tessema	Senior Expert	Project Formulation and Evaluation
21	Gashaw Geda	Team Leader	Curriculum development & Program Supervisor
22	Gashaw Shibabaw	Senior Expert	Plant Science Curriculum Development
23	Wubshiet Alemayehu	Senior Expert	Farm Machinery Curriculum Development
24	Asfaw Mengistu	Senior Expert	Cooperatives
25	Alemayehu Shishigu	Senior Expert	Extension Training
	<b>Regions</b>		
26	Abera Gebreamlak	Head	Regional Extension Department, Tigray
27	Haji Birru	Head	Regional Extension Department, Oromiya
28	Adebabay Mengist	D/Head	Bureau of Agriculture and Rural Development, Amhara
29	Sebsibe Teklu	Head	Extension & Technology Dissemination, SNNPR
	<b>ILRI</b>		
30	Jeroen Dijkman,	Director	Theme 2, Enabling innovation
31	Dirk Hoekstra	Project Manager	Improving Productivity and Market Success (IPMS) of Ethiopian Farmers project
32	Azage Tegegne		“ “ “
33	Berhanu Gebremedhin	Policy/institutions Analyst	“ “ “

34	Ermias Sehai	Knowledge Management Expert	“	“	“
35	Abebe Misgina	Senior Research Technologist	“	“	“
36	Kahsay Berhe	Senior Research Technologist	“	“	“
37	Noah Kebede	Research Officer (GIS)	“	“	“
38	Aklilu Bogale		“	“	“
39	Yirgalem Assegid	Research and Development Officer (RDO)	“	“	“
40	Nigatu Alemayehu	RDO	“	“	“
41	Worku Teka	RDO	“	“	“
42	Gebremedhin Woldewahid	RDO	“	“	“
43	Ketma Yilma	RDO	“	“	“
44	Gebreyohannes Berhane	RDO	“	“	“
45	Abebe Shiferaw	RDO	“	“	“
46	Zewdu Ayele	RDO	“	“	“
	<b>IFPRI/ISNAR</b>				
47	Ponniah Anandajayasekeram				
48	Sinidu Workneh	Research Officer			

## **Annex 3. Workshop program on introduction to research and development for innovative extension systems**

**Venue:** Ethiopian Agricultural Research Organization (EARO), Small Auditorium  
**Date:** May 23-25, 2005

### **Workshop objectives:**

1. Familiarize workshop participants with the challenges of the R&D systems and changing paradigms
2. Familiarize workshop participants with the changing role and challenges of the extension system
3. Familiarize workshop participants with components of innovative extension approaches i.e: methods, group formation and management, tools, participatory monitoring and evaluation
4. Familiarize workshop participants with process monitoring:
5. Propose innovative extension approaches to be tested in the IPMS project

There will be four regional working groups, one from each region, and one group from the Federal Ministry of Agriculture: Each group will discuss and present issues based on resource materials, Chapters 3, 4 and 5, which were provided earlier:

### **Instruction:**

#### **1 Extension models/approaches**

Read the source material in chapter 3 and prepare a 15 minute presentation (one per region) covering:

- The region/Woredas experience with the different extension models/approaches
- What models/approaches would be useful in your region/Woreda, why and how to introduce it

#### **2 Group formation and management**

Read the source material in chapter 4 and prepare posters/flip chart (one per region) covering

- The regions/Woredas experience with groups including formation and management
- How groups approaches can be used in your region/Woreda, why and how to introduce it

#### **3 Participatory tools and approaches**

Read the source material in chapter 5 (excluding section 5:9 and 5:10) and prepare 15 minute presentation covering:

- The region/Woreda experience with the tools and participatory approaches
- What methods of the toolkit and approaches can be used in your region/Woreda, why and how to introduce it

### **Note:**

Source materials were forwarded to workshop participants before the start of the workshop:

*May 23, 2005*

<b>Time</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>
08:30 - 09:00	Arrival and registration of participants	
	Chairperson: Secretary	Ato Gashaw Geda Ato Abebe Misgina
09:00 - 09:15	Welcome and introduction	Ato Ebrahim Mohammed, Head, MoARD Extension and TVET Department
09:15 – 09:45	Introduction to IPMS and its extension component	Dirk Hoekstra
09:45 – 10:00	Introduction to the workshop	Ananda Ponniah
10:00 – 10:30	Introduction to the existing extension system	Ato Ebrahim Mohammed, Head, MoARD Extension and TVET Department
10:30 - 11:00	Coffee/tea break	
	Chairperson: Secretary	Ato Adebabay Mengistu Ato Worku Teka
11:00 – 12:30	Presentation and discussion on the challenges of the R&D systems and changing paradigms	Ananda Ponniah
12:30 – 13:30	Lunch	
	Chairperson: Secretary	Ato Adebabay Mengistu Ato Ketema Yilma
13:30 – 14:30	Presentation and discussion on changing/new roles and challenges of the extension system	Ananda Ponniah
14:30 –on wards with coffee/tea break	WG discussion and preparation presentations based on resource materials - extension models/approaches - groups formation and management - tools and participatory approaches	4 Regional working groups and 1 Federal Ministry of Agriculture working group

*May 24, 2005*

<b>Time</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>
	Chairperson: Secretary	Dr: Gebremedhin Woldewahid Ato Abera Gebreamlak
08:30 – 10:30	WG presentations and discussions on extension models/approaches	4 WGs, plus discussants from MoARD and IPMS
10:30 – 11:00	Coffee/tea break	
	Chairperson: Secretary	Ato Abera Gebreamlak Dr: Gebreyohanes Berhane
11:00 – 13:00	Poster presentations by WGs and discussions on group formation and management	4 WGs plus discussants from MoARD and IPMS
13:00 - 14:00	Lunch	
	Chairperson: Secretary:	Ato Haji Biru Ato Negatu Alemayehu
14:00 – 17:30 With coffee tea break	WG presentations and discussions on the tools and approaches for participatory research and development	4 WGs plus discussants from MoARD and IPMS

*May 25, 2005*

<b>Time</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>
	Chairperson: Secretary:	Ato Melaku Jirata Ato Yirgalem Asegid
08:45 – 09:45	Presentation and discussion on IPMS knowledge management strategy/approach	Ato Ermias Sehai
	Chairperson Secretary:	Dr: Berhanu Gebremedhin Ato Zewdu Ayele
09:45 – 10:30	Introduction to Participatory M&E	Dr. Ananda
10:30-10:45	Coffee/tea	
	Chairperson: Secretary:	Dr: Azage Tegegne Ato Abebe Shiferaw
10:45 – 12:00	Discussion session on experimentation with extension approaches in the IPMS project including the setting of targets	Dr. Jeroen Dijkman
12:00 – 13:30	Lunch	
13:30 – 15:30	Discussion session on experimentation and process monitoring – including current workshop process	Dr. Jeroen Dijkman
15:30 – 16:00	Coffee/tea	
17:30 – 17:45	Summary and closing	Dirk Hoekstra

## **Annex 4. Region/Woreda experiences with different extension models/approaches**

### **4.1 Amhara Region**

Three models were identified

#### **1. Training and visit**

- ◆ It was implemented in the region starting from 1989-1994 EC
- ◆ 1 DA was served for 800-1000 farmers
- ◆ 48 farmers were visited at fortnight
- ◆ DA's center was service cooperatives
- ◆ It was donor driven extension system

#### **Objectives**

- ◆ To meet the PADEP project objectives
- ◆ To increase production and productivity
- ◆ To promote cash crop production

#### **Organization**

- ◆ Subject matter specialists (SMS) established at Region, Zone and woreda level
- ◆ Extension supervisors assisted 7-10 DA posts
- ◆ DA cantered at service cooperatives level
- ◆ DA select contact farmers and Technologies were demonstrated to these farmers with the assumption of technology adoption by copy farmers
- ◆ Research and extension linkage Committee were functional

#### **Methods**

- ◆ Technologies were promoted through individuals and DAs provide training on technologies and appropriate practise and visited by the DA for their successful implementation
- ◆ Group approaches were also used and implemented through demonstration, field days and group discussion

#### **Strength of the T&V model**

- ◆ Clear line of command
- ◆ Capacity was built at all levels (Region experts to Farmers) through training
- ◆ REL was better

#### **Weakness**

- ◆ Top down approach
- ◆ Less flexibility
- ◆ Limited technologies were transferred
- ◆ Not gender sensitive

## **2. PADETES**

- ◆ Large demonstration site were used
- ◆ It is a package approach
- ◆ Include livestock and forestry
- ◆ 1DA Conduct 60 demonstration sites
- ◆ Intensive training for SMS, supervisors DAs and for farmers
- ◆ It was commodity approach (Maize, poultry etc)

### **Organization**

- ◆ SMS at different level
- ◆ Farmers organized in different groups based on commodity (Tef group, Maize group etc) there were 1-5 farmers in one group
- ◆ One farmer is a leader to demonstrate technologies and practices while others copy

### **Method**

- ◆ It follows group farmers method

### **Strength**

- ◆ Increased production and productivity
- ◆ Access for inputs improved
- ◆ Improve problem solving capacity by learning
- ◆ The role of extension workers was facilitation
- ◆ Participate all wealth group HH in the community

### **Weaknesses**

- ◆ The emphasis is given for increasing production and has poor market orientation (out put oriented not impact oriented)
- ◆ Unmanageable when the number of demonstration sites increased from time to time
- ◆ Does not consider the resource base of farmers
- ◆ Lack of adoption for some technologies
- ◆ Poor linkage between research and extension

## **3. Training and Advisory extension service**

- ◆ Establishment of FTC
- ◆ 3 DAs specialized in 3 different disciplines (Crop, Livestock and NRM) are assigned at Kebele level
- ◆ Provision of training for 6 months for farmers with outlined curriculum
- ◆ Two approaches were used

### **1. HH package (1DA for 50 HH)**

- Base line data is collected on status of the HH status
- Business plan that improve the livelihood of the HH will be developed
- Analysis will be made on over all enterprise mix

- Technologies and practises will be provided that improve the livelihood of the HH
- The achievements will be evaluated against the pre steted goals

## **2. Minimum package**

- Provision of Advise in all spectrum of production for large group of HHs (30-40)
- Sub groups constituting 5-7 HHs also organized
- FHHs, youth groups also form a group separately

### **Strength**

- ◆ Emphasis is given for smallholders
- ◆ Farmers involved based on their interest
- ◆ Farmers are consulted on the plan
- ◆ Address women (verbally)
- ◆ Agents are multidisciplinary and assigned at Kebele level

### **Weakness**

- ◆ Top dawn approach
- ◆ Poor M & E
- ◆ Gap between Research and Development

## **Chosen Extension model**

### **Participatory Extension approach**

#### **(Why the approach is chosen)**

It integrates community mobilization for planning and action with rural development, agricultural extension and research

It is based on equal partnership between farmers, researchers and extension agents who can learn from each other and contribute their knowledge and skill

It aims to strengthen rural people's problem solving planning and management abilities

It promotes farmers' capacity to adopt and develop new and appropriate technologies/innovations

It encourages farmers to learn through experimentation building on their knowledge and practices and blending them with new ideas. It is action reflection or action learning

It recognizes that communities are not homogeneous but consist various social groups with conflicts and differences in interests, power and capabilities. Each group then make collective decisions and also provide opportunities to negotiate between groups

**(HOW)** The Participatory extension model can be introduced through

- ◆ Through awareness creation to all stakeholders
- ◆ Identification of interested group
- ◆ By selecting model kebeles or target group

## **II. Group formation and management**

### **Past experience in group formation**

During T & V Farmers were organized in 8 groups according to their proximity

In the PADETES approach farmers were organized in different groups based on commodity (Tef group, Maize group etc) there were 1-5 farmers in one group

Currently (with training and advisory service), farmers are organized in a group of HHs (30-40)

Sub groups constituting 5-7 HHs also organized

Female HHs, also form a group separately

Groups are not formed based on the interest but on the interest of the outsider

Groups are not formed following all the procedures of group formation

Groups formed have no vision and goals

Group leaders are appointees

There is no action planning

Top down approach/ group formation is not demand driven

Many groups are formed and difficult to be reached by facilitators

### **Conclusion**

Not sustainable

Difficult to manage

Less efficient and productive

Not problem solving

Create conflicts among group members

### **Group formation can be introduced through**

- ◆ After conducting need assessment survey
- ◆ Identification of target group (Based on common interest and social setting age, gender, wealth etc)
- ◆ Awareness creation about the purpose of grouping
- ◆ Follow the step by step procedure on methods of group formation
- ◆ Facilitating group formation and management

- ◆ Empowering group members on group management
  - ◆ Demonstrating problem solving technologies
- III. Participatory tools and approaches

#### Past experience

- Participatory Rural appraisal (PRA) in connection with the FINIDA project, IPMS
- Rapid rural appraisal common in GO's
- LLPPA in relation to NRM

#### **Chosen tool**

#### **Participatory learning and Action**

#### **Rationale**

- The doer is the farmer himself which is in line with the current extension approach of training and advisory
- It comprises other tools such as PRA tools, Stakeholder analysis, gender analysis
- It involves M & E that allows to review and rank emerging issues the intern helps for CAP.
- Farmers are keen and highly interested to learn from action
-

## 4.2 Tigray Region (1991-2005)

### Extension models/approaches

#### Existing models

#### Model 1: Transfer of Technology (ToT)

##### Extension cases

1. Pond construction
2. Water delivery technologies
3. Soil and water conservation

##### Extension approaches

Approaches	2002	2003	2004	2005
Advice	√	√	√	√
Demonstration	√	√	√	√
Training	√	√	√	√
Field day	√	√	√	√
Mass media	√	√	√	√

##### Usefulness of the model

Cases	2002	2003	2004	2005
Pond (number)	0	†	†	11,345
Use of water delivery tech. (number)	Low	†	†	Very high
SWC	Low (Cropland)	†	†	All land uses

##### Why?

Moisture stress areas

Unreliable amount & distribution of rainfall

#### Model 2: Farming Systems

##### Extension cases

1. Improved bee management
2. Improved dairy cows & Poultry management
3. Crop production  
(variety & management)

## Extension approaches

Approaches	2002	2003	2004	2005
Advice	√	√	√	√
Demonstration	√	√	√	√
Training	√	√	√	√
Field day	√	√	√	√
Mass media	√	√	√	√

## Usefulness of the model

Cases	2002	2003	2004	2005
Improved bee management	Low	†	†	5,115
Improved dairy cows	Low	†	†	Very high
Improved poultry production	Low	†	†	Very high
Crop production	Low	†	†	Very high

Why?

1. Increased production and contribute to food security.
2. Increased income generation.

## Recommended Model: Pluralistic/Participatory

Why?

### Participatory

Various stakeholders can participate

Different sources can be used

Spatial coverage can be increased

Many beneficiaries could be covered

## II. Group formation and Management: Tigray experience

### Group formation and management

Group	Formation	Major function	Other Function	Composition	Size
Religious	Religious factor	Multiple	Information	All	NL
Debri	>>	>>	>>	adult	>>
Tsebel	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>
Funeral	>>	Funeral ceremony	>>	>>	>>
Saving & credit	Self motivated	Economic	>>	HH	>>
Livestock herding	>>	Resource Mgmt	Extension	F&M	>>
Group	Formation	Major function	Other Function	Composition	Size
Harvesting Weeding	Self motivated	Self motivated	extension	F&M	NL
Water users	Self motive & external	>>	>>	>>	NL
HH ext. input purchasing	External facilitator	>>	>>	>>	NL
Credit collateral	>>	Extension	>>	>>	> 3
Model farmers	>>	>>	>>	>>	30-35
Dairy group	>>	Market	>>		NL

Group formation useful?

Yes

Why?

### III. Tools and approaches to participatory R & D: Tigray experience

#### Participatory methods and experience in Tigray

Participatory method	Toolkits	Areas of application
Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA)	Review, interview observation, informants, focus groups, ranking, etc.	Strategic plan & package preparation
Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA)	The same	SWC, Strategic plan & package preparation
PRA & Planning	The same	SWC, Strategic plan & package preparation
Participatory Assessment & Planning (PAP)	The same	SWC & seedling establishment
Participatory Learning & Action (PLA)	The same	Bee keeping, dairy, poultry & crop production
Participatory Impact Monitoring & Evaluation	The same	Not used
Participatory Farm Management Methods	The same	Household package
Participatory method	Useful?	Why?
Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA)	Yes	Save time & resources
Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA)	Yes	Community participation & on time decision
Participatory Rural Appraisal & Planning	Yes	Diagnosis and planning
Participatory Assessment & Planning (PAP)	Yes	Diagnosis and planning
Participatory Learning & Action (PLA)	Yes	Diagnosis, planning & implementation
Participatory Impact Monitoring & Evaluation	Not tested	
Participatory Farm Management Methods	Yes	Planning in farm & households

Participatory in R & D useful?

Why?

Other activities

1. Gender analysis
2. Stakeholder analysis
3. Actor linkage analysis

## **4.3 SNNPRS**

### **I. Experience with different extension models**

#### **Introduction**

The common features of extension system in the region is that planning process is top-down approach, evaluation and monitoring is not participatory, flow of information is unidirectional. There are 5 extension models implemented in the region. The models are: Technology Transfer Model, Commodity extension model, Training and extension model, Pluralistic model of extension and Participatory extension system.

#### **Description of models used in the region**

##### **Technology transfer model**

In this model technologies are generated at research stations and diffused to farmers using extension agents. Introduction of technology is not participatory. This approach focuses on better-endowed and progressive farmers. The diversity and type of technologies generated were very few with little degree of adoption and diffusion.

##### **1. Commodity extension**

This extension system was mainly introduced and delivered by the former Ministry of Coffee and Tea Development. The service focuses on coffee and tea production and marketing improvement. The clientele are coffee growers and the over all process is top-down approach.

##### **2. Training and visit extension model**

This system has regular training and visit program. Researchers train subject matter specialists (SMS) on quarterly bases and the SMS intern train DAs on monthly bases. The DAs in tern pass information through regular visit schedules using group approach. One DA is allocated to 1300-1800 farmers for "potential or surplus producing woredas" and to 1800-2600 farmers in non-surplus producing woredas. Farmers are organized in to group as contact farmers. Each contact farmer has 25 to 30 follower farmers. The system uses single line command making each extension worker accountable to its organization, hindering any external interference. The approach avoids duplication of effort. Extension workers are not allowed to be involved in credit provision and collection tax and loan.

##### **3. Pluralistic model of extension**

In the region, the extension service is given by different agencies including: Bureau of Agriculture and Natural Resource, Cooperative Promotion Bureau, Non Governmental Organizations and Research Centers.

Bureau of Agriculture and Natural Resource deals with crop and livestock improvement, natural resource development, working on soil and water conservation, forest management, and wild life management. Cooperative Promotion Bureau deals with group formation, establishment of cooperatives, agricultural marketing improvement. Non-Governmental Organizations take part in various sectors. In agriculture sector, NGOs deals with all sorts of commodity. Most of them use integrated rural development approach. Research centers are involved in provision of information to farmers using on farm and adaptive trials.

#### **4. Farmer participatory approach**

The regional government is using extension system called "Participatory Demonstration and Extension System, PADETS". The main components of the system are Participation (involving of farmers in planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation) Demonstration ( a tool for interaction of researchers, extension worker and farmers interact) and Training (capacity building scheme for farmers and extension agent)

Conceptually, in this extension system there is emphasis of diverse linkages among partners (researchers, NGOs, input suppliers, credit providers and farmers). However, in practice this is not the case. The system is suffering from lack of implementation mechanisms.

#### **Proposed extension model for the region**

The group has decided to suggest model for the region after undertaking thorough study. It can be realized that each model has a useful ingredient or element in it. But as a whole, participatory extension model is preferred because of the following reasons:

- Community based extension and joint learning is central issue

- There is equal partnership between farmers, researchers, extension agents and other partners

- It is focused on solving problem of rural people.

- It build capacity of farmers to develop and adopt new appropriate technology

- It recognizes the diversity of community

- The system emphasis participatory facilitation and role of extension agents

## **II. Experience with group formation and management**

### **Introduction**

There are informal (traditional) groups organized and managed according to set of rules in the region. Traditional groups include Idir, Debo, Geza (for house construction), Mishilla in Alaba Special woreda (for butter use/ sharing during holidays), Wujo in Dale woreda (Milk groups). Groups like Debo, Mishilla Irrigation and water users group, sericulture groups and pond construction groups can be described as *agricultural groups*. Formal groups have also long history in the region, as cooperative establishment begins since the time of Derge regime. There are groups formed by NGOs, Micro finance Institute as saving and credit groups or associations.

### **Group formation**

Group formation is mostly motivated from outsiders (Externally facilitated). Group formation is lengthy process (difficult due to requirements and steps) and often takes time. Group management is self managed but with high external input even in some traditional groups. External input begins from drafting group vision and mission to setting objectives, plan and bylaws and organizational structure.

During group formation cooperatives desk and woreda sector office staff is involved. Woreda sector office staff over see the group committee, prepare business plan undertakes socioeconomic survey and support committee in fund raising and other issue. Although there is variation in steps followed, the typical steps to be followed in group formation are: Initiation from staff/farmers (conception of idea and mobilization of members), awareness creation, registration (birth of group, setting of goal and objectives), resource mobilization (securing fund, developing operational guideline), organizing committee and addressing legal issues (certification, planning and implementation). The stages at which groups in the region are found vary and in general the stages can be grouped as primary level groups and secondary level groups (groups of groups).

Over the past years, the number of groups formed and their members has increased. For example the level of cooperatives has changed from primary to secondary in both Dale and Alaba Special woreda.

### **Groups recommended for the region**

Organizing groups around certain commodities as Coffee, pepper, pineapple and haricot bean for production and marketing. Saving and credit groups, Input groups and women's group on particular commodity is recommended.

### **How to organize groups?**

Groups formed on voluntary base are recommended to take advantage of group benefits (experience sharing, to pool resources, to be cost effective, to act as collateral substitute, to increase bargaining power).

### III. Experiences with participatory tools and approach

#### PRA tools experience

PRA tools has been practiced in the region in a inconspicuous way and training was given for a few staff by NGOs and Government for specific purpose. The experience is limited and emphasis is not given to use of the method, though the importance of the method is understood.

OFFICE	PRA TOOL	WHEN/WHY/WHO
OoANRD and RDCO	Stakeholder analysis	Used in preparation of woreda strategic plans. Prepared by team leaders and desk heads. Training was held on Strategic planning by Regional Civil Service Commission
	Situation analysis ( Internal)	Is SWOT ( examines opportunity )
	External Environmental analysis	Is SWOT (examines threats )

The use of stakeholder analysis and SWOT (external and internal environmental analysis) started recently during plan preparation.

#### Experience of selected desks

DESK	PRA TOOL	WHEN/WHY
Cooperative desk	1 Group discussion	Used to create awareness creation on cooperatives role and importance
	2 Interview	Used during socio-economic survey for Need assessment
	3 Focus group discussion	Used with economically active groups in forming cooperatives(groups) also with different sex groups
	4 Ranking (preference)	Used to prioritize the service type (mill house, grain marketing) Used by experts in the desks and among farmers
	5 Trend analysis	Used to examine past problems of previously established cooperatives
Crop production and technology dissemination desk	1 Observation	Used to identify pest and crop problems, to find out innovative farmer. Used on farmers' field day (for comparison of technology or crop performance)

DESK	PRA TOOL	WHEN/WHY
	2 Interview	Structured Interview- used by regional offices to be filled at woreda level Structured Interview (e.g Tables, formats)- used to report to region by woreda staff e.g Market survey Semi-Structured- used by experts to report on crop/technology status or progress
	3 Focus group discussion	Used for to get information on crop problems, to draw common action plan
	4 Trend analysis	Used to examine crop performance on demonstration sites( on plots)
Natural resource desk	1 Interview	Questionnaire is often used to collect data (e.g water shed management information from regional office)
	2 Group Discussion	Used for participatory land-use planning (maps are not available) to delineate area for closure Used by community planning team
	3 Wealth rank	Used to find implementers and non implementers of soil and water conservation measures
	4 Resource Map	Used by experts and farmers to delineate conservation area. ( Base map )
	5 Trend analysis	Used by experts to know past drought periods, time of high degradation rate in vegetation

### Trends in use of pra tools

It seems that most of the PRA methods were used sporadically at selected places in the woreda. More tools have come in to use in recent time. Evidence indicates that PRA (stakeholder and SWOT analysis) was used for the first time during plan preparation of 2002/3 woreda strategic plan.

### PRA use and its approaches

The use PRA methods focused on data collection and most data collected was not validated. In past the use of PRA methods was initiated by experts (or projects implemented by OoANRD). The usage of the methods varies according to each staff experience and desk need. Evidences indicate that the use of PRA has not lead to better targeting (e.g. identification of right beneficiary for technology), enhancement of project cover ( e.g. conservation area) and better use of local material (e.g. in technology use).

## Use of PRA tools in extension approach

- 1 Planning** = Information to be used for planning are not collected using PRA methods. Planning is based on information obtained from offices. Most of the figures to be planned are either from the regional office or from the woreda. The use of PRA tool use for planning purpose is almost absent; if any it is consultative participation.
- 2 Implementation**=questionnaire, group discussion, interview methods are used for implementation of extension program (e.g data is collected using tables, formats).
- 3 Monitoring and evaluation**=Discussion and observation is the commonly used methods. The latter was used since the introduction of Result Based Management. Active participation exists in reporting disaster, disease outbreak. Virtually participation in evaluation of extension system is passive.

## How to introduce the tool kit and why?

There is no difficulty in use of the PRA methods (TOOL KITS) except that staff lack common guideline and experience. There is a need to consider budget, capacity building and time aspect to introduce the use of PRA too kits. Sample woreda plan is sent from regional bureau during plan preparation. Some staff had training on PRA by NGOs but all have not used the methods for field application as required. Very limited number of PRA methods has been used in used in the region. List used methods include: gender analysis, actor linkage analysis, PAP, PLA and PFM. Preference of method or methods vary according to the purpose of use, information type and community group. In general, almost all method can be used depending on the purpose of user in the region.

## 4.4 Oromiya Region

### I. Experiences of Agricultural Extension Services

Agricultural Extension Experiences in Oromiya

- Generally it follows the same approach the country adopted
- Different extension systems attempted in the past
- CADU/ARLU specific to Arsi area/project approach/
- It was an integrated rural development approach
- It has got different components

#### Methodology

Through DA's and Model farmers

DA used demonstration plots to disseminate technology

MPP1 & MPP2

Methodology:

Through demonstration of agri. Technology with model farmers  
Similar all over the country

#### **PADEP**

- Used to employ T&V approach
- Financed and supported by World Bank

#### **PADETS**

- Operational 1995 onwards
- Adopted from SG 2000
- Follows a package approach
- Provision of inputs and credit is one of its components
- Demonstration is done on the actual fields of the farmers
- Transfer of technology is from farmer to farmer by organizing field days

#### **The "Modified" PADETS**

- Currently modified PADETS & Farming system approach are in use
- Various components are incorporated in this extension activity
  - \*crop, livestock, NRM and Coffee
- Recommendations based on specific agro ecology
- Is an alternative package
- The region is divided into 4 production system
  - Moisture stress
  - Pastoral
  - Surplus production and
  - Coffee production

### **Agricultural Extension Approach in Ada'a & Meisso**

- Ada'a is food secured area
- Meisso is food in secured area
- The Extension model in use now is
  - ✓ The Minimum package
  - ✓ The Household package

### **The approach we follow**

- Individual approach
- Minimum package
- Household package
- Group approach
- Minimum package through group leaders

### **The problems**

- Capacity of DA is low
- Credit related problems
- Push and pull related work of DA's
- Inappropriate /blanket recommendation s

## **II. Experiences with Group Formation and Management: The case of 2 PLS/Ada'a & Meisso/**

### **Types of Groups**

#### **1. Service and Market Groups to Cooperatives**

- Ada'a Dairy Cooperatives  
AI, Vet., marketing, credit and saving, processing plant and feed supply
- Yerer Union  
Input supply/seed, fertilizer and chemicals  
Marketing  
Credit  
Training
- Women Dairy Groups

#### **2. Production and Marketing Groups**

- Women groups (4) organized in sericulture/silk/ production, processing and marketing

##### Problems encountered

- Limited mobility to attend all functions on behalf of the groups
- Husbands object wives positive move /gender inequality/
- Gossip about women leaders by the women themselves/Lack of gender awareness and assertiveness/
- Extended time to reach on agreement
- Rivalry for leadership
- Underrating women groups
- Lack a sense of real women groups feelings/Some joined the groups with some other agenda in mind/ /

#### **3. Development teams/groups for extension service promotion**

- Composed of 20 30 farmers/group
- Approached by Das
- Groups are not self-initiated /formed by DAs/
- “ Innovative farmers” are team leaders
- Group leaders are a bridge for information exchange/ technology and data/
- Community mobilization for local level development purpose

##### **Problems encountered**

- No common understanding/vision among members
- Could be manipulated by political figures and cadres

#### **4. Self-initiated traditional groups**

##### 4.1. Women milk groups/Afoshu/

- Women with milk produced at home come together and form group
- Group size varies from 4-10 women
- Lives in the same and/or adjacent villages
- Contribute morning milk for the women whose turn is ready/particularly on that day/
- They also do a sort merry-go-round activity/with part of the money obtained from milk sale/

##### 4.2. Social groups

- Self initiated
- Focuses on funeral, wedding and other social obligations

The way forward

- Which?

Business oriented group formation

- Why?

Sustainability

business is a bond to many activities

How?

- Awareness creation
- Technical and financial support
  - credit
  - training
- Monitoring & evaluation
- Participatory learning

### **III. The Experiences with the Tools and Approaches for Participatory R&D**

#### **PADETES /Participatory Demonstration and Training Extension System/**

- The Extension System currently in use
- The name coined with the word “Participatory”
- Is it really matches with the naming?  
Participation and Participatory

#### **“Participatory”**

- Involvement of the communities at all stages of the dev’t process
- Any project/program initiated and “owned” by the beneficiaries
- Bottom-up approaches
- Value the inputs from the beneficiaries
- Respectful to the incorporation of indigenous knowledge in all aspects of the program
- Contribute to the Empowerment of the people involved in the program

#### **Participation**

- Voluntary or other forms contributions by the rural people to predetermined programs
- As a product –can act as an objective in itself and is one of the indicator of success
- As a process-when the act of “P” is used to achieve a stated objective

#### **The Early Stage/1995-1999/of “PADETS”**

##### **Features**

- Top down approach
- Blanket recommendation approach /fertilizer, seed type, plot size, etc./
- Not accompanied with options/alternatives
- Encourages the participation to predetermined program
- Lacks considerations to indigenous knowledge and resources

#### **2000 and Onwards**

##### **/PADETS/**

- Gave a say to the communities need
- Acted flexibly
- Came up with alternative packages/options
- Became a bit considerate to the local resources and indigenous knowledge
- However it is very difficult to trace whether used the participatory toolkits or not.
- It is a modified PADETS

## **Concluding Remarks**

According to Ashby & Sperling (1995) definition of Participation, the PADETs Extension approach could be categorized as:

- ✓ **Functional participation** /something Useful is accomplished./
- ✓ **Capacity-building participation**/enhance the skill of the farmers/ and According to Martin& Selman (1997) **Contractual**/provide specific services/
- ✓ Mostly **Passive** and
- ✓ In some cases **Co-opted**

## **Participatory methods of the Toolkits & Approaches that can be used in Oromiya**

### **The Way Forward**

Make a real move from the “Rhetorical Participatory” approach to concrete and down to earth participatory approach

OR

Active Participation

Why Active Participation?

Active Participation of the communities ensures:

- ✓ The Development of self-reliance/Ownership
- ✓ To mobilize own/local resources
- ✓ Relieve them from mental & physical dependency syndrome
- ✓ To effect real transformation
- ✓ To maintain gender balance
- ✓ Empowers individuals/communities
- ✓ Sustainability factor

### **How to materialize/realize it**

- Assess gaps
- Capacitate both community and staff
- Then begin to act at community level
  - Depart from top-down approach
  - Try to envisage all the toolkits
  - Stick to bottom-up approach

N.B: Involve the communities from the inception, identification, formulation, Implementation and Monitoring to Evaluation

## **Annex 5. Discussion session on current and future extension systems and the role of IPMS**

### **Federal Ministry of Agriculture Extension group**

#### **Current situation**

- Top down approach
- Loose linkage between federal and regions
- Loose linkage with research
- No monitoring and evaluation system
- Insufficient participatory approach
- Lack of capacity at all levels
- Market problem
- Infrastructural problems
- Shortage of input
- Lack of post harvesting, agro-processing (value adding)
- Shortage of technology
- Blanket recommendation
- Lack of motivation and incentives
- Problems of drought/moisture stress
- Land degradation is a major problem

#### **Vision**

- Increased production and productivity and improved living standards of the nation

#### **Who needs to be involved?**

- Farmers
- Research
- Private sector
- NGO
- MoARD
- GO

#### **Strategy**

- Improving implementation capacity
- Improving linkages (extension, farmers, research, private sector, NGO, donors, etc.)
- Market orientation
- Adopting participatory approach
- Improving input availability and delivery systems

#### **Support needed**

- Training
- Budget
- Technical

#### **IPMS facilitation**

- To pilot better functioning of market oriented extension system

## **Amhara Region**

### **Current situation**

- Production focussed (not market oriented)
- Package focussed
- Top down (campaign, non participatory)
- Low capacity at all levels
- Frequent changes in approach
- Poor knowledge management
- Unclear role

### **Vision**

- Demand driven
- Participatory extension
- Strong linkage with all stakeholders
- Market oriented
- Effective institutional arrangement
- Strong linkage with all stakeholders
- Proper knowledge management

### **Who needs to be involved?**

- Farmers
- Local institutions/cooperatives
- Private sector
- NGO
- MoARD

### **Strategy**

- Share vision to all stakeholders
- Improving organizational efficiency of the MoARD

### **Support needed**

- Need gap analysis
- Capacity building

### **IPMS facilitation**

- Skill development through training
- Facilitate for a common understanding among stakeholders
- Synthesis and sharing of knowledge
- Resources
- Evaluation of institutional arrangement
- Redefine the role of extension

## **SNNPR**

### **Current situation**

- Participatory Demonstration and Training Extension Systems (PADETE) not operational as envisaged
- Participation as a concept not understood
- Government still follow top down approach
- Extension is under resourced
- Extension suffer from poor linkage with research and teaching institutions (information, technology and current development)

### **Vision**

- To see effective, efficient and responsive extension system in place that would contribute positively towards improving the living standard of farmers, Demand driven

### **Who needs to be involved?**

- MoARD
- Research institutions
- Teaching institutions
- Cooperative unions
- Farmer institutions s
- Private sector
- NGO

### **Strategy**

- Capacity building
  - Human resources
  - Institutional development
  - Develop implementation strategy/procedure to make MoARD efficient and effectively implementing PADETE
- Better linkages and interactions with relevant stakeholders

### **Support needed**

- Staff training in knowledge and skill development training to bring change in attitude of workers and making them efficient in delivering extension service
- Logistical support to make MoARD more effective by assessing it to network for information and knowledge, making FTCs operational and other important infrastructure
- Financial support to cover operational costs

### **IPMS facilitation**

- The group wish IPMS to play a role in facilitating capacity building through training, building bridge between various development actors, accessing knowledge, information and technology so as to enable the extension service play a much better role and fulfill its stated objectives.

## **Tigray Region**

### **Current situation**

- Household extension intervention
- Minimum extension

### **Vision**

- Focused, information and knowledge based, and demand driven extension services

### **Who needs to be involved?**

- Farmers
- Extension workers/agents
- Researchers
- NGOs
- Private investors
- Traders
- Cooperatives
- Marketing agencies
- Input suppliers (private, GO)
- Credit institutions

### **Strategy**

- Decentralized and participatory extension system

### **Support needed**

- Capacity building
- Appropriate technologies
- Institutional strengthening
- Establishing knowledge management system

### **IPMS facilitation**

- Capacity building
- Appropriate technologies
- Institutional strengthening
- Establishment of knowledge management system

## **Oromiya Region**

### **Current situation**

- Limited extension delivery
- High DA to farmers ration needed
- Inadequate capacity of extension staff
- Lack of motivation (pull push to extension work) and incentives
- Lack of regular in-service training
- Limited input supply
- Limited technology adoption and diffusion
- Lack of gender sensitivity
- Lack of environmentally friendly approach in extension
- Poor HIV/AIDS education through the extension system
- Less market focussed and less support to private sector
- 

### **Vision**

- To make extension staff able to deliver appropriate technology
- Create farming community that adopt improved agricultural technology and improve their living standards

### **Who needs to be involved?**

- Farming community/Pastoralists
- GO institutions
  - Research
  - Extension
  - Cooperative office
  - Universities
- Private sector
- NGOs
- International Research and development institutions
- Religious organizations and groups
- Community Based Organization
- Schools

### **Strategy**

- Promote efficient participatory system which is market oriented

### **Support needed**

- Capacity development
- Promote incentives
- Improve input delivery
- Networking and linkage

### **IPMS facilitation**

- Capacity development

- Networking
- Consulting policy recommendation
- Innovative technology transfer

## **IPMS staff group**

### **Current situation**

- Technology transfer
  - Top down consultation
  - Single provider
  - Little pilot testing
  - Supply driven

### **Vision**

- Extension need to be knowledge and information provider
- Linkage service provider (Private/public)
- Capacity building and empowerment (farmer)
- Demand driven
- Multiple provider

### **Who needs to be involved?**

- Farmers
- Public institutions
  - Research/FTC, MoARD, Regions, woreda
- Policy makers
- Private sector
- Cooperatives, traders, PLCs, CBOs, NGOs, Private companies
- Donors

### **Strategy**

- Capacity building (institutions, farmers)
- Changing institutional arrangements
- Learning process
- Establishing innovative expert group at regional level

### **Support needed**

- Operational costs
- Training (community based)
- Technical assistance
- Infrastructure
- Knowledge management
- Monitoring and evaluation

### **What can IPMS do?**

- Operational costs
- Training (community based)
- Technical assistance
- Infrastructure
- Knowledge management
- Monitoring and evaluation