



Improving Productivity & Market Success of Ethiopian Farmers

Report on Project Launching and Planning Workshop

June 30-July 2, 2004

ILRI, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia



Canadian International
Development Agency

Agence canadienne de
développement international

ILRI

INTERNATIONAL
LIVESTOCK RESEARCH
INSTITUTE



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

Summary report IPMS launching workshop

1 Introduction

The Government of Ethiopia's key strategy to realize its poverty reduction objective in rural Ethiopia is transforming subsistence farmers into market orientated farmers. This transformation requires making improved technologies available, accessible and affordable to farmers, while at the same time improving the institutional infrastructure and support services to farmers. Of particular relevance in this transformation process is improved access of farmers to input and output markets. To this effect, the Government of Ethiopia (GoE) in collaboration with the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) organized a technology exposition and workshop at ILRI-Addis campus in June 2002, of which the IPMS project is a follow-up. The goal of the current project is to realize an integrated agricultural development in Ethiopia that combines technology transfer, input-output market development, and enhanced impact of policies and institutions.

Improving productivity and Market Success of Ethiopian Farmers (IPMS) project launching workshop was held at the ILRI campus from June 30 to July 2, immediately following the technology exhibition. The project was attended by project staff, potential beneficiaries from the federal and regional level, potential national and international research and development partners and specialists in topics relevant for the project (A list of participants is shown in **Annex 1**).

The objectives of this workshop were:

1. To review project design
2. To develop a plan for project planning phase: including review of activities, involvement of partners and taskforces
3. To obtain innovative ideas and alternatives for testing during project implementation

The workshop program is attached in **Annex 2**.

The workshop started with introductory speeches by Dr Carlos Sere, DG of ILRI and Mark Andre Fredette (CIDA Director for Ethiopia & Head of Development Cooperation for the Horn of Africa), after which the project document between ILRI and CIDA was officially signed. Remarks were then made by Ato Ibrahim Mohammed (Head of the Extension and ATVET Department) on behalf of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development. All presentations stressed the importance of a market oriented agricultural development and the need for partnership.

The workshop then continued with plenary sessions on:

- Session 1: Regional Agricultural and Rural development Strategies and Priorities
- Session 2: Success stories and the IPMS Ethiopian Farmers Project
- Session 3: Current status of knowledge, methods and approaches to knowledge management and capacity building in Ethiopia
- Session 4 Current status of knowledge, methods and approaches to sustainable livelihood development in Ethiopia

-Session 5 Current status of knowledge, methods and approaches to policy and institutional development in Ethiopia

After these sessions working groups were formed to review proposed activities under the four main project components i.e. knowledge management, capacity building, sustainable livelihood development and policy and institutional development. Each working group presented its findings in a plenary session which was followed by one summary session.

2 Plenary sessions

Copies of the papers/presentations are available on the project website: www.ipms-ethiopia.org

Session 1 Regional Agricultural and Rural development Strategies and Priorities

Berhe Feseha and Mezgebe Tsegaye (Tigray); Girma Tesahun, Tadesse Adgo and Seid Yasin (Amhara); Assefa Taa (Oromiya); Bekele Haile (SNNPR).

To set the scene for the IPMS project, the workshop's first session focused on the regional agricultural and rural development strategies from Tigray, Amhara, Oromia and the SNNP Regional States. The papers include background materials to each of the regions together with achievements in agricultural developments. Most of the past efforts have been focused on food crops, in particular cereal crops. Much less attention was given to livestock production and cash commodities. Due attention is therefore being given to the identification and specialization of market oriented crops like cereals, coffee, spices, vegetables and fruits, fiber crops mainly cotton, livestock and fish development and sericulture. Attention will also be paid to linkages of these commodities with agro-industry. Integrated micro water shed development with water harvesting and in-situ soil moisture conservation, improving input multiplication and distribution, capacitating the cooperatives and credit facilities, and capacity building of farmers, DAs etc are some of the priority areas for development. Moreover, decentralization at district level, rural infrastructure development, expansion of market opportunities, enhancing community participation, sustainable use of the natural resource base are some of the opportunities that exist in the region.

Session 2 Success stories and the IPMS Ethiopian Farmers Project

Success stories /Steven Haggblade, IFPRI/

To add to the justification of the project, in terms of the transfer of available knowledge for greater dissemination in Ethiopian, the potential contribution of the national and international research centers was highlighted on the basis of success stories in Africa. Banana breeding laid foundation of success in Uganda, Cassava breeding and disease resistant variety of cassava showed 40 % rise in yield without fertilizer and increased income of 10-20 million farmers, biological control of cassava mealy bug averted famine and triggered policy interest in Cassava. Maize breeding produced hybrids which increased yield by 40 % on 58 % cropped area and benefited 5 – 10 million farm families in Eastern and Southern Africa. Research on Cotton in Mali showed 9 % annual production growth over 40 years in which 30 % of the population participated. Francophone African countries became number 3 world cotton exporters. Improved breeds, AI and veterinary services of crossbred dairy cows became the fastest growing source of

income for smallholder farmers in Kenya. About 600,000 small farmers earned USD 370.00 per year on the average. Improved NRM technologies like improved fallow, leguminous trees and shrubs from ICRAF doubled yield. Conservation farming including water harvesting and minimum tillage have shown tremendous success.

A recent conference in Pretoria discussed on the issue of refining and scaling up of technologies like soil and water conservation, replication of proven commodity-specific breeding and processing successes, marketing and information systems, vertical supply chains, regional cooperation in trade and agricultural technology. Significant poverty reduction will not be possible in Africa without rapid agricultural growth. Pre-requisites for expanding success in the future are good governance-Political commitment, farmer organization and sustained funding for agricultural research and extension.

IPMS project proposal /Dirk Hoekstra, ILRI/

The IPMS project proposal was then introduced by Dirk Hoekstra, highlighting the project goal, and the 4 main focus areas: sustainable livelihood development strategy, knowledge management system, capacity building system and policy/institution development. It furthermore mentioned that the project intends to operate in 4 Regional States (Tigray, Amhara, Oromiya and SNNP) and 10 Pilot Learning Sites.

It was stressed that farmers should be involved in the development process as active participants. The selection of the PLS would be made using criteria to be discussed during the workshop. Also, the project will have an open mind with regard to methodologies to be used in the development strategy. It would build on experiences gained by other actors.

It was also mentioned that although the project's idea originated from the technology exhibition in 2002 in which the CGIAR (Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research) and Ethiopian research institutions exhibited their technologies, the MoARD (Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development) later on expanded the scope of the project including the strengthening and transformation of its extension system. With the assistance of ILRI, CIDA (Canada International Development Agency) was approached to fund the project and the MoARD appointed ILRI as the implementing agency. It was stressed that although the project would have its own core staff at the HQ and the PLS, the sister institutions would still have an important role to play based on their expertise with regard to the identified priority commodities and potential interventions.

Session 3 Current status of knowledge, methods and approaches to knowledge management and capacity building in Ethiopia

During this session, two presentations were made on the knowledge management (existing and future) and 2 on capacity building.

Current status & experiences in knowledge management in Ethiopia /Alemayehu Gebehu/Woldemeskel Gebremariam, MoARD/

Specific reference was made to the National Agricultural Information System (NAIS). The NAIS was established to aggregate agricultural information from the regional agricultural development bureaus (RADBs) and develop situation reports at higher levels. It passed through different phases starting from the preparatory phase of PADEP1 (1987-92). The specific objectives of national Agricultural Information System (NAIS) are 1) to establish information communication platform 2) to establish agricultural monitoring system to address the demands of the end users and 3) to provide access to agricultural information systems to various users. The DAs are the major data collectors. It gives highly disaggregated data at the lowest administrative level. This system was expected to address problems such as, lack of inter-institutional coordination, lack of vertical coordination particularly in production and dissemination of agricultural information, and also solve the problem of lack of harmonization and lack of access. It has implemented a pilot phase to develop and test the various information systems and platforms. In this initial phase about 60 computers and 5 servers have been distributed to the regions and federal governments, and the installation process is under progress. It has been also actively establishing data base at woreda levels. The program conducted various capacity building short term courses and study tours at various levels. Currently the pilot implementation phase is under evaluation by external evaluators so as to validate whether NAIS could serve as a food security information system and serve the demands of MoARD. It was also meant to make efficient use of existing agricultural network infrastructures.

Alternative Options to knowledge management /Ermias Sehai, ILRI/

A presentation was then made on the proposed strategy for developing the IPMS knowledge management strategy by Ermias Sehai, the ILRI IT Manager. The objectives of the knowledge management system in the IPMS project was to i) improve strategies and processes for the transfer of information on best bet solutions and ii) improve capacity to synthesize and utilize information from diverse sources. Knowledge is created as part of an interactive process and is a human attribute with value laden and action learning. There are two types of knowledge: Explicit and tacit. Explicit is a type of knowledge that we know we can write down and share while tacit knowledge is that we do not know that we know. Managing knowledge is a systematic discipline of policies and activities to enable institutions to apply knowledge effectively. The management aspect focuses on how institutions identify, capture, share and leverage knowledge. The KM would contribute to the IPMS project by 1) developing methods to get information from where it is and deliver where it is needed. 2) Develop tools to facilitate knowledge sharing among key institutions and pilot learning sites. To achieve this goal there is a need to understand the critical linkages between people, technologies and the processes. Because different stakeholders may need different information channels and information loads. The technology component to transfer the information could range from radio to intranet and beyond. To make KM efficient we need to assess the current state of knowledge, analyze the gaps and leverage from our successes and learn from our failures.

Participants raised several issues including further clarification of terminology, stressing the need for knowledge management, need for a sufficient allocation of resources and incentive system for participants in the knowledge management system.

Current status and experiences in capacity building and institutional learning in Ethiopia/Fikadu Tilahun, MoARD/

A presentation was then made by Fikadu Tilahun, head of the extension team for adequate moisture areas in the MoARD, on the Ministry's present extension and capacity building program. The new ATVET (Agricultural Technical Vocational Education Training) program was launched in 2001/02 and operates in 25 colleges and has enrolled 30,000 students. The program is envisioned to graduate 55,000 diploma holder DAs to be located in Woreda offices and in the Farmer Training Centres (FTCs). The Ministry expects to have 15,000 FTCs operational by 2008. The Project will link up with these initiatives and provide support to the FTCs in the PLSs, and to ensure that a market oriented development strategy is being followed.

***Capacity strengthening: lessons from the Region /Ponniah Anandajayasekeram, IFPRI-
ISNAR/***

Finally a presentation was made by Dr *Anandajayasekeram* from IFPRI/ISNAR outlining the principles of capacity building. ISNARs' capacity building philosophy is based on experiential learning, broader stakeholder participation, inter-disciplinary team approach and ensuring sustainability. It is also based on innovation systems perspective. National innovation systems should include indigenous technical knowledge (ITK), modern actors, civil society and all other stakeholders. It also consists of inter-linked sub systems. It should recognize pluralism in service provision, broader involvement, actual and potential linkages, complementarities and synergies. Various models have been tested to strengthen the capacity of end users including farmers research group (FRGs), participatory research and development (PR&D), farmer field school (FFSs), group-based savings and credit schemes. However, there is a need for critical appraisal to document lessons learned and develop strategies. Capacity building is a strong component of the IFPRI-ISNAR programme.

Participants raised issues on the sustainability of the technical vocational education and training (TVETs) and the functioning of the FTCs. It is expected that the IPMS project can contribute to the development and functioning of these institutions.

Session 4 Current status of knowledge, methods and approaches to sustainable livelihood development in Ethiopia

Experience in Agricultural Extension in Ethiopia /Ebrahim Mohammed, MoARD/

The paper presented by the Head of Extension highlighted the history of the development of different approaches for improving the livelihood of the rural population. Agricultural extension started in Ethiopia in 1953 following the Imperial Ethiopian College of Agriculture and mechanical arts (IECAMA) currently named as Alemaya University. In 1963, the mandate of agricultural extension was transferred to the Ministry of Agriculture. In 1967, the first comprehensive package project, the Chilalo Agricultural Development Unit (CADU), was established in Arsi region financed by Swedish International Development Authority (SIDA). This was followed by Welayta Agricultural Development Unit (WADU) in 1970, the Ada District Development Project (ADDP) in 1972. Then the Tach Adiabo and Hedekit Agricultural Development (TAHADU), Southern Regional Agricultural Development Project (SORADEP) and Humera Agricultural Development (HAD) were also established with almost similar approaches. In 1968-1971, nation wide programmes (with the exception of the pastoral areas) were designed with the assistance of SIDA by the minimum package programme (MPP-1). The

Extension and Implementation Department (EPID) was established within the MOA to implement this program. MPP-2 started in 1980, which resulted in dissolving EPID and the closure of development centers. In 1982, MPP-2 was replaced by the Peasant Agricultural Development Programme (PADEP). Based on the agricultural Development -led industrialization (ADLI) strategy, a Participatory Demonstration and Training Extension System (PADETES) was developed in 1995 by the Government of the federal democratic Republic of Ethiopia (FDRE). Prior to the implementation of the PADETES, a pilot extension intervention program called SG-2000 was initiated in 1993 by Sasakawa Global. A new phase has now been entered in which a much strengthened extension system is being developed through TVETs and FTCs (see session 3).

Participants raised issues concerning the extension approaches and the need to be more flexible and more participatory. Also the roles of the extension service vis a vis other tasks need to be redefined. The IPMS project is expected to contribute to such development through the introduction of innovative extension approaches in the selected Pilot Learning Sites (PLS).

Enhancing the Role of extension to Sustainable Livelihood Development (SLD) Practice and Principles /Jeroen Dijkman, ILRI/

In this presentation the need for change from the existing extension system was discussed. Reasons for such changes are a more market oriented development strategy and the realization that farmer empowerment can be the engine for development. Empowering communities to be responsible for their own development can take different forms. It means making extension and research staff and local officials accountable to farmers or farmer associations. Also the need to increase the role of the private sector in development was elaborated on. In developing new extension systems, an innovative system approach (ISA) was advocated in which technology and institutional innovations are developed at the PLS through a learning process. Linear approaches will often not work in an environment which is subject to frequent changes. A question to be addressed by the project is how one can develop an innovation system approach for extension with different stakeholders, which is able to respond rapidly to new challenges and opportunities.

Session 5 Current status of knowledge, methods and approaches to policy and institutional development in Ethiopia

Agricultural market development in Ethiopia: problems and issues /Mohammed Jabbar, ILRI/

The presenter introduced his presentation by highlighting the importance of appropriate marketing arrangements for the success of the IPMS Project. He presented a general description of the marketing problems of the crop sector, namely grain prices instability, financial services, post harvest losses and storage, transport, communication and market information, lack of grain quality standards, processing, and high transaction costs. He then described alternative solutions for each group of marketing constraints. Problems in livestock marketing were briefly outlined. These included primarily the low marketing efficiency, the role of livestock marketing in managing risks associated with cropping, product safety in relation to public health, disease and trade, cross-border trade and provision of livestock services by both public and private

organizations. The presenter concluded his presentation by pointing to the need for identifying the main market constraints in Ethiopia and focusing on these priorities in the IPMS pilot sites.

Participants commented that the paper presented a rather broad set of marketing problems with numerous options for solutions. They asked what would be the priorities for interventions that would produce the greatest difference in improving the marketing of agricultural products in Ethiopia. It was suggested that establishing those priorities should be one of the initial activities of the IPMS Project.

The Development of Microfinance Industry in Ethiopia: Current Status and the Prospect for Growth / Welday Amaha, AEMFI/

This presentation gave an historical perspective of the evolution of credit and financing institutions in Ethiopia. It referred to the era comprised up to 1996, in which government institutions and non-government organizations subsidized credit. During this era, saving and credit cooperatives were established and they were often associated with failure and mismanagement. Credit provided in this era was mostly (89%) defaulted. It was closely related to projects and used to purchase inputs following a top-down approach. Credit was often perceived, not as a loan that was to be repaid, but as aid. It ignored the ability of poor people to save. Financial institutions in this era distributed donor funds, but not really provided financial services. It explained how the financial systems in Ethiopia changed with the proclamation of a law for regulating micro-finance institutions in 1996. As a result of this law, micro-finance institutions evolved into more sustainable mechanisms to provide credit to poor people. They are demand-led, have a strong focus in rural poor and use savings as a capital for providing loans. However, their outreach is still limited, do not give priority to some vulnerable groups (women, the poorest of the poor, etc) and face the challenge of “competition” from government and NGO initiatives that provide subsidized credit and aid. It also described the role of banks and saving/credit cooperatives as mechanism to deliver financial services to poor people. He concluded the presentation highlighting the need for strengthening these institutions so they become sustainable and more effective in providing financial services to poor people.

Participants raised several issues concerning interest rates, limitations of the AEMFI (Association of Ethiopian Micro Finance Institution), especially in relation to the poor. It was also pointed out that interest rates varied considerable from 9 to 25 %. There is also still a mix up with credit supplied through the Ministry of Agriculture, usually a much reduced interest rates.

Policy and Institution Development for Agricultural Transformation in Ethiopia /Berhanu Gebremedhin, ILRI/

Dr. Behanu Gebremedhin referred to the problems of poverty, food insecurity and resource degradation of Ethiopia, the favorable institutional environment that the Ethiopian government is promoting to overcome these problems and the attempts of the international donor community to promote rural development in poor countries. He emphasized the need for agricultural transformation through diversification and market orientation, and explained how this change can ultimately lead to structural transformation through employment sources from the non-agricultural sector, specialization, technological change and institutional innovations. He then described the changes in policy and institutions that are required to transform agriculture into

market oriented forms of production. These involve land tenure, extension services, input supply, linkage to markets, financial services and credit and organization of producers. The presentation concluded with an outline of some options for the IPMS Project supported by CIDA to address these needs.

Participants raised issues in relation to land tenure and its effect on development, and involvement/linkages with partner institutions in developing policy recommendations. It was also stressed that institutional innovations/policy options may be tested at the PLS level.

3 Working group sessions

Three working groups were established centered around the four project components. Working Group (WG) 1 combined the first and second component i.e. knowledge management and capacity building; WG 2 focused on sustainable livelihood development in PLS and WG 3 on Policy institutional recommendations

Each working group was requested to review and comment on the draft result chains for each of the components. The result chain includes activities, the reach of the activities in terms of individuals and institutions, the outputs and the outcome of the combined outputs (draft results chains were issued to each of the WGs). The groups were also requested to comment on the selection criteria/process, the involvement of stakeholders and mechanisms in the project and the proposed planning phase activities for each of the components (a draft plan for each component was provided to the WGs).

This workshop represents the first step in the process of developing a project implementation plan (PIP) within the overall framework of the project proposal. The PIP is expected to be ready and be presented for approval by the MoARD and CIDA in December.

Sustainable livelihood development working group report - Tilahun Ameda

The proposed activities were reviewed and the WG made several suggestions to fine-tuning the rather broadly defined activities including:

- needs assessment to be jointly at household, community and higher level
- client driven learning model
- area based approach
- identify and document who is doing what in the PLS
- explore existing markets (information, linkages, factors influencing success)
- explore local livelihood approaches, strategies
- identify entry points with immediate benefits

The group also suggested that starting with 10 PLS might be too ambitious and recommended stakeholder involvement in the development and implementation of activities.

The group also suggested that CBOs, NGOs, local administrators, resource people, schools and religious leaders should be included in the project reach.

The outputs and outcomes were also redefined to better reflect the activities and the ultimate impact. Outputs included the methodologies and approaches for technology adoption towards

assets and income creation identified and results shared across PLS, and decision support tools developed for further dissemination. It was also recommended to include some of the impact statements (on increased production and productivity and institutional arrangements) at the outcome level. Furthermore the strategy, technology and process outcome statement was enhanced by including increased capacity for resilience, income generation, risk aversion, access to resources and farmer innovation. It was stressed that process outcomes were at least equal in importance to the technology outcomes.

A number of suggestions were made on the selection of the PLS. It was recommended that regions select 4 sites each based on the criteria recommended by the workshop. Regions then meet to make a final choice of 2 each based on complementarities between initially selected sites. Sites should be representative for regional priority commodities and offer variability for developing market oriented innovations.

To involve others in the project the group emphasized that mechanisms should be used to bring the various actors together. It was also stressed that decision making should be based on discussions among partners at various levels (national, regional, PLS). Memberships in committees should be inclusive rather than exclusive. It was also emphasized that the beneficiaries should feel ownership of the project at the different levels.

Finally, for the planning phase activities, the WG advised to have committees at the different levels from the start. The project should also hold orientation and awareness creation workshops about the project in the regions and PLS. The project should also try to assess the potential enterprise development options.

Policy/institution development working group report- Girma Tesfahun

The WG proposed some changes in the wording of the activities which emphasized the testing of policies, strategies and institutional innovations in PLS (this may overlap with activities defined in the sustainable livelihood development component). The group also made additions in the reach statement and included civil societies, donors, government officials, MFIs and RARIs. The wording of the outputs and outcomes were also modified to better reflect the proposed activity chain. At the output level, it was suggested that policies, technologies and institutional arrangements are assessed and documented including the strength and weaknesses. At the outcome level, the same are introduced and implemented.

The WG also made some suggestions for innovative finance and marketing arrangements including separation of finance and input supply. Rainfall insurance linked to credit, livestock insurance. Innovative marketing approaches to be considered are: forward contracting, warehouse receipt system, contract farming/out growers schemes, agricultural machinery hiring services.

The WG suggested that the overarching criterion for the selection of PLS is representation of development domains as defined by agro ecological and agricultural potential and market access. Such representation should first be considered at the regional level. Additional criteria include proximity to TVETs, diversity in PLS, good overall institutional capacity to sustain the project

activities (research, extension, NGOs and other actors). It was also stressed that pastoralist systems should be included in the selection criteria.

A review of the policy/institution planning activities was divided into pre- and post-PLS selection. During the pre selection period inventory work on policy and institutions should be made. Post selection emphasis should be put on rapid assessment of opportunities and needs in the PLS and characterization of poverty for basic stratification of the community. Use should be made of various tools/methods including GIS, PRA and market chain analysis.

Several stakeholders were identified for the policy/institution recommendation component, including IFPRI and ILRI and the various institutional organizations (MFI, Cooperatives, Marketing Bureaus, Administrative Offices).

Knowledge management (KM) and capacity building working group – Eyasu Elias

The activities, outputs and outcomes were reviewed jointly and the following observations were made for KM. Purpose is to capture local (indigenous) as well as global knowledge and make it available. The institutional analysis should include an assessment of the different stake holders i.e. research, universities, NGOs, farmers, private sector. Different stakeholders require different information/knowledge. Development of the knowledge management mechanisms and structure should be linked to AgriNet/NAIS in the MoARD. It was also stressed that ownership of the KM system should be by the MoARD.

For the capacity building exercise, it was felt that an assessment needs to be made of the human resource capacity of the main stakeholders. The target group for the capacity building of the human resources includes the TVETs and the extension staff including the field staff. The primary stakeholders to be brought on board are ATVETs, Regional Research Centers, Cooperatives and Farmers.

For the selection of the PLS the WG first of all clarified that the whole Woreda would form the pilot area. Project activities may cover all or a few sites (Peasant Associations), depending on potentials. It was also mentioned that activities in the PLS should be closely linked to the Farmer Training Centers. Considerable debate took place on the criteria. It was felt that food insecurity may not be the best criteria for selecting PLS which are to have a market orientation. It was felt that neglecting food insecure woredas would result in the project not targeting the poorest woredas. It was also argued that food insecure Woredas already received support from the food security programs. An overarching criteria should be that the PLS should be representative of different development potentials. Other criteria should be a high probability of success based on accessibility, presence of market oriented institutions including credit, markets. Proximity to TVETs was also advocated by some.

4 Summary sessions

In this final session the workshop summarized the major findings and recommendations.

General comments

- This project is about process as well as technology transfer. The dichotomy between process and technology transfer is not going to be useful, as the project involves both. The innovation process is very important, but the technology transfer component is an integral part. The project started as a technology transfer project, but gradually embraced innovation process. There is a need to artfully blend the tech transfer with the innovation system.
- The signed document was not distributed to CG centers, and should have been. The document will be distributed to CGs and other collaborators.
- A clearly thought out mechanism to link the PLSs with the higher level is important.
- There will be a substantial amount of policy analysis beyond the pilot learning sites.
- The connection between the technology exhibition and the project need to be spelt out.
- An inventory of every thing that contributes to the project (including expertise needs to be done.
- We need to ask what is it that we want to achieve when we think of partnership. Partnerships can be primary or secondary.

Selection of PLS

- The pilot learning sites will determine the technology needed. Hence, CG centres or NARS will be called upon based on the technology need of the PLSs. Expression of interest will have to be sought after the technology needs of the PLSs is determined.
- Need to synthesize the suggestions of the WGs about their suggestion on how to select the PLSs
- Need to collect secondary information.
- Need to collect spatial information.
- There are two approaches to be used:
 - Development Domains approach
 - Questions approach (What do we want to learn?) Development domains approach may encompass the questions approach.
- Need to determine carefully how the regions will be involved in selecting the PLSs.
- Need to consider farmer researcher Groups.
- Decide carefully on the number of PLSs per region? Based on size? Based on diversity of agro-ecology? Based on Population? Based on diversity of Farming systems?
- The selection of PLSs should be done based on a combination of bottom-up and top-down approaches.
- The selection of the PLSs across regions should not be independent of each other. For example, a pilot learning site in Amhara that represents a given situation should be able to generate lessons for similar situations in Tigray, Oromia or SNNPR.
- African Highland Initiative (AHI) used the following steps in selecting its sites:
 - Criteria developed
 - Criteria given to regions
 - Each region came up with some selection
 - Debated and agreed on final selections
- The project implementation plan (PIP) will have to be quite precise regarding what should be done in the PLSs. Hence, ten of the PLSs will have to be selected prior to the completion of the PIP.

- In order to spread risk (of failure), it may be better to start with more PLSs than less. Important to assess capacity of the project team, and determine what can be done and start with the number of PLSs that can be accommodated.
- Regions can be given the criteria, asked to select a few top candidate PLSs, then final selection can be made in collaboration with project staff.
- Important to get feed back from stakeholders/collaborators before Selection of PLSs is finalized.

Project management

- There is a project steering committee (PSC).
- There is project implementation committee, which can include more members as approved by the PSC.
- The project technical committee should focus on the technical matters of the project.
- Important to consider how representation at the local level will be ensured.
- Each of the four regions will need to be represented at the National Technical Committee.
- The national technical committee may be useful to ensure regional representation at the national level.
- There may be a need to have regional technical committees as well.
- It is important to link across the project results.

Next steps

- Collection of baseline information for the development of the program
- Develop action plans
- Need to discuss the process of PIP development
- Need to institute RBM into the project.
- Need to constitute the National Technical Committee before selection of the PLSs.
- After selection of PLSs, expression of interest should be sought.
- Strong baseline data is important.
- Need to realize that there will be a lot of pressure on the project.
- Teams at the PLS level may need to be constituted.
- Important to get the sense of ownership of the woredas.
- Important to manage the expectation carefully.

Annex 1. Project launch and planning workshop list of participants

Name	Organization	Email
Mengistu Buta	Africare	afrieth@telecom.net.et
Amare Sima	Agarfa TVET	
Amanuel Assefa	Agri-Service Ethiopia	ase@telecom.net.et
Ann Stroud	AHI/ICRAF/ASARECA	a.stroud@cgiar.org
Wolday Amaha	AEMFI	
Girma Tesfahun	Amhara ARI	girmatesfa@yahoo.com
Tsegaye Tadesse	Amhara BoA	boaplan@yahoo.com
Mekonnen Mekuria	Amhara BoRD	Amhr_rd@telecom.net.et
Afvrika Juvenal	CARE Ethiopia	juvenala@careet.org
Mulugeta Tefera	CARE Ethiopia	mulugetat@careet.org
Roger Kirkby	CIAT	r.kirkby@cgiar.org
Tilahun Amede	CIAT	t.amede@cgiar.org
Pandey Shivaji	CIMMYT	s.pandey@cgiar.org
Strafford Twumasi-Afryie	CIMMYT	s.twumasi@cgiar.org
Wilfred Mwangi	CIMMYT	w.mwangi@cgiar.org
Addisu Mehrete	Cooperative Commission	
Ginjo Giya	CRDA	rdt@crdaethiopia.org
Gure Kumsa	CRS	gurek@crsethiopia.org
Yohannes G/Meskel	Dedebit Credit & Saving Institution	decsi@telecom.net.et
Melkamnesh Alemu	DFID	m-alemu@dfid.gov.uk
Tsedeke Abate	EARO	dg@earo.org.et
Ashenafi Gizaw	Embassy of Norway	gja@mfn.no
Sissay G/Giorgis	FAO	sissay.gebregiorgis@fao.org
Ismail A. Ahmed	ICARDA	ICARDA-Cairo@cgiar.org
Said Nahdy	ICRISAT	s.silim@cgiar.org
Steven Haggblade	IFPRI	s.haggblade@cgiar.org
P. Anandajayasekeram	IFPRI-ISNAR	p.anandajayasekeram@cgiar.org
Abebe Menkir	IITA	a.menkir@cgiar.org
David Chikoye	IITA	d.chikoye@cgiar.org
Eyasu Elias	ICRAF	e.elias@cgiar.org
Mark Andre Fredette	CIDA	
Dirk Hoekstra	ILRI	d.hoekstra@cgiar.org
Sere Carlos	ILRI	c.sere@cgiar.org
Bruce Scott	ILRI	b.scott@cgiar.org
John McDermott	ILRI	j.macdermott@cgiar.org

Azage Tegegne	ILRI	a.tegegne@cgiar.org
Berhanu Gebremedhin	ILRI	b.gebremedhin@cgiar.org
Kahsay Berhe	ILRI	k.berhe@cgiar.org
Jeroen Djikman	ILRI	j.djikman@cgiar.org
Abebe Misgina	ILRI	a.misgina@cgiar.org
Don Peden	ILRI	d.peden@cgiar.org
Ermias Sehai	ILRI	e.sehai@cgiar.org
Jean Hanson	ILRI	j.hanson@cgiar.org
Mario Herrero	ILRI	m.herrero@cgiar.org
Mohammad Jabbar	ILRI	m.jabbar@cgiar.org
Salvador Fernandez-Rivera	ILRI	s.fernandez-rivera@cgiar.org
Ralph Roothaert	ILRI/CIAT	r.roothaert@cgiar.org
Christopher Delgado	ILRI/IFPRI	c.delgado@cgiar.org
Michael J. Potts	International Potato Centre	m.potts@cgiar.org
Dejene Mekonnen	Irish Embassy	dejene.makonnen@lueagh.gov.ie
Jim Ryan	ISNAR Division, IFPRI	j.ryan@cgiar.org
Zenete Peixoto Franca	ISNAR Division, IFPRI	z.franca@cgiar.org
Bancy Mati	IWMI	b.mati@cgiar.org
Seleshi Bekele	IWMI	s.bekele@cgiar.org
Yonas Regassa	Jimma RTPC	jtrc@telecom.net.et
Demere Anno	Menschen fur Menschen - Merabete	mfmirdp@telecom.net.et
Daniel Danano	MERET Project of MoARD/WFP	ethiocat@telecom.net.et
Alemayehu Gebeyehu	MoARD	alemgeb@yahoo.com
Fekadu Tilahun	MoARD	
Bateno Kabeto	MoARD	moa.crop@telecom.net.et
Berhane Ghiday	MoARD	
Belachew Hurrissa	MoARD	dh.anpmark@telecom.net.et
Girma Tesema	MoARD	
Ibrahim Mohammed	MoARD	aed@telecom.net.et
Mebrat Alem	MoARD	
Bezabeh Emanu	OARI	emana_b@yahoo.com
Aliye Hussen	Oromia ARI	asoba_a@yahoo.com
Asefa Taa	Oromia ARI	
Mohammad Hassena	Oromia ARI	mhassena@yahoo.co.uk
Argaw Ashine	PANOS Ethiopia	a_argaw@hotmail.com
Ali Said	PSU/CIDA	foodsecurity@psuaddis.org
Kibru Mamusha	Royal Netherlands Embassy	kibru.mamusha@minbuza.nl
Berecha Turi	SG-2000	

Bekele Haile	South BoA & Natl Resource Devt.	
Daniel Dauro	Southern ARI	arc@telecom.net.et
Kiros Tikue	Tigray Agricultural Mktg Support Agency	mebkir@hotmail.com
Abbadig Girmay	Tigray ARI	abbadig@yahoo.com
Amare Belay	Tigray ARI	marc@telecom.net.et
Abera G/Amlak	Tigray BoA	
Berhe Fiseha Yeibio	Tigray BoRD	
Belay Demissie	USAID/Ethiopia	bdemissie@usaid.gov
Getu Shiferaw	Welayta Soddo TVET	
Assaye Legesse	World Bank	alegesse@worldbank.org
Yitbarek Nigatu	World Vision Ethiopia	yitbarek_Nigatu@wvi.org
Daniel Jamu	World Fish Center	d.jamu@cgiar.org

Annex 2. Project Launching and Planning Workshop Program, June 30 – July 2, 2004,

ILRI-Addis Campus

DAY 1 June 30, 2004		
TIME	ACTIVITY	PRESENTER
8:00 – 9:15	Registration of Participants	Organizers
Welcoming Speeches, Signing Ceremony, Launching of Project and Opening		
Chair: Dr. Azage Tegegne, ILRI		
Rapporteur: Dr. Said Silim, ICRISAT		
9:15 – 9:25	Introductory Speech	Dr. Carlos Sere, ILRI
9:25- 9:35	Introductory Speech	Mr. Mark Andre Fredette, CIDA Director for Ethiopia and head of Development Cooperation for the Horn of Africa
9:35 - 9:40	Signing Ceremony	Mr. Andre Fredette, CIDA and Dr. Carlos Sere, ILRI
9:40 - 9:50	Remarks	Ebrahim Mohammad, MoARD
9:50- 10:20	Coffee Break, Group Photo	Organizers
Session I: Regional Agricultural and Rural Development Strategies and Priorities		
Chair: Ato Ibrahim Mohammed, MoARD		
Rapporteur: Dr. Twumasi Afriyie, CIMMYT		
10:20-10:40	Workshop Introduction	Dirk Hoekstra, ILRI
10:40-11:00	Tigray region	Berhe Feseha and Mezgebe Tsegaye, Regional representatives
11:00– 11:20	Amhara region	Girma Tesfahun, Tadesse Adgo, and Seid Yassin, Regional representatives
11:20-11:40	Oromia region	Assefa Taa, Regional representative
11:40-12:00	SNNP region	Bekele Haile, Regional representative
12:00 – 1:00	Questions/Discussions	Participants
1:00- 2:00	LUNCH	Organizers

Session II: Success Stories and IPMS Ethiopian Farmers Project		
Chair: Dr. Roger Kirkby, CIAT		
Rapporteur: Dr. Eyasu Elias, ICRAF		
2:00 – 2:30	Success stories in African Agriculture: Contributions of the CGIAR	Dr. Steven Haggblade, IFPRI
2:30- 3:00	Overview of IPMS Ethiopian Farmers project	Dirk Hoekstra, ILRI
3:00 – 3:20	Questions/ Discussions	Participants
3:20-3:50	<i>Coffee Break</i>	Organizers
Session III: Current Status of Knowledge, Methods and Approaches to Knowledge Management and Capacity building in Ethiopia		
Chair: Dr. David Chikoye, IITA		
Rapporteur: Dr. Tilahun Amede, CIAT/AHI		
3:50-4:10	Current Status and Experiences in Knowledge Management in Ethiopia	Alemayehu Gebeyehu/Woldemeskel Gebremariam, MoARD
4:10 – 4:30	Alternative Options to Knowledge Management	Ato Ermias Sehai, ILRI
4:30 – 4:40	Questions/Discussions	Participants
4:40-5:00	Current status and Experiences in Capacity building and Institutional Learning in Ethiopia	Fekadu Tilahun, MoARD
5:00-5:20	Alternative Options to Capacity Building and Institutional Learning	Dr. Ponniah Anandajayasekeram, IFPRI/ISNAR
5:20:5:30	Questions/Discussions	Participants
6:00	Reception	Organizers

DAY 2 July 1, 2004

Session IV: Current Status of Knowledge, Methods and Approaches to Sustainable Livelihoods in Ethiopia

Chair: Dr. Zinash Sileshi, EARO

Rapporteur: Dr. Sileshi Bekele, IWMI

9:00-9:20	Experiences in Agricultural Extension in Ethiopia	Ebrahim Mohammed, MoARD
9:20:9:40	Alternative Options to Sustainable Livelihoods Development	Dr. Jeroen Djikman, ILRI
9:40-10:00	Questions/Discussions	Participants
10:00 – 10:30	<i>Coffee Break</i>	<i>Organizers</i>

Session V: Current Status of Knowledge, Methods and Approaches to Policy and Institutional Development in Ethiopia

Chair: Dr. John Pender, IFPRI

Rapporteur: Dr. Salvador Fernandez-Rivera, ILRI

10:30 – 10:50	Agricultural Market Development in Ethiopia: Problems and Issues	Dr. Mohammed Jabbar, ILRI
10:50 – 11:10	Rural Credit Services in Ethiopia	Dr. Welday Amaha, AEMFI
11:10-11:30	Policy and Institution Development for Agricultural transformation in Ethiopia	Dr. Berhanu Gebremedhin, ILRI
11:30-12:00	Questions/Discussions	Participants
12:00 – 1:00	Lunch	Organizers

Session VI: Working Group Deliberations

Chairs:

Knowledge Management and Capacity Building: Dirk Hoekstra, ILRI

Sustainable Livelihoods Development: Dr. Azage Tegege, ILRI

Policy and Institutional Development: Dr. Berhanu Gebremedhin, ILRI

1:00-3:00	Working group deliberations	Working groups
3:00-3:30	<i>Coffee break</i>	Organizers
3:30-5:30	Working group deliberations continue	Working groups

Day 3		
Session VII. Working group reports on Knowledge Management and Capacity Building, Sustainable Livelihoods Development and Policy/Institutions Development		
Chair: Dr. Bruce Scott, ILRI		
Rapporteur: Dr. Ann Stroud, AHI		
9:00-10:00	Sustainable Livelihoods Development	Dr. Tilahun Amede
10:00-10:30	Policy Institutional Development	Girma Tesfahun
10:30-11:00	Coffee break	<i>Organizers</i>
11:00– 11:30	Knowledge Management and Capacity Building	Dr. Eyasu Elias
11:30 – 12:30	Questions/Discussions	Participants
12:30-1:30	Lunch	Organizers
Session VIII. Harmonizing Working Group Reports, and Methods and Activities of Project		
Chair: Dr. John McDermott		
Rapporteur: Dr. Berhanu G/Medhin		
1:30-2:00	Harmonizing working group report	Dr. Berhanu G/Medhin
2:00-2:30	Wrapping up and Future Directions	Mr. Dirk Hoekstra
2:30	Closing	