



# Improving Productivity & Market Success of Ethiopian Farmers

**National Advisory and Learning Committee (NALC)  
Workshop Report  
March 15-17, 2006**



Canadian International  
Development Agency

Agence canadienne de  
développement international



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

## Table of Contents

<b>1 Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2 Review project purpose, objectives and overall strategy.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3 Market oriented research and development approaches and processes and innovative capacity building.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>4 Input supply research and development .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>5 Output marketing research and development .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>6 Knowledge management research and development .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>7 After action review.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>8 Workshop summary .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>9 Closing remarks .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Annex 1 Program IPMS NALC workshop .....</b>	<b>21</b>

# 1 Introduction

A field trip and workshop was organized by IPMS for the National Advisory and Learning Committee (NALC) members from March 15 -17 in Tigray (see annex 1 for the workshop program). The workshop was attended by representatives from the 8 Pilot Learning Woredas (PLWs), the 4 Regions, members of the steering committee and staff from national and international stakeholder institutions. A list of participants is attached in Annex 2.

During the field trip, participants were shown on-going activities in Atsbi District, one of the IPMS PLW. Emphasis was on demonstrating the market oriented innovation system approach to extension and development activities.

During the next two days, the NALC reviewed the overall project purposes and objectives as well as the individual project components i.e. research and development for capacity building, knowledge management, technology and input/output marketing arrangements of IPMS. This included a poster session on commodity development in the different PLWs organized during a cocktail hosted on the evening of 16th. The objectives of were to:

- Review and refine the project goal, purpose, objectives and overall strategy based on experiences in the first year of implementation
- Review 2005/06 program and outline program for 2006/07 for project components based on lessons learned, PIP and adjustments made to the project objectives

It was further explained that the outputs:

- Will be consolidated by the project team and incorporated into the program of work and budget for 2006/07
- This program of work and budget will be reviewed and adjusted by the project steering committee
- The steering committee/project manager will present it to the IPMS management Board and CIDA for final approval.

## 2 Review project purpose, objectives and overall strategy

An overview of the lessons learned on the project, goal, purpose, objectives and strategy was presented by the project manager – Dirk Hoekstra. In the presentation emphasis was

put on i) need for increased involvement of stakeholders in accomplishing the project objectives now and in the future ii) the research components being an integral part of the project and iii) the innovation systems approach in which processes, relationships and behaviours are emphasized. Dirk proposed that the lessons learned would be used to refine the project purpose and objective statements.

### *Purpose statement*

For the project purpose statement it was proposed to include the phrase ‘**the adoption of the innovation system approach (ISA) by the MoARD**’ in the statement (replacing the more generally worded improving the efficiency of the government’s efforts).

A discussion evolved around innovation systems approach and several comments, questions and answers were provided:

- Problems exist because the MoARD puts lots of efforts to improve production and once this has been achieved, no one bothers to connect farmers with the market. Partner linkages are therefore required.
- It’s true that in the past, the focus has been on improving production and now we know that it’s important to look at markets as well and the government’s strategy is also in line with this.
- Previously, we used to think that everyone played their own role but now we expect all of these stakeholders – researchers, MoARD etc to work together to bring about change. How do we deal with traders? Perhaps we need special institutional arrangements? For market orientation development, we should learn to look at the bigger picture.
- The concept of including all stakeholders is a good one. We should ensure that stakeholders producing inputs are also included.
- People who don’t have a job may not realize that there are indeed jobs available, so we should try to build their capacity and this should be part of the project purpose. Perhaps entrepreneurship courses could be offered. Capacity building is one of the project’s components. The purpose statement is a broad statement and is at the higher level so we cannot include all of the project components in this broad statement since it would make the statement too long. However, at the lower level capacity building and entrepreneurship are included.
- It seems that there is a shift in the objectives from before, there seems to be an improvement in the service aspect to adopt an ISA. Are we moving too far away from the original goal and focusing more on the process? If we focus more on the ISA will the agriculture problem in Ethiopia be solved? This is how it sounds to

me i.e. it's because we haven't taken this approach that Ethiopia has problems and that following the ISA will solve all problems. It seems that the purpose of this project will be to push the ISA. This is a new approach throughout the world and are we sure that it will work that well? Does this purpose statement include all outcomes/objectives of the project?

- We are seeing that there are more clarifications and our approach was commodity based development at the Woreda level when we originally (at PRA) made these plans e.g. Fogera rice, fish etc. When Dirk made his presentation it looked like there is going to be a change from commodity to innovation systems approach? The system may not be clear to everyone so it must be clearly defined, what exactly is this system? Are we being derailed from the original project purpose? The ISA seems to be predetermined by the project as the only viable approach.
- We can look at past lessons, what is the status of Ethiopia, especially in the mountainous north, the capability of the farmers and their resource endowment is variable. We need to plan according to the characteristics of the area, mountainous, swampy etc. Such planning can not only be conducted at the macro level because you can't just make plans and tell farmers to go forward with these plans. We may end up depending on individuals to do development and these individuals may have indigenous knowledge, or have gone to school, or learned from experience. Sasakawa global 2000 did top down commodity planning which was effective and increased productivity and farmers were given cattle as incentive. However, the next year, the same farmers wouldn't continue to produce those commodities and had their reasons for this action, they have diverse needs and may not be concerned only with the financial implications of a project. The ISA as I understand is not top down but is inclusive of all stakeholders and is demand driven. We all need to have the same understanding of ISA.
- All questions so far have focused on ISA and if we clarify this issue it will address many of the questions and concerns raised so far. In the past, with extension, we take new technologies and make sure they are adopted but the new technologies never looked at the result but ISA looks like it will do this.
- ILRI has an ISA program – (Theme 2) and it takes some time to absorb this concept because we all have different backgrounds. Even within ILRI, people are still struggling with the concept. ISA tries to avoid imposing on people to concentrate on certain commodities; e.g. when we chose fish in Fogera as a priority commodity, we did so by going through a process. The same process will come up with a different list of preferred or potential commodities in another Woreda. ISA helps you to figure out what is appropriate based on what the people can do plus what the market requires. What are the lessons learned and is it transferable to other commodities? Development is not static and new things pop up so we should have a system that identifies new opportunities. This approach is not a shift, it's a result of a process which can lead to commodity based technology and input/output marketing arrangements. It is not only limited to

processes and approaches it also involves partner linkages, learning and knowledge management.

- We need to understand the difference between a knowledge/technology versus innovation. Unless knowledge/technology is used, it is not an innovation (knowledge dissemination, uptake and application). We also need to know the difference between an organization and an institution. EIAR is an organization and so is the MoARD, the institutions are the rules of the game, and there are formal and informal rules. Innovation includes all actors, process and rules of the game. We are not only talking about knowledge creation but also dissemination and application. You asked the question why didn't we succeed in the past? We focused on knowledge creation. Who are the people who should be involved in that process? We should focus more on innovations, partnerships and institutional arrangements.
- We deal with many actors but we forget about our partners, if we make the linkages, we ensure that technologies are utilized. The commodities we are working on in the PLWs are the commodities that are being produced, our target is not developing the commodities *per se* but the systems that can lead to effective market orientation of such commodities.
- Let's simplify what ISA means in IPMS. First of all it's a system which has many actors and this project should include the public sector, researchers, and communities. Beyond IPMS, the purpose of the ISA is to bring together different actors to achieve market success. There are different levels of complexity but the basics for our purpose is just this.
- It looks like we're heading in one direction and the concern is to try to understand, we are not saying that the approach is incorrect. So if we make the purpose statement even longer this may create problems. Instead, let's make it shorter but with more definitions and explain vague things such as the ISA, market orientation etc for future use as well as for other people. If we look at the picture in the ILRI handout, explaining the themes, the approach that is used is very clear and it may be better to use the same method by keeping key phrases and words such as ISA, transform, sustainable development etc.
- There are 2 words that are confusing – innovation and invention. A researcher invents something and that thing is used well, but we cannot call it an innovation. Innovation may be defined as the use of an invention.
- The ISA is indeed a confusing concept and I believe there are 3 aspects that may help to understand it better i) Systemic thinking – holistic and within it there are actors, who are they? ii) Multiple actors which means partners are necessary iii) process of learning by doing.

- We need to understand what ISA is and we need a clear understanding before we include it in the purpose statement.
- I have no problem with the concept of ISA, but at the purpose level should we state adoption of an approach? It could be one approach among the others. At this level I think we should say something more than the adoption of one approach, the project should use more approaches.
- We understand it but is it important to include it in the purpose, should we take that as one approach among many or is it the approach that IPMS plans to take? If so we need to convince the group here that it is indeed acceptable.

Besides the discussions on ISA, the following comments, questions were raised on the purpose statement:

- Do we need to mention market orientation, i.e. isn't the statement inclusive of it?
- Even if we have market orientation in the statement, we do other things such as NRM, which will have a long term impact and there are also activities related to biodiversity which has many impacts on diversity. For instance, many people are rushing to go to Metema because of sesame but this will impact the environment, and there is concern from farmers about shortage of water. We need to include environment in the purpose statement.
- Why do we say MoARD in the purpose statement? This implies that we are limited to the federal government.
- We may have to look at the outcome indicators proposed to measure progress in achieving the project purpose to reflect the ISA.

#### Recommendations

To increase stakeholder understanding of innovation systems, IPMS will organize some introductory courses for key stakeholders.

Proposed purpose statement:

*To introduce an innovation system perspective in Agricultural and Rural Development, linked to other stakeholders to transform agricultural productivity and production, and rural development in Ethiopia in an environmentally sustainable way for market oriented agricultural development.*

(Existing purpose statement: To strengthen the effectiveness of the Government's efforts to transform agricultural productivity and production, and rural development in Ethiopia)

### ***Knowledge management objective***

To reflect that the various activities in the knowledge management component are subject to testing and will therefore be closely monitored, it is proposed to include the word test in the objective statement. Participants stressed that the statement should be all inclusive of the ministry of agriculture at federal, regional and PLW levels. Participants also stressed that it should be clear that the system should provide information for private sector partners as well. Based on this, the following refined statement is proposed:

*To develop and test a gender sensitive agricultural knowledge management system in the agricultural research and development (ARD) that will enable Ethiopian institutions, farmers, pastoralists and private sector to adopt appropriate technologies from research and development institutions based in Ethiopia and elsewhere.*

### ***Capacity building objective statement***

To reflect the fact that in an innovation system approach, different partners are linked for a common goal, it is proposed to combine in one objective, the capacity building activities of the different partners, including linking mechanisms and processes. Presently, the capacity building of private sector partners and farmers is included in the third objective. Also to reflect the fact that the capacity building activities are subject to testing and will therefore be closely monitored, it was proposed to include the word 'test' in the objective statement. Participants agreed and the following statement is proposed

*To build, test and strengthen gender balanced capacity of existing public and private organizations and individuals (farmers, pastoralist, traders) engaged in the agricultural sector to foster institutional learning and change so that new collaborative arrangements across sectors and levels are developed to better support the dissemination, use and impact of market oriented agricultural technologies and information.*

### ***Technology uptake and input output marketing objective***

In the previous objective statement, emphasis was put on capacity development of farmers and private sector partners, but this has now been incorporated in the second objective. This objective therefore is reformulated as follows:

*To introduce, test and strengthen gender sensitive processes, approaches and methods to facilitate the introduction and adoption/adaptation of technologies and, innovative input/output marketing arrangements and small scale agri business financing in PLWs in support of market oriented development.*

### ***Recommendation, strategy development and promotion***

It was proposed to broaden this objective statement to accommodate advocacy of the policy and approaches developed and tested and to indicate that the project also has international relevance.

Participants provided the following feedback

- I have some concern about the word advocacy although we do need people who know how to influence the change process. For research institutions like ILRI, we try to provide information/evidence to all involved so that they can make better decisions. If we do advocacy we will be seen as an institute who has a certain position and that's not the goal of this project. ILRI should have a more proactive approach to improve livelihoods of poor people.
- When we look at the objectives we need to look at linkages, since we have the gender sensitivity in all objectives, we should include that in the purpose statement.
- It's important to have the concept of advocacy because we haven't done any promotion activities, but the word 'advocacy' is too strong so perhaps we should reword it as 'promotion of results'.
- The project was initiated by the government and the policy makers are waiting for the results of the project. I feel that the word communicate will capture what we are trying to do in advocacy. I am also concerned with the international relevance that will be expected from this project (IPGs), since this project is an Ethiopian project. Information obtained from this project may be useful for other countries but should this be an objective of the project?
- The advocacy statement doesn't give the correct idea, it should be more of a PR concept. The government is looking for results/outputs so we need to communicate this and PR will work for the public, decision makers and the scientific community. There should be an inbuilt activity of a project that does PR and we should find the proper terminology to reflect this.
- Instead of advocacy, perhaps we should use the word promotion – one for policy makers, scientific community (journals), users (beneficiaries), and should also be prepared in local languages so that the farmers can easily make use of the information.
- We can learn from the IPMS experience but international relevance shouldn't be an objective on its own. Also, does gender have to be mentioned everywhere? We should be careful because if we are mentioning this in every objective just to mention it and we don't fulfil that goal in a gender sensitive way, it may be problematic. Perhaps we should only mention it when we are certain?
- Regarding the IPG issue, the project belongs to the MoARD and the focus of this project is Ethiopia which is a unique place. However, there is general information that will be useful for other CG centers and can be applied to other places. Also, this is a two way street, there could also be international information that can be applied to Ethiopia. So this concept will be used to compare what works here to

what works in other places. But I do want to reiterate that the focus of this project is what is going to work in Ethiopia.

- When the MoARD requested that ILRI prepare this proposal, it was to see what knowledge could be used here in Ethiopia, from other CG centers.
- CIDA should be happy that the project will be making an impact beyond Ethiopia

Based on this discussion the following revised objective statement is proposed:

*To generate, communicate and promote gender sensitive policy options and strategies, on technology generation and use, input/output marketing and small scale agri finance for scaling out and up market oriented agricultural development of national and international relevance.*

### **Gender**

Participants did observe that gender sensitivity was mentioned in all objective statements, which prompted the following comments/clarifications:

- Regarding gender in development, we should know that the relationship between men and women should also be about how to share resources. It isn't just about men and women but is much more than that.
- We must promote the gender issue but this should not be confused with social objectives, i.e. promoting market activities. Rather than saying advocate, maybe we should say, 'strengthening the advocacy capacity of...'
- Gender is a cross cutting issue in all our developmental work. Also when we promote markets, gender has to be considered. This is CIDA's policy as well as other NGOs.
- It may look a bit too much when you have gender sensitivity everywhere but we are also actively mainstreaming gender and HIV/AIDS in our activities and we understand that we may come up with outputs that may not be gender sensitive, but it is important to recognise and be aware of such outputs, to alleviate negative impacts.
- If we don't understand the concept of gender, we will have problems. To me, on a higher level, gender means the old, the young, the handicapped etc. There may be types of people (the elderly for instance) who are disadvantaged.

### **3 Market oriented research and development approaches and processes and innovative capacity building**

Presentations were made by Dr Ranjitha Puskur – IPMS innovation system specialist and Dr Azage Tegegne – IPMS technology specialist , highlighting what had been accomplished and what was planned for 2006/07 (see attachments in the Annex). Specific attention was paid to the processes followed in the PLWs during the planning phase and it was stressed that new institutional structures were required for implementation and participation by various stakeholders, including commodity platforms and innovation systems team supporting the RALCs and WALCs. The issue of selecting additional PLWs in each Region (bringing the total number of PLWs to 12) to test the scaling up of processes, approaches and methods was also introduced. This would start with the initial identification of priority commodities and potential interventions in the value chain in the new sites.

For capacity building, particular emphasis was put on a proposal for additional MSc/BSc training in support of the innovation systems approach for a market orientated agricultural development. Finally, the need for experimentation in extension and the role of the farmer training centers (FTCs) was presented.

Based on these presentations, 3 working groups were formed to discuss the following topics in more depth.

- i) Selection of additional PLWs for testing scaling out of processes
- ii) Innovative capacity building
- iii) Innovative extension

#### ***Working group report on selection of additional PLS***

The reasons and time frame for scaling out were discussed in the group. Based on this, it was felt that it may be too early (not enough proof that a market oriented approach works) and that the reasons were not clear. It was also recommended to leave this choice to the RALCs since they would be involved in the implementation. (See presentation in the Annex)

Participants agreed with the latter and the project team is expecting a response from the RALCs in the next month. It needs to be stressed that this modification in the project is also subject to approval by the M?BoARD and CIDA.

#### ***Working group report on innovative capacity building***

The group touched on various issues including the MSc/BSc training (see presentation in Annex). During the plenary some more discussion took place around the composition and role of the WALC. The need for flexibility to accommodate partners based on the specific situations in the PLWs was emphasized. It was also stressed that the capacity

building should not be limited to MSc and BSc training. Short term in service training should also be emphasized.

***Working group report on innovative extension.***

The group deliberated on 4 main areas - i) new role of extension, ii) M & E system, iii) role of FTCs and iv) use of woreda information center (see presentation in the Annex). During the plenary session, some additional points were made by IPMS staff and participants on the new extension system:

- How do we go forward with extension playing a new role? The important thing that comes out is that there is a serious gap between research and extension. This area needs a lot of work. Regarding the issue of decentralization, Woredas have no control over what's going on in their Woredas and everything is being handed down from the federal government. The FTC curricula are developed at regional level and given to Woredas and they are never consulted in the process. Should IPMS start developing curriculum for FTCs? IPMS is more focused on short term courses for farmers, based on their needs. In terms of human capacity, and the DAs that have been trained at the TVETs, their training should be 30% theory and 70% practical training. But what actually happens is the reverse. So when these DAs start working, they have no idea about the situation on the ground. The operational funds are just enough to pay salaries of DAs and the plan is to build more FTCs. Perhaps the construction of these FTCs should be stopped and money should be spent on operationalising the already created FTCs. It should be clear that IPMS is not there to provide funds for operational expenses of FTCs, but would invest in capacity building of DAs and provide support for implementing participatory and market-oriented extension approaches.
- We recently conducted a small survey of TVET training on newly graduated DAs and those who have been working for 2 years. In terms of training, all have received the reverse of what they should have been received (i.e. 30% theory and 70% practical). We will be in trouble if we expect these new graduates to train farmers. We have a curriculum that has been developed without any consultation with the Woredas. IPMS should talk to policy makers to allow flexibility at all levels. We should identify trainings based on the needs of the farmers, e.g. coffee, livestock system and haricot beans otherwise we are going to be asking farmers to attend text book based trainings.
- My expectation of IPMS will also be to focus on the role of FTCs and should not dilute what the government is doing. IPMS should show a clear strategy on what can be done with FTCs. When developing curriculum at the federal level, we have to realistically discuss the issues and the experts must do the designing. I agree with consulting the Woredas but they don't have the capacity and we can't develop curriculum for each Woreda and each commodity. IPMS should tell the government that they may need to limit the number of FTCs and give them advice on what they should do and play the leading role in advising the government.

Otherwise if we sit in a small circle like this and criticize the system, it will not work.

- Do we understand what we are talking about? We have so many different variations in the environment even within close distances, e.g. Wukro and Atsbi. So when thinking of FTC intervention we have to take into consideration the differences and it's quite difficult to understand the reality on the ground. In some cases, the local varieties are better than the so called improved variety. No focus was given on apiculture so maybe an FTC should focus just on apiculture and maybe the knowledge input on the curriculum will come then.

## **4 Input supply research and development**

Dr Azage prepared an overview of the input research and development activities during the past year (see presentations in Annex). The presentation also provided an overview of the potential interventions and research areas for crop and livestock input supply in the coming year. Emphasis was put on the role of the private sector in the supply of these inputs.

The following issues were raised/responded to:

- Input supply is major development problem. For instance with chickpea, there is a shortage of seed in terms of the existing demand and even the seed will not be ready for the farmers when they need it. By the time the seeds are made available, the demand may not be there. There is a need to find a way where the technology is quickly provided to the farmers, i.e. creating a line where the technology reaches the farmers quickly when the demand is there.
- The way we go with extension shows that what we are doing is not planned and that we are doing things in an ad hoc manner but this is not fair, and there should be a balanced view. Regarding input supply, when there is market failure, the government needs to react. Market failure requires that we do this type of work. Cooperatives and the private sector must also be able to provide some inputs and their cooperation should be enhanced so that we improve input supply. Improved seed supply is being provided on the most part by the government. How can we improve this system? IPMS must find innovative ways of improving this current system. The way we are going now may not result in sustainable development projects so in terms of input supply and extension, the project must find new innovative ways of improving these systems. We don't expect vehicles and buildings from this project but need innovative ways to improve and add value to this system.
- We need to appreciate the efforts that are currently being put forth. If we don't do that, then we will have the same outlook on future attempts. Let's add value to the existing system, for instance supporting the private sector which is currently being

done by the government. The project is not going to bring anything new but build on the existing system. For instance, new coffee seeds were produced but none of the farmers wanted them and we had to beg them to accept these new seeds.

- The current problems are that there is no effective/efficient input supply, and some inputs are not readily available, especially when farmers need them the most. There is also a sustainability problem with supply; there isn't enough for next year or the future. There is no creativity; the government always follows the same system year after year. The creativity will come from the private sector, since at that point it will be profit and business driven. Many of the problems are due to the fact that input supply is controlled by the government so we should try hard to see how this can be moved to the private sector. The way we try to justify this is by saying that the farmer does not have capacity, well let's try to build that capacity. Since input supply should be handled by the private sector, how can we strengthen the private sector? The government distorts the market and this is sometimes encouraged by NGOs, so with the IPMS project, we need to change this. Input supply should be market driven.
- Why would the government raise seedlings when we can contract farmers to do this? This is very expensive & inefficient and supply is provided at a subsidized rate to farmers. Why not train or raise capacity of private traders to do it legally? The subsidies distort the market.
- When markets fail because of national disasters for instance, we appreciate the government's help in terms of input supply. Why does the MoARD consider input supply as one of its responsibilities? What favorable and enabling situations have we created for the private sector to enter and start operating? We keep doing it year in and year out. Let's experiment on some options and try to scale that out to other areas. Let's start testing and experimenting in a few areas. We are not saying that the government is failing everywhere. At this stage IPMS has nothing to offer but has now started monitoring a few areas and we will provide info on improved input supply system – considering alternatives is a must!
- We do know that there are weak areas where we need to improve and we are not discrediting the efforts of the government but can we look at available alternatives? We appreciate that there are differences between regions and these are documented and we are trying to learn success stories to pass them onto those who can make use of them.
- You have given us a direction about effectiveness and efficiency. We will verify and come up with facts and figures. Yes, the current input supply system is not sustainable and we cannot continue with the government's approach.
- What is the best alternative for this country to move into a market oriented system? We are trying to assess what alternatives there are and this will be

documented and forwarded to you. Maybe the coffee experience will be applicable for fruit?

- We need strategic thinking and the government cannot continue like this in terms of input supply, we all agree with this. But we need to create awareness and the role of extension role should be creating this demand. Regarding the livestock extension system, AI failed at the national level, this is a national issue so IPMS should look at the livestock extension system at the national level and revise it.
- I don't agree that the government continues to be involved. How do they get out? In terms of livestock, seed etc, farmers need access, availability, and quality standards regulation. If there is a calamity, the government bears the burden and if everything is transferred to the private sector, there will be problems since they may try to take advantage of the situation. But how the government gets out needs to be thought about strategically and done slowly so that it is sustainable. The private sector will always have the profit margin in mind.
- The government needs to create a favorable environment for the private sector, we all agree. But when the whole system is released to the private sector, what can happen? The private sector must bear the burden and the government only interferes when the private sector can no longer handle things. There are countries where the government always intervenes if the situation affects the economy. In Europe, agriculture is highly subsidized but we are being told here that the government shouldn't be involved. I also don't agree that the private sector will always be interested in their profit margin. The government should monitor and shouldn't interfere unless it's absolutely necessary such as when farmers will be affected. The proposal for us to start experimenting is acceptable to me but what do we experiment on? IPMS should find out about the research methods that are available and see what's applicable to Ethiopia. This should be a joint effort with everyone.
- One of the first two things that we did after the PRA is to critically assess the extension system and we have learned lessons from that. There are very serious problems of input supply, some more serious than others. But there are also several encouraging things and we have identified policy issues that need to be addressed. When you come to the private sector, for instance in beehives, the production is being handled by the private sector. The bureau trained the private sector which has now taken over the production. However hives are still being distributed through the government. The role of IPMS will be to critically assess this from a policy perspective and see what policies should be set.
- IPMS is trying to look into animal production issues and provide guidance, for instance this year, the IPMS project is sponsoring the annual ESAP conference and we will be happy to share the reports with you. Yes, strategic thinking is indeed required in terms of the government's exit strategy. Let's study our input supply system and make informed decisions. When we get into a market oriented

system, those farmers who are making a good profit don't need the extension because they are producing cash commodities such as the flower sector where the government has never provided anything. As we move more into market orientation, farmers can pay for the research and extension. Concerning the government's exit strategy, let's do research and provide scientific information for policy makers to make informed decision. There are variations when you move into market orientation, you must make informed decisions and research will support this. The national system is not into this type of research so let's provide the evidence. Our focus is how we can make things more efficient to make the input supply system better for market oriented commodities.

## **5 Output marketing research and development**

Dr Berhanu gave an overview of output marketing research and development activities in 2005/06 and outlined the program for 2006/07 (presentation attached in Annex). The lack of information on markets has prompted IPMS to undertake and facilitate a considerable amount of research, with students and regional and international partners which should lead to actions in the coming years. The market chain analysis methodology has been developed/adopted as a research tool.

The following issues were raised/responded to:

- There is a good start in terms of market. What is the status of the illegal market trading of livestock in north Gondar? Please provide us with an update on the students working on dairy in Fogera supervised by IPMS.
- Regarding the illegal market trading issue, IPMS will try to focus on the PLWs but we may not have time to go into that scale of national level. We need to review the existing work and build on it. The market chain analysis will include the illegal trade issue in the PLWs where it is relevant.
- It seems that the research does not focus on NRM marketable products. There is export of forestry products such as gums, incense and we receive requests for assistance in their export. Bamboo is a great resource and the government has created a project together with partners. So, why not try to focus the marketing research to include NRM issues as well?
- During the initial exercises, there was an exciting presentation about bamboo but for some reason it didn't catch on. If farmers are interested in it, it will catch on, it's part of a marketing strategy.
- In IPMS' studies in the south, there have been efforts to include NRM in the initial diagnosis and those have been included in the PRA reports.
- The Federal Ministry does not seem to be considered as a partner in marketing research activities so far. Also, the market research work has been useful and has

provided us with lots of information so it's a good start. When we look at the research done by universities, it's full of models, so I'm not sure if this will be applicable for our purposes.

- The Federal MoARD should indeed be a partner and the reason we make no mention of them is because we are just developing the collaboration with the state ministry of input supply and output marketing For instance two staff members of the MoARD's (NRM and input supply and output marketing state ministry) have recently joined IPMS' steering committee.
- To bring about market oriented production, the market should be the starting point, not the production. The market chain analysis goes from production to consumption and looks at demand first and guides farmers on production. In terms of trying new approaches, in Uganda and India we saw many new and innovative ways of doing things. Arrangements are made for farmers to sell their items in town and a place has been created which makes it easy for them to sell their products. So maybe we can try this here so that farmers can sell their products easily. In Uganda farmers use mobile telephones to get market information. This may not be very expensive so can we think of how this can be done in Ethiopia?
- Does the market chain analysis approach also include demand estimates?
- In response to whether the market chain analysis will look at demand, it was said that the beginning point for any market chain study should be the consumption end point. So, demand is an important consideration in market chain analysis. Moreover, the coordination between the different stages of the market chain is an important focus of a market chain study. This year we will be more active in introducing interventions. Regarding the use of mobile telephones for market information, this is something we need to consider but may not work very well in all rural areas but yes this would indeed help the market.
- The market chain analysis is ultimately about an intervention to improve the coordination between the different value stages in order to meet consumer demand. The marketing studies do have an element of an assessment of the demand. We are not alone in this game, there are other studies being conducted by different organizations. IPMS will not look at larger scale consumer demand studies, except at a little at the local level since there are other projects already doing this.

## **6 Knowledge management research and development**

Ermias Sehai presented the IPMS achievements in knowledge management and the plans for 2006/07 (see presentation attached). Emphasis will be put on operationalising the plans including the human input and processes.

The following issues were raised/responded to:

- In terms of capacity building, why aren't the regions also being considered? Why, isn't it necessary to consider them? What happens in terms of scaling out?
- We should also consider creating capacity on GIS. Most of our work is not scientifically supported so we may not have the results that we want, so we should think about building capacity on GIS at the regional level.
- What should be done with the zones in terms of capacity building, especially in Oromia?
- In terms of capacity building at the Woreda and regional level, trainings will include the regional level, and computer based training materials at regional and Woreda levels. Specifically, activities sometimes take place at the federal level but if this is going to cause problems, we will have to revisit the whole idea. The focus of implementation is at Woreda level. In terms of materials, nothing has been done at the regional level but efforts have gone into training and capacity building.
- The Woreda info center has to start work immediately. The DAs must pass this info on to farmers, so how is the IPMS project thinking about this and how will it reach the farmers and other FTCs? The messages should be in the local language but what we find on the computers is mostly in English. In addition, the DAs must properly understand the information.
- We need to think about the target audience for the Woreda knowledge centers and portals. After the information has been collected, in order to add value to it, it should be translated into the local languages. It may be good to have the information in English, but who will benefit from this? The Woreda knowledge center will be located at the Woreda for the time being and will then move onto FTCs. But let's hope that this will not tempt DAs to always go to the Woredas looking for knowledge and use this as an excuse for them to spend more time there. It may be better to have the info center at the FTCs in order to attract farmers also.
- One of the things I learned is that there are other people thinking of using this system of knowledge sharing in different areas, for instance TAMPA is using PLS to collect and disseminate market information. When we develop the Woreda info centers, we should link up with these initiatives so that it's an integrated system.

- The fundamental challenge is the human side because people are not good at sharing information, since they are rewarded for guarding information by having more power and authority. Although the internet has changed things and has made a lot of information available, still the human aspect will make things move fast or not. We need to work on training people on how to facilitate information sharing.
- Wireless telephone connections are spreading throughout most of the Woredas including PAs which will help with communicating information.
- Regarding the Woreda info centers, how do the DAs get the info? Are they going to leave their work to come and get information? For Federal and the Woredas, the immediate target is the experts who have daily access to the internet. If this information can not reach the farmers, the experts can be the intermediaries. When the DAs are able to get the information, they should pass it onto those who need it. Content managers must have lots of flexibility to be able to edit this information.
- We should have linkages with the World Bank and the nature of the portal will allow us to have this linkage so that people can get to the resources they need. That system will be a portal to multiple resources.
- Regarding the challenge of human behaviour, in the KM framework, we proposed to the ministry, that this is the most difficult, more so than the technical side. People who know more are valued more so they don't want their value to be reduced. This is a concept that we always try to fight against, and process changes and incentives could be put in place to alleviate this problem. We can find out which pages are visited the most. The system would be most successful if people change their minds, and they do it not because they have to but because they believe that sharing information will help others.
- The flexibility of our project should start from here since initially the focus was on federal and the Woredas. We need to close the gap so that people don't think that when they leave they take everything else with them. If the project cannot provide the computers, maybe they can be provided with the software.
- We need advice from you about KM and ICT, and whether we should do more short term trainings or if the MSc and BSc trainings are better. Last year we were told no one with an IT background was available. You need to have a look at the people who have studied in regions, Woredas etc and let us know what you prefer.
- We should not only look at the regions but also the zones from national to Woreda and at least provide CDs and books. IPMS will provide training, computers etc. and some lucky PLWs have found buildings already up and running but in Metema we are stuck and don't even have a proper building. Many activities are planned at the higher level but on the ground things are different.

- In capacity building, we keep saying at federal and Woreda level but many regional offices are not better off than the Woredas in terms of resources. We shouldn't ignore the fact that we provide them with CDs, materials, books etc. and IPMS has talked about flexibility so this is the time to show this – what is the project going to do?
- So far, the IPMS project has not been allowed to build buildings. Even though the Woreda has tried to build the info center, the project should show some flexibility. We will hopefully find a common solution for the infrastructure problem in Metema.

## **7 After action review**

The expected workshop outputs were:

- Improved understanding of the project's concepts by the stakeholders based on lessons learned
- Increased institutional commitment to project's research and development strategy based on lessons learned
- Agreement on the project's strategic, research and development activities

Participants agreed that the workshop had given them a better understanding of the project's concepts. However it was beyond the scope of the workshop to have increased institutional commitment since this would have to be discussed with the stakeholders concerned. Also, for the proposed research and development activities, agreement should be reached with the stakeholders involved through RALC and WALC meetings.

All participants agreed that for the next NALC workshop, the research and development stakeholders should also make presentations on the lessons learned.

## **8 Workshop summary**

Dirk Hoekstra highlighted the following issues at the end of the workshop:

The overall project purpose and strategy were highlighted during the workshop to emphasize the innovation system perspective; the action research integrated in each of the project components and the approaches, processes and methods required for a market oriented development. It was stressed that increased involvement of stakeholder organizations was required for the project to be successful.

The issue of the additional PLS to test scaling up of processes through existing institutions was also highlighted. RALCs are expected to provide feedback on this issue to project management.

For capacity building, the need for an innovation system thinking was emphasized and development of individuals and teams to support the RALC and WALCs. In light of this, the project will revisit the MSc and BSc proposal in consultation with the RALCs and WALCs and project steering committee. Furthermore, increased emphasis will be put on short term capacity building in areas such as knowledge management, gender, marketing, GIS and environment.

The main issue highlighted in the input supply component is the role of government vis a vis the private sector. The project will focus on experimenting by involving small scale entrepreneurs and provide policy advice based on studies conducted in the PLWs.

The project marketing component has and will focus its attention on marketing research since very little is known formally. It is important for the project to involve the partner institution in this and thus build their capacity in this field.

Knowledge management is a new concept and a lot of learning by doing will be required to operationalize this in the PLWs as well as the regional and federal level. It should be realized however that KM is not limited to IT based knowledge management. The technology exhibitions are also useful tools.

## **9 Closing remarks**

By John McDermott – DDG ILRI

He stressed the importance of organized learning and documentation and indicated the need for the development of a knowledge sharing culture. During the week, he witnessed the application of good ideas, which were manifested by the exciting field trip to Atsbi and the poster presentations. He also indicated that there is a lot of demand on our time to ensure that the development and research activities are implemented adequately.

He outlined the following challenges in implementing innovative ideas

1. How we share knowledge – value others knowledge, we need champions for new ideas and also to inspire others
2. Improve institutional performance through group formations, networking, support others to deliver, who should do it? Who is better positioned to do it? We need to come together to help institutions do better, we should be critical, but careful not to offend others
3. To do better, learning by doing is important and we need to facilitate skill development
4. To facilitate change, we have to be transparent, organized and willing to learn together
5. IPMS has complex relationships with various actors and this is a huge task. For example, the BECA facility in Nairobi is a new thing which requires collective action. In order to successfully promote new ideas, organizational management is

- required. Regarding IPMS activities, the question is, will Ethiopian institutions own it? drive it? and champion it?
6. He indicated that he is less worried about what happens to the commodities in the PLWs which are focused on improving productivity and markets, etc. But, are these leanings institutionalized at the Regional and Federal levels? Getting the attention of top officials and leaders may be difficult as they have a lot of other issues to attend to. However, it has to be done. He also stated that although there is a lot of hard work in IPMS, it is also very exciting. As a DDG, he committed himself to provide as much support as possible to the project.

By Abbay Woldu – Head of the Tigray Bureau of Agriculture and Rural Development

There is a lot of good work going on in IPMS and I would like to thank every one involved in this important event. There were three important undertakings in Tigray over the last two weeks. These are the TARI annual research review, the technology exhibition/workshop and the NALC meeting. We are very happy to have hosted all of them here in Tigray.

Although I have been involved in the preparation of the technology exhibition, I did not attend the opening ceremony. I got time to visit it today. I have noticed a lot of media coverage (radio and TV) about the displays and I think it was a very successful event. Many stakeholders, including farmers, participated. I was delighted to see Regional, Federal and International organizations participate in the exhibition. Breeding of ideas between innovative farmers and expert professionals created a conducive environment for knowledge sharing. We are proud to have hosted the event.

The way this exhibition is organized is very different from what we used to do in the past. It is very innovative in its own way. We are pleased to inform you that the Regional State will take the lessons to all the Woredas in the Region. We also request other Regions to do the same.

The workshop brought in prominent scientists and experts together. This has given a chance to the Regional experts to interact with you. A number of important points have been raised during the meeting and we will incorporate your suggestions/recommendations in to our five year development plan, which is being developed at the moment.

In closing, I would like to thank the IPMS project for the support, and particularly Dr. Gebremedhin Woldewahid for the coordination of activities. I would also like to thank Regional representatives for their active participation. Finally, I would like to appreciate the organizers of the exhibition and workshop from the Regional Bureau of Agriculture and Rural Development and all others who participated in this important event. My special thanks go to Ato Aberra, who served as a Chairman of the Technical Committee.

## Annex 1 Program IPMS NALC workshop

**Dates: March 15 – 17**

### **Program**

**March 15:** Field visit to Atsbi

### **March 16**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Responsible</b>
	Session 1: Chairperson: Azage Tegegne	
8.30 – 8.45	Welcome and explanation of role of NALC in IPMS organizational structure	John McDermott
8.45 – 09.00	Workshop objectives, program and expected output	Dirk Hoekstra
09.00- 9.30	General overview - project purpose, objectives, strategies, lessons learned during the first year and implications for project implementation	Dirk Hoekstra
9.30 – 10.30	Plenary discussion with feedback on general lessons learned, bottlenecks and strategy to increase institutional commitment	All
10.30 – 11.00	Coffee/tea break	
	Session 2 Chairperson: Ermias Sehai	
11.00 – 11.30	Overview of project's strategy/methods for PLS research and development and lessons learned	Ranjitha Puskur
11.30 - 12.30	Plenary discussion on project strategy including selection of additional PLSs for testing initiation of scaling up some activities	All
12.30 – 14.00	Lunch	
	Session 3 Chairperson: Dirk Hoekstra	
14.00 – 14.30	Overview of project's capacity building development strategy, lessons learned and plans for 2006/07	Azage Tegegne
14.30 – 15.00	Overview of project's capacity building research strategy including HIV/AIDS, gender and plan for 2006/07	Ranjitha Puskur
15.00 – 15.30	Coffee/tea break	
15.30 - 1700	3 working groups on innovative extension approaches/methods, building innovation system capacity, mainstreaming gender and HIV/AIDS	WG
17.00 -18.00	Plenary session working group report	All

**March 17**

	Session 4 Chairperson: Ranjitha Puskur	
08.30 – 09.30	Marketplace on selected PLS activities	RDOs
09.30 – 10.00	Overview of project marketing research and development strategy, lessons learned and plans for 2006/07	Berhanu Gebremedhin
10.00 - 10.30	Coffee/tea break	
10.30 – 11.15	Plenary discussion - marketing strategy and plans - institutionalization of market research and facilitation/orientation role	All
11.15 – 11.45	Overview of project input supply research and development strategy, lessons learned and plans for 2006/07	Azage Tegegne
11.45 – 12.30	Plenary discussion - input supply research and development strategy and plans - institutionalization of input supply system research role and facilitation/orientation role	All
12.30 – 14.00	Lunch	
	Session 5 Chairperson: Berhanu Gebremedhin	
14.00 – 14.30	Overview of project's KM research and development strategy, lessons learned and plans for 2006/07	Ermias Sehai
14.30 – 15.00	Plenary session to discuss strategy and institutionalization of KM at Federal, Regional and Woreda levels	All
15.00 -15.30	Coffee/tea break	
15.30 – 16.00	After action review of the workshop	Ermias Sehai
16.00– 16.30	Summary and closing	Dirk Hoekstra John McDermott

**Annex 2 List of NALC workshop participants**

Sr. No.	Name	Sex	Organization	Position
	Daniel Dauro	M	SARI	Director
46	Anisa Gobaro	M	SNNPR-BoARD	Head, Office of Agriculture-SNNPR
47	Belay			
48	Berhanu Fisseha	M	Tigray-BoARD	Head, Dept. of Planning and Prog.
49	Mulay Berhanu Bamud	M	Tigray-BoARD	Deputy Head
3	Temesgen Kedir	M	Alaba-OARD	Deputy Head
4	Gebre-medhin Tesfay	M	Alamata OaRD	Head
5	Gebreyesus Meles	M	Alamata OaRD	
6	Tefera Derbew	M	Amhara -BoARD	Head
7	Eshete Dejen	M	ARARI	Director for Livestock
8	Alemayehu Fekadu	M	Atsbi-Agri. Head	
9	Ahmed Mohammed	M	CIDA	Livelihood division
10	Fasil Kelemework	M	EIAR	Head, REFLD
11	Ayehu Zerihun	M	Fogera-OARD	Head
12	Abraham Muche	M	Fogera-OARD	Deputy Head
13	Dessalegne Begna	M	Holeta Bee Res.	Center Manager
14	P. Anandajayasekeram	M	IFPRI-ILRI	Senior Research Fellow
15	Woudyalew Mulatu	M	ILRI	Program Supervisor
16	John McDermott	M	ILRI	Deputy Director General
17	Girmay G/Egziabher	M	Information Bureau	Programme producer
18	Dirk Hoekstra	M	IPMS	Project Manager
19	Abraham Gebrehiwot	M	IPMS	RDA
20	Ranjitha Puskur	F	IPMS	Scientist
21	Berhanu Gebremedhin	M	IPMS	Scientist
22	Gebreyohannes Berhane	M	IPMS	RDO
23	Ketema Yilma	M	IPMS	RDO
24	Zewdu Ayele	M	IPMS	RDO
25	Ermias Sehai	M	IPMS	KM Expert
26	Nigatu Alemayehu	M	IPMS	RDO
27	Noah Kebede	M	IPMS	GIS-RO
28	Azage Tegegne	M	IPMS	Scientist
29	Worku Teka	M	IPMS	RDO
30	Abebe Shiferaw	M	IPMS	RDO
31	Yirgalem Assegid	M	IPMS	RDO
32	Muluhiwot Getachew	F	IPMS	Program Assistant
33	Kahsay Berhe	M	IPMS	Research
34	Dawit Woldemariam	M	IPMS	RDA
35	Godswill Makombe	M	IWMI	Post Doc
36	Sufian Abdulahi	M	Meisso-OOPRD	
37	Saladin Ahmed	M	Meisso-OOPRD	Head
38	Dessie Teshager	M	Metema-OoARD	Deputy Head
39	Melaku Jirata	M	MoARD	Team Leader
40	Assefa Mulugeta	M	MoARD(Marketing)	Dept. Head
41	Amare Worku	M	MoARD(NRM)	Dept. Head
42	Mohammed Hasena	M	OARI	Director, Socio-Economics
43	Belayneh Baramo	M	OoARD (Dale)	Deputy Head of Dale Office of Agr.
44	Tesfaye Bekele	M	Oromiya ARDB	WSM & SWC dept. head

