GFRAS is leading a discussion on the ‘New Extensionist’ concept, using a position paper to detail the roles and capacities needed to effectively work within agricultural innovation systems. Experts from research, extension, and education from around the globe systematically reviewed the paper from the perspective of their sector or region. An on-line survey was conducted, followed up by a global e-discussion. The paper was revised based on these interactions and will be presented and discussed at GCARD II in October 2012.

Overall the response to the GFRAS position paper was positive and the concept of ‘The New Extensionist’ was validated.

On the whole, the experts agreed that the paper was useful in providing a tool to raise awareness of the importance of extension and advisory services (EAS), although they were undecided as to whether or not the role of EAS was clear in relation to other actors within the agricultural innovation system. Most recommended a shorter 12-page paper and that the recommendations should be more strongly linked to the challenges as they were initially laid out.

Survey respondents commented that the report focuses less on individual extension workers, while recognising that one person will not be able to implement all the roles and capacities needed and that overall the discussion seemed to focus on perspectives for improving extension as an institution more than the extension officer per se. In fact this was intended by GFRAS, that the paper focuses on overall capacities and skills and not just those at the individual level. There was concern that there is not adequate focus on field realities and farmers’ priorities, as the ‘the bottom line is that farmers are looking for ways to improve their livelihoods through improved agriculture’ and ‘technologies are probably more of interest than facilitatory skills’. In short there should not be a shift away from increasing technical capacity, but rather a broadening to add value to existing interaction, learning and adaptation. Respondents saw the need for more discussion on ‘how these recommended actors implement what is needed including how GFRAS/GCARD are going to move the recommendations to actions’.

Many varied and detailed comments were given to GFRAS on the paper. Overall key missing issues were gender equity both within staffing of extension but also in serving the needs of women farmers, one of the most active topics in the e-discussions. Many commented that the role of information and communication technologies (ICTs) could be better highlighted with the proviso to look at when and how information becomes knowledge and innovation by being used to bring about positive change. Also the exact role of different actors and connections to innovations systems was still seen as fuzzy and ill defined. This led to requests for contextual specificity as to which actors could be most usefully targeted in a global programme for improving advisory services.

A two page summary of the position paper was created, briefly covering the roles the ‘New Extensionists’ need to play, the capacities needed to fulfil these roles and the recommended actions and actors at national, regional and global levels to develop these capacities. This two page summary was sent out across a broad number of list servs managed by GFRAS, FARA, GFAR, and e-agriculture, with an invitation to read the two-page summary and respond to a short on-line questionnaire, which led to an invitation to join a further in depth e-discussion. This resulted in over 200 respondents to the survey with a fewer
number joining actively in the follow up e-discussion. The survey results are shared below and are followed by the main points from the e-discussion. For a copy of the survey please contact info@g-fras.org.

**Survey results**

1. The respondents came predominantly from development agencies, research, education and public advisory services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which sector BEST describes where you work?</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Agency (public, private, civil society)</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University or other Education</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Extension and Advisory Services Sector</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please write in below)</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society Extension and Advisory Services Sector</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Extension and Advisory Services Sector</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer Organisation</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other sector (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other sectors included farmers, advisors, consultants and professional associations in different areas, UN staff, retired personnel and media specialists.

2. While they came from all over the world some areas such as Australia and Caribbean are still under-represented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which geographic area BEST describes where you work?</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Africa</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asia</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please write in below)</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Africa</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islands</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Asia/Middle East</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Asia</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Africa</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far East</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central America</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia/New Zealand</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others included South Asia (India, 8), Mediterranean, Transcaucasia, China and combinations of the above.
3. Aside from mediating conflicts, the roles presented below were seen as core mandatory roles of extension and advisory services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of roles</th>
<th>No of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing networks</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organising Producers</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediating conflicts</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating access to credit, inputs and...</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convening innovation platforms</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocating for policy change</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminating new knowledge, training and...</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are any core roles missing?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a relevant role or function for either EAS or AIS</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful role and function to be played by other actors in AIS</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful but not essential role and function for EAS</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core mandatory role and function for EAS</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

66 people commented further and the roles listed as missing included:
- Advocacy, brokering, mediation, facilitation in a variety of settings, including provincial and national government policies; education and advice on corporate products (e.g. GMOs.)
- Linking research with users through participatory research and providing feedback and information on innovation uptake, farmer to farmer training
- Input into education and training curricula
- Building capacity within communities to both articulate and advocate for their needs, form farmer groups, and on how to approach officials
- Understanding farmers’ needs, and providing gender equitable and demand-led services; providing information on private sector products, providing market information and access, and coordinating and supporting farmers to engage effectively with other players in the value chains, and so building rural producers skills and capacity in critical success areas
- Training in sustainable use of natural resources and agro-ecology
- Creating coherence between different advisory and extension services and officers and doing impact assessment for each skill
- Incentive mechanisms for EAS officers

4. Most of the capacities suggested to fulfil these roles were considered as essential and in need of developing.

Thirty-four comments on the chart below related to reemphasising technical capacity and skills first and broader facilitation skills second, understanding the actual focus of extension services, whether politically driven or farmer-led, ensuring real competence and familiarity with the technologies, especially as clean non-polluting and renewable energy technologies are available, gender sensitivity, translation of research into useful communication with farmers, social interaction skills and accounting and managerial skills. Some also found the question hard to answer, either because different country experiences would lead to very different answers or just not understanding the delineation of the different levels.
5. On the whole there was agreement that the recommendations at the three different levels (national, regional, global) were actionable and clear and the right actors were ascribed.

On the whole there is agreement that the recommended activities and actors at each level are correctly identified. While disagreement with the recommended activities and actors decreases from national to global, uncertainty that they are correct increases.
Nevertheless these questions generated 40-50 in-depth comments at each level of analysis. Some comments were on specific recommendations, some prioritising the recommendations within each level and others really highlighting areas they felt were not covered. These included gender, private sector involvement, management of and access to scarce resources, missing players such as NGOs and farmer organisations and who, in particular for regional and global level recommendations, will lead implementation at the national and farmer level, with suggestions of hybrid level strategic approaches. Suggestion on ‘missing recommendations’ covered networking growers and building their capacity and linkages to engage in private sector quality food markets as well as the role of ICTs. Two-way communication and land access and tenure issues were also raised. More detailed comments are listed in Annex 1.

6. 128 people responded to a question on which recommendations they would take a lead or actively engage in implementing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Number of People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the national level, diagnosing the agricultural innovation system, creating innovation platforms, establishing and strengthening training centre as well as collaborative projects with different actors in AIS are best supported. At the regional level organising regional consultations and training programmes and collating and synthesizing evidence on different aspects of EAS in the region were well supported. At the global level, developing frameworks, tools and training modules, policy advocacy and promoting inter-regional reforms are well supported. Many of the comments have emphasized that unless the smallholder farmer is directly brought in they may not benefit. As such, the recommendations themselves will be refined by this feedback. Also, discussions will take place at GCARD II on whether the ones most supported are the easiest ones to achieve, which provide the greatest impact for farmers and whether more effort needs to be focused on those currently much less supported.
7. Many felt that the paper was a useful advocacy tool.

8. Over 180 comments were made as ‘burning issues’ to take forward in the e-discussion.

As with many of the other questions, the comments were very varied and covered many different topics, demonstrating the complexity and inter-connectness of extension work when taking an integrated approach to different farming systems and contexts. What stands out is the primary concern for the capacity building and empowerment of small-holder farmers. Respondents highlighted the need for networks and linkages, partnerships with many actors in the value chain, and the complexity of the skills and technologies, such as ICTs, that farmers need or can benefit from. This raised concern as to how far the role of the extensionist can be expanded before becoming stretched too thin. Nevertheless there is a clear concern that the global forum GFRAS remains inclusive in its thinking, not just on how to really engage more women in EAS, to support women farmers, but also of the different types of farmers, across all intensive and extensive, agricultural-based, pastoralist, mixed cropping and livestock-based systems. Respondents also suggest further thinking on how EAS fits into agricultural innovation systems and a focus on value chains while engaging public, private, community and non-governmental players. There is also a suggestion that GFRAS clarify carefully its most effective role and create strong partnerships and networks to ensure that not only the ‘New Extensionist’ actually emerges, but also they make a difference to the smallholder farming systems.

Report on the e discussion

The first question in the e-discussion related to the gender equity issues in EAS and began an interesting and fruitful debate. Contributions came from India, Egypt, Ethiopia, Nigeria, Argentina, Ghana, Sudan and Tanzania to name a few. All emphasized women’s extensive role in farming and that women are on farm when the male members of the household are migrant workers, as well as being seasonal workers themselves.

It was pointed out that in 1995 IFPRI recommended more female extension workers and that a combined long list of barriers to change included socioeconomic, cultural, institutional, religious traditions, gender barriers, beliefs, traditions, or norms such as ‘women cannot own property’ and traditions that regulate the level of women’s ‘visibility’. National, regional, state, provincial differences and specificities were
highlighted. Some suggested that extension services therefore needed to merge completely with current social realities for any scheme to work and others noted that women’s roles are beginning to change in urban and peri-urban settings. Some pointed out the need to link servicing women’s needs through extension more closely to sociology and research, especially where ‘researchers are men, extensionists are men and there are many social barriers to interacting’. This can lead to examples such as in Congo where ‘a lot of research was put into big disease-resistant cassava tubers for urban markets but not into cassava leaves that have more nutritional value and also economic value to women’.

In India both grassroots and country-wide activities were bringing change from self-help groups for marginal women farmers, mobilising money and resources, offering credit, and forging linkages with banks, so women have access to market (weaver's associations, community-led informal dairying, organic farming, with a note that ‘when most of the organisations are filled with women as active members then all the extension efforts are focused on them’. At the same time the Indian government has set up a country-wide scheme 'Mahila Kisan Sashaktikaran Pariyojan' (MKSP)) to support women in agriculture. Change is also coming in that the current head of agricultural extension services in Egypt is a woman while the average age of officers is increasing. In Tanzania gender balance in extension is progressive but women farmers are still mainly at subsistence level with little access to market.

Some emphasized supporting women and youth in linking to productive markets is crucial and that the entire system of extension delivery has to be totally reorganised. New technologies, different products and activities and ways of delivering need to be developed and implemented. As the discussion moved on to look at entry points for innovation, concrete examples such as Chetna Organics and Basix India, which provides a comprehensive set of livelihood promotion services that include Financial Inclusion Services (FINS), Agricultural/Business Development Services (Ag/BDS) and Institutional Development Services (IDS) to rural poor households under one umbrella. E-choupal initiative from ITC India and other different ICT interventions were also shared. There is positive proof of impact of using radio to disseminate carefully layered and relevant agricultural information. Also shared was improving dairy fodder through scale in Kenya and working with nursery owners to give advice on tree planting and management.

The discussion moved on to raise complex and sensitive issues such as child labour, where in reality in India and Sudan children are involved in agricultural activities and seed production but the legal system prevents the inclusion of children in extension service offerings.

As the discussion moved on again to ‘which capacity needs to be prioritised in your area’, some concrete examples were given. In Kerala India, a development project (KHDP) was initially funded by the European Union, and subsequently taken over by the Government of Kerala (VFCK). In this project, training was a priority activity and three categories of master farmers were identified (production technology, credit and marketing) and given practical training. The master farmers in turn trained the other farmers. Many innovative concepts were also introduced under the programme such as participatory technology development (PTD), self-help journalism (farmers writing for farmers), farmer markets, credit-linked crop insurance, etc.

There was concern about correctly identifying the top priority entry points and different training, skills and delivery methods that could most bring about change. Thought was given to what to do at each stage of an extension officers’ training as well as whom to train, finding key people in the value chain to give advice with a product, such as a participant from East Africa sharing about tree nursery owners.

As a general comment, it was noted that ‘in their reference to extension, contributions ranged from the concept of advisory ‘services’ to that of an extension ‘system’. While, in the past, there have been discussions on the real or alleged differences between ‘extension’ and ‘rural advice’, there has been little on the differences between ‘services’ and ‘system’. As such the ‘complexity of extension as a function in development does not necessarily imply a complexity of competencies for extension agents in their work’ and a caution was raised on being clear about the difference between services and systems. Contributors also pointed out that fragmentation in the system between different ministries, donor and aid agencies leads to lower impact and that the motivation of extension agents becomes a key element of their effectiveness.
Annex 1: Unedited comments on the recommendations from the survey

Comments on the recommended activities and actors at the national level

1. Other rural actors such as fishers and forest users are not included.
2. In some cases only one organization/entity is earmarked where a consortium of several entities seems more appropriate to perform the actions suggested; I think also ATVET institutes should be actively involved in actions for Capacity Development; develop a body for ensuring quality; R1 could also be supported with bilateral aid modalities.
3. In West Africa, and to a large degree in East Africa, the national governments lack resources to build the capacity of the EAS. Most work is being done by donors and NGOs. The governments are racing to privatize EAS. To a large degree this is due to lack of money and an educated work force. This race to privatization is an important aspect that is not addressed in the summary. There is a tremendous amount of capacity development needed to enable the governments to carry out the recommendations made in the summary document.
4. I think we should analyse what training is required before the different social and cultural realities of production and know the limitations imposed by the same cultural differences. Here are few authors expressed in the field of knowledge production in Extension. Thus technology transfer appears less contentious. Consider the issues of culture and production takes conflicts analyse and limitations, is why in these streams more analysis are regarding case studies and generalizations as in studies of diffusion and technology transfer. It is an exploration of the links between research and extension. But bearing in mind that research extension also occurs from the interaction of knowledge production actors.
5. Some actions [do] not necessarily have to be carried out by national organizations alone (only in N9 are regional networks mentioned and there are great potential synergies when working among countries to develop methodologies, etc. Actors: Were farmer organizations left out or are they tacitly included as part of the innovation system?
6. Several decision makers, leaders, managers on EAS organisation level and National Government level are not familiar with concepts and approaches of extension and advisory work and therefor they are not able to turn suggested actions (N) into practical actions on national level.
7. Extensionists should have key role in developing strategies, decision taking processes and opportunities to exposure to-regional and global level extension forum to share their experience and knowledge.
8. Resources are a constraint.
9. Missing: Development agencies such as FAO that provide policy advice and technical assistance to reforming and reshaping EAS at national level through its field programme.
10. Private consultants should be included.
11. Unclear or limited role for farmer organizations as key players in EAS; too much reliance on government and academic institutions.
12. Other actors should include gender specialists/champions even at the national level that will ensure that EAS, RAS and AIS activities wear [a] gender lens. Clear, concise, functional and operational gender indicators should be rigorously pursued. This will create more workable and realizable recommendations. A need to collaborate and partner with funders who have commitment for financing gender related issues in EAS, RAS and AIS.
13. The inclusion of these actors must be people who are proactive to make the new perspective actionable.
14. There is little emphasis on small holder farmers’ involvement at national level. I think.
15. The quest for generalizable/generic recommendations is a challenge. While they all sound worthy: in practice they will only gain meaning when adapted to local circumstances, among which funding (tied or not) will dictate the extent to which they are functional.
16. There is a need to have clear roles of different actors
18. In N8, I suggest to add ‘and by learning by doing mode’. Also suggest to add some words showing that we have to capitalise on existing studies and diagnosis, and to not reinvent the wheel... This list is likely to show that nothing was done right now!
19. Try avoiding jargon (e.g. skill up-gradation of individuals). Make it sound more farmers focused. Right now it sounds top down. The ‘actors’ are vague - ‘Management institutions'? 'A facilitator'? Why management experts and not communications experts?
20. The role of CSO’s [civil society organisations] is underestimated.
22. Producers organizations
23. There should be also platforms to engage with civil societies and farmer groups to ensure that they are
involved in Extension work

24. Particularly N4 is still very vague; needs assessment is missing and assessment of the interest of the farmers - the latter is not self-evident. In terms of actors - as soon as farms become businesses, the tax advisors become the most important players. I am not sure whether you can see the active support of ministries to such activities as self-evident. In terms of further research: also at national level the studies should already be designed allowing cross-country comparison/comparative assessment.

25. Subject Matter Specialist are needed at sector of agriculture.

26. You have no private actors at all. If we truly mean to have hybrid extension services -- not simply government focused -- we need to seriously include key private players in the Ag sector. They are providing private services now to compensate for the very poor public services in almost every country where I work. Private means NGO's AND for-profit players (e.g., processors, big buyers). Also the actions are process oriented. The substance of the actions is not as clear as it should be.

27. I suggest that you replace ‘Ministry of agriculture’ by ‘Government through Ministry of agriculture’

28. The problem of water resources management in China is described as the problem of the ‘9 dragons’. I believe that I counted a similar number of ‘dragons’ with some involvement in extension.

29. There is much overlap in the actions and actors. These are all very much public and SC actors; where are the actors from the private sector (e.g. commodity boards and business associations).

30. Recommendations are clear but unsure how actionable they are in many countries as many depend on an openness to change which is not present in many governments.

31. EAS is too broad and vague a category to be able to discern whether all relevant actors are included, especially as EAS is defined in terms of activities rather than actors.

32. In the national recommendations animal and fisheries sector should not be under looked.

33. As much as possible the Ministry of Agriculture should not participate in the activities.

34. Yes, it has come important that private sector and Media are key, another key client are school going children who need to play a big role in extension from school to home.

35. The presence of the private sector and the degree to which they can substitute for public sector EAS varies greatly between countries. Currently much of the technical work done by public extension staff should be done by seed, fertilizer and pesticide companies.

36. I think it is well said.

37. Resources are normally shared at the National level based on knowledge and advocacy of all actors. This is the arena of struggle for scarce resources.

38. I’m not sure what N8 really is?

39. It’s important to consider NGOs, input providers and trader’s associations.

40. Tendency of developing nations to ignore the importance of extension and advisory services.

41. How much is gender considered? How much are ‘non-traditional’ organizations and networks considered?

42. All this assumes that the correct knowledge is available to the actors. This is not always the case.

43. But, I am missing the farmer organisations or sector organisation like inter professional bodies.

44. Put in place a Multi-stakeholder platform.

45. Include innovator -farmers as master trainers.

46. Identification of success stories/pilots.

47. Not sure what is meant by N1 - ‘Diagnosis’ of the AIS’.

48. The private INDEPENDENT extension sector is nowhere mentioned, but consists of people with specific PRACTICAL experience. They love from advice, so their advice is oriented to readily applicable innovation with a good rate on success. Those guys/girls are most of the time not visible since fully occupied with their growers. Invite them to participate!

49. Some Actors are missing like private sectors who are recipient of services. Similarly some issues for information and research priorities are missing like Indigenous Knowledge, Documentation, theory building and active role on validation.

50. The actors need to be discussed and identified as part of N1, N2, N3. Countries differ in levels of development of AIS and availability of expertise in areas of concern

51. Does not account for cultural attitudes SE Asia says what it thinks you want to hear. Need independent evaluation of extension services - NOT Ministries of Agriculture.

52. N5, N6, N8, N10, and N11 are the most salient recommendations. I think the other recommendations are not necessary, or are less relevant at this time. It seems better to highlight a few critical recommendations, than to have a list of 11 different ones.

53. N1 All actors in the AIS should participate in the diagnosis. Additional action: Create an accessible resource centre where documented collective experiences can be consulted, discussed, amended so as to promote continuous and accumulated learning.

54. N1. Not clear what is meant by ’Diagnosis’—clarify

N2. What kind of survey--environmental scan of what is already there? Clarify.

N8. Prefer word ‘stakeholders’ to ‘actors’

N9. I would move this to the #2 position
N11. I would move this to the #1 position

55. Universities should direct post-graduate students of extension and rural development to do their research in line with the recommendations of GFRAS.

56. N3 should be led by the extension institution and supported by a facilitator

58. No mention made of development agencies (FAO and others) and their role

57. Not sure that I understand these actions and also not if they are the right ones - particularly I am not sure that the big exercises of diagnosis and surveys will work or what they will be good for creating innovation platforms - not sure what they are?

59. Agri business/enterprise development service providers/advisors

60. Community Based Organisations; Other non-strictly extension Professional Associations; Business and industry; Local and international NGOs.

61. Civil society is not well involved!

62. There is need for privatization of extension service in Tanzania.

63. Make courses on rural sociology as core for those who aspire to be in the EAS and AIS

64. LET KEN KONSCHEL (CURRENTLY VISITING THE U.K., HE WILL HELP YOU ON THIS) (I AM NOT SURE OF THIS LEVEL OF REQUIRED KNOWLEDGE MYSELF)

65. The private sector needs to clearly stand out (i.e. not just be: other actors in the AIS).

66. At the national level, there should be successful individuals in particular sector to encourage the easy adoption of the policy and technology.

67. The recommendations are clear and actionable providing that there is motivation. Resources will critical. Because I am not active at the national level, I am not sure whether the actors are 'right' - although they seem sensible. Maybe in some countries the actors may not exist.

68. If extension are to be mobilized to provide a storage structure for addressing the demands of the rural poor. It is essential to promote a broader perspective on the extension consist of governmental private, civil society and NGOs structures.

69. For conflict, post-conflict countries, N11 must be THE PRIORITY otherwise N1-N10 are 'pie in the sky' unrealistic expectations. While these are great recs, in my experience, they apply more to EAS systems that are quite well-developed.

The customers (farmers) need to have more say/input. In evaluation, in certification, in payment of providers.

**Comments on the recommended activities and actors at the regional level**

1. Instead of creating ever new platforms, frameworks and networks, rather focus on making the existing ones function properly; recommendation G3 could also -maybe even better- be applied at regional level.

2. Let us not waste money and effort on this regional level. Several could be done in the context of global level. Many carcasses of regional activities have been left behind as they were unsustainable and served as talking shops only for professionals and consultants.

3. I am undecided because most regional organizations focus on the most important (wealthy) nations. For example, most of the focus of the East Africa regional EAS networks go to Kenya, Uganda, and Ethiopia. There needs to be specific attention and programming directed at the other EAC nations. This has been going on for a long time and will not change (unless specifically addressed) due to the national priorities of the current beneficiaries; ASARECA is a good example of an organization that does not provide support to countries that need capacity development the most.

4. Recommended actions are clear, but not sure this list is exhaustive. Actors: just a comment on the absence of examples from the American Region.

5. Countries on different development stage have rather big differences in EAS development. Countries do see role of EAS differently. Therefore countries have different resources, motivation and ability for cooperation on regional level. This makes more difficult to reach regional solutions.

6. Go broader, go beyond agricultural research based extension actors.

7. Missing: Development agencies such as FAO that provide policy advice and advocacy at regional level.

8. Again, farmer organizations can play a role at the regional level in terms of providing feedback, sharing good practices, and helping in policy advocacy.

9. The need to establish linkages between gender ARD, address and close the present gender gaps existing at the regional level. Other actors/partners should be strengthened on gender issues outside of agricultural domain affecting both men and women and their households.

10. The inclusion of these actors must be people who are proactive to make the new perspective actionable.

11. The recommendations need to be farmer driven. Get feedback from them to help inform recommendations and policies. Regional farmers should share with each other what works and does not.

12. Utilise existing programs rather than establishing new regional networks. For example Landcare is found in over 20 countries (and growing) and is established from a local base with regional and cross country networks. Is there a credible role for CAADP at national and regional levels or is it dead already?
13. This is clearer, although once you have collected evidence, it does not say what you will do with it in practice.
14. Use existing professional actors in the country in collaboration with GFRAS (SASAE in South Africa).
15. Regional Programs as RUTA, and networks as RELASER (Latin America network for RAS).
16. R2: some common indicators might be set up for increasing research’s effectiveness.
17. Again private sector needs to be represented. See my comment above about the substance of the desired actions. Also using terms such as ‘innovation platforms’... so vague.
18. There are prominent Chinese in ADB and CGIAR but it is difficult to know to what extent a Chinese perspective is included in the recommendations.
19. These are very traditional donor oriented actors I would rather look at players at national and country cluster levels with appropriate trade infrastructure and agro-ecological connections.
20. Clear and easy to promote as does not depend on national budgets and priorities.
21. EAS is too broad and vague a category to be able to discern whether all relevant actors are included, especially as EAS is defined in terms of activities rather than actors.
22. Lack of enough information.
23. Do not want programmes to appear as having any political bias as this would prevent opposing farmers to participate.
24. I need better briefing on who is represented on the Boards of the institutions proposed. Perhaps what I am trying to say is that we must ensure that the opportunities for a disjoint between academic research and practical application is minimised.
25. People working with grassroots communities are also key at regional level and also need to include CGIAR centres.
26. Multinational Agribusiness already do this. Surely we have this in SADC etc.
27. Agree
28. In East Africa Region, we are still in a process of coming up with acceptable approach and policies that facilitated trans-boundary trade and exchange of materials.
29. Involving regional networks such as ReSAKSS might be important
30. The effort in making lower level citizens have access to information electronically. The challenge is the number of people who are able to use ICT.
31. How important is the regional level to national and local level actors? Is it just a convenience for international organizations or does it really add value?
32. But, there should be a focus on cross country economic evaluation and impact benchmarking.
33. Different stakeholders to be properly identified.
34. ‘Regional EAS networks’ could be more clearly defined.
35. Do NOT create new organisations, but facilitate and enhance the local preferences. Those preferences are based on similar climates or culture. Think in terms of the crop/the animal so that growers and extension can exchange immediately and do not lose time to think ‘what is in for me?’
36. For South Asia like SAARC is missing which can play good role if clear orientation and exchange is made. Likewise there are regional private sector organisations that play significant and meaningful role.
37. Regional conflicts (Africa) and climatic differences and impacts to be carefully considered (EX. The horn, N&S Sudan), commitment of regional and international organization to honestly and openly support regional EAS is indispensable, the introversion of int’al EAS in this case is a must.
38. More emphasis on livestock if truly addressing the poor.
39. In some countries, trying to be linked with regional players might be regarded as politically threatening and an act of espionage!
40. Development agencies need to be included. The regional platforms could provide technical support and training - responding to country demands
41. It is important that the issues of gender equality for the regions are mainstreamed into these actions!
42. Regional bodies such as the Southern African Development Community whose development mandate is regional with shared policies, resources and assignments some of which are in the Agriculture and rural development sector and natural resources management. Programmes that have a regional focus like for example there was a regional Kellogg supported integrated Agricultural development programme for southern Africa in the late 1990s early 2000s.
43. The regional level is not yet harmonized! Harmonization of recommendations in all East African countries is essential.
44. I think we need to include sub-regional research organizations e.g. ASARECA, CORAF etc.
45. There has been significant investment in developing regional bodies. I am not sure if there is total clarity on whether this investment has produced positive cost/benefit in all those that have been mentioned. Of course, there may be others not mentioned here - but these might be revealed under R2.
46. What I find missing is how will this be funded? Loans from a bank, fine, but long-term how will these loans be re-paid? What is the revenue model? If it is donor funded, it will be donor driven. How can it be driven by the farmers, the communities, which are perceived to be benefiting from these services?
47. Strong advisory institution should be in place to provide a foundation of support to rural population to reach markets, to access knowledge information and technologies and to influence policy that affect their lives.
48. Recs would benefit from inclusion of significant input by national systems into the regional platforms. Additionally, for Africa, regional platforms exist (e.g., CAADP). May be useful to progressively build on those platforms.

Comments on the recommended activities and actors at the global level

1. Ownership, transparency and accountability are three essential pillars supporting strong, effective and sustainable extension modalities. The accumulated involvement of multiple multilateral institutions at the global level is at odds with these principles, and almost a sure recipe to ineffective use of resources to little avail. Cannot we create a single Extension Reference Centre where all EAS stakeholders, practitioners and policy-makers (organizations, governments, donor institutions etc.) can collect up-to-date information on Extension Worldwide (incl. facilities and modalities for international support)?
2. I do have problems with the suggested levels for extension capacity development. The best development of extension capacity is on the ground. Our challenge is we have a distinct shortage of persons that can help develop such capacity. It cannot really be done at the regional or global level unless it is within an on the ground extension environment. An example here would be the south-south seasoning rice production and extension training being implemented by IRRI and Philrice for extension persons in Africa with JICA funding and under CARD.
3. Focus on G 3-6. Try to be realistic and practical
4. There is tendency that bigger countries can provide more input and resources into cooperation on global level, they tend to dominate. Special attention should be paid on plural approach and avoiding advocating one ‘right’ approach. Remember about consequences of promoting approaches like Training and Visit system.
5. Wondered why only GFRAS-centric global recommendations suggested.
6. The specific role of FAO as a UN specialized technical agency that provides policy advice, technical assistance and capacity development for the reform and reshaping of EAS at national, regional and international level, is overlooked.
7. Better to focus coordination function, not policy/finance matters. afraid involving politics
8. We need to firm up the link between EAS and R&D initiatives; R&D develops the ‘product’ based on the feedback from EAS; EAS tries to sell the ‘product’ to the clients; the two should form part of a whole initiative.
9. It is important at the global level to engender the recommendations at the global level and also ensures GFRAS champions gender integration at all levels and engenders their activities at the global and institutional levels. Gender expertise is needed to ensure capacity utilization, commitment, accountability and sustainability of gender in RAS, AIS and EAS at the global level.
10. The inclusion of these actors must be people who are proactive to make the new perspective actionable.
11. As above.
12. Role of UN specialised agencies and organizations is missed.
13. You might highlight that it is aspired to avoid parallel work of different organisations.
14. See my comments above for questions 8 and 9. This is all written from an insider’s perspective. Terms are so vague; steps are all process oriented. I think paper should add more meat -- WHAT is to be done to make extension vital and scalable and sustainable?
15. It is not clear that small farmer organisations are being represented.
16. Most global players overlap with the regional ones and can only be effective if rooted in national or regional action.
17. Actors for G2 would need to include others than GFRAS - e.g. Action by: GFRAS in collaboration with Regional Networks, FAO, World Bank and others. Donors since funding would need to be through them.
18. EAS is too broad and vague a category to be able to discern whether all relevant actors are included, especially as EAS is defined in terms of activities rather than actors.
19. It is quite difficult to answer clearly about nr 11.
20. In developing countries funding is essential for public extension to be successful and therefore those from extra regional sources would be welcomed. More so since private extension would never be fully adopted.
21. SHARE OUTPUTS WIDELY. OTHER DONORS. INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANISATIONS........
22. The academia and regional research bodies are key
23. This is imperative
24. At the global level, there are disjointed efforts which surely need to be strengthened.
25. I would put the focus on reviewing and building on what is already working
26. What about those who do knowledge management, data base of tools, approaches, safe keeping of tools and materials, ...
27. It’s understandable since GFRAS is initiating this effort, but I think there needs to be some discussion about its organizational role in coordinating almost all of the efforts listed at the global level. Not saying this is
wrong, but don't think it should be presumed that GFRAS should be in the driver's seat. Are others suited for this? Does GFRAS have the capacity?

28. LONG term actions are in my opinion the crucial words
29. I did not see CGIAR. If there is already sorry for misunderstanding
30. It looks as if three are three layers or levels. The approach is top down or bottom up. We need to adopt a hybrid approach that looks to each region as a unique but in the same time interlinked to the global human agony and suffering. We need to look to the region from anthropological (cultural) along with the ecological, political and climatic classification. in this case we may have more and more regions that reflect our understanding and respect for the differences
31. More emphasis on livestock if truly addressing the poor
32. Recommend further consideration of formal policy for open knowledge practices currently endorsed by UNESCO and the Commonwealth Ministers.
33. Gender is absent in the recommendations
34. G1 GFRAS is well positioned for the policy and advocacy role but not sure if they have the resources to undertake capacity development.
35. The role and functions of GFRAS exceed their capacity as a global forum and recognition is needed of other global development agencies. Some of the functions listed should be undertaken by regional networks - technical support/training.
36. It is only that this is describing more or less the current functions of GFRAS. I am missing something more tangible for capacity development/reorientation of the new extensionist....
37. Agri business/enterprise development service providers/advisors e.g. Technoserve types
38. The Business sector and industry
39. More explanations to be availed for our specific location.
40. This would be complimentary to the national and regional recommendations
41. Prepare a base paper, incorporate views and inputs of regional/sub-regional actors to make it more realistic and workable (one shoe is not going to fit all)
42. HAVING SEEN THE AGRICULTURAL SYSTEMS TRAINING MANUAL, WHilst I was on the revamping & typing crew/team, of the new modules required by the dept. of agriculture, here in S.AFRICA... vs. THE KNOWLEDGE I HAVE STUDIED IN THE MANUAL THAT KEN KONSCHEL HAVE BEEN AWARDED FOR BY THE INVENTORS INSTITUTE... BEST SUITING THE S.AFRICAN/ZULULAND CLIMATE, etc. BUT, CAN BE MODIFIED TO BE ANYWHERE, I KNOW, YOU WILL BE MOST GRATEFUL FOR THIS INTRODUCTION I AM LEADING YOU TO CONTACT KEN KONSCHEL...MAY OUR SPIRITUAL FATHER BLESS US ALL, HIS CHILDREN. I PRAY THAT YOU WILL SEE THAT THIS IS AN ANSWER TO OUR PRAYERS COLLECTIVELY, FOR THE SAKE OF THE STARVING NATION/S. AMEN FOR THIS SURVEY TO LEND ME OPPORTUNITY TO DRAW YOUR ATTENTION TO HIS WORKS, KEN KONSCHEL's WORK i.e. BLESS YOU ALL - THANK YOU FOR READING MY COMMENTS.
43. Actors do not link with players at regional and national level
44. This is an ambitious undertaking. Having seen how difficult it is for a global body to get the right mix of 'strategic' actions and those that get too close implementation - it is essential to prioritize among these 7 functions. I imagine that this has come up before - what are the pros and cons of having GFRAS and GFAR as separate bodies - and should they come together as a GFAIS. Apologies if I am deviating from the purpose of this survey.
45. Universities known to have strong EAS components to partner with universities in the developing countries.
46. The actors are too far removed from the actual events on the ground. At the university level, information can be shared globally. Once the big global players get involved in provision of services (tools, advocacy, financing, technical support, etc.) it removes the incentive for those closest to the problem to take responsibility and provide solutions. The actors mentioned here are too far removed!
47. There is a current an enormous need to mobilize Agriculture Extension Services for food security and to achieve a range of rural development goals.
48. A cautionary word: It may be useful to consider developing mechanisms to ensure global actions are sufficiently contextualized to national situations. The applicability of global actions/outputs/outcomes to national situations which vary widely is of concern.