GFRAS New Extensionist E-discussion

Summary at the end of week two

Thank you all for your participation. It has been an active week. In this summary, we summarise the regional discussions before seeing what common themes we need to work on this coming week.

South East Asia

Prioritising activities

Mahesh said that two criteria can be combined and that the top three should be:
1. It has a high chance of impact in the field
2. It adds value to and is likely to be endorsed and implemented by existing relevant extension services
3. It is cost effective (low financial intensity) and can be turned into a business model

The top 3 recommendations in region:
1. Need new capacities to address the current challenges in agriculture and to contribute better to agricultural innovation
2. To better contribute to agricultural innovation, EAS should collectively perform a wide range of roles
3. To perform these roles, EAS need new capacities at the individual, organisational, and enabling environment (system) levels.

This group still needs to list prioritized recommended activities according to the numbering in the New Extensionist summary.

Different perspectives

SK Reddy shared his thoughts that the traditional extensions approaches of the donors, World Bank, FAO, UNDP, and needing to serve their own needs have not delivered sustainable solutions. Moreover he suggested that ‘we should forget about the classical extension systems that existed until late 90s. Today no government in the least developed countries (LDCs) is able to fund and manage the system’ and academics lack the field experience to do more than talk. Willem concurred that often ‘government centric’ approaches had left farmers behind. Million joined in with an erudite sharing of the limits of current approaches and suggested that ‘the problems that farmers are facing today are more of political and social in nature than "technical"or "extension" so to say. Hence, it is time for extension to be critical to current political/social/economic orders than only naively attempting to be technically efficient. ‘

Paul suggested that "pluralistic" extension could be a convenient term to describe the current EAS environment in LCDs because the job to be done far exceeds the available resources, so we must consider all reasonable contributors and suggested that traditional donors do have a role and have had some successes, He also suggested that ‘there is an appropriate role already for governments in such public good extension areas as R&D, priority setting and light-handed regulation of the
pluralistic extension services that ARE available, be they from institutes or schools public or private, or consulting firms, or specific sets of services from input vendors or product buyers.’

Willem concurred that ‘the trick will be to support the government’s role in delivery, where appropriate, but developing its capacity to actually manage a pluralistic system, which would include regulation and certification for instance.’ He gave the example of Moldavia where the often too narrow skills sets of the large number of employees in the Ministry of Agriculture still meant farmers’ needs were not being met. R M Prasad concurred that we have to support a pluralistic extension system. He also shared that ‘there are cases where public extension professionals are doing a lot for empowering the farmers to facilitate farmer to farmer extension. I am referring to the concepts of “farm schools” and "farmer friends" successfully implemented in some of the states in India.

SK Reddy went on to suggest that today’s need is to test/pilotSCALE up new approaches (IT based and others). Over 50% of small famers have cell phones these days. Willem suggested that if we need to test and scale up new approaches, we also need to work out and test how for instance, cell phones, will have a greater impact. Kristin concurred that cell phones do offer enormous EAS potential, as demonstrated initially by smallholder use for credit and money transfers in SSA, and on a more limited basis for market price information discovery, and for agricultural production, pest control and handling advice. She agreed there is a need to look for more self-sustaining financing. John in Uganda shared his skepticism that farmers can afford to or will pay for advice, with Willem suggesting that we need to dig into how to make it affordable for farmers to pay for the service at 2-3% of inputs costs with maybe 50% paid on after a successful harvest, as nationally subsidized extensions services are not sustainable. However, in the Africa discussion Stephanie shared the One Acre fund’s success in having farmers partially pay for services (see below).

Team processes
Mohamed shared some thoughts on the team processes: ‘The tasks to be performed by a three member team in each country. A regional team leader should work as review team leader who will provide a common format to keep the report uniform. The country team should present the findings in the regional workshop in common threads will be identified and reported including country variations. The selected model(s) will be tested as decided in the workshop. As regard funding the New Extensionist Secretariat will contact with donors with a work plan…. I can form the team in Bangladesh.

Responses to questions
1. What outputs and outcomes do you want to see in 2-4 years?
   - The existing EAS reviewed in terms of reach, effectiveness, constraints & possibilities for improvement.
   - New models are tested by modifying or reforming the existing EAS.
   - Coordination among different EAS ensured through joint workshops.
   - Increased investment in agricultural extension activities leading to increased visibility and access to extension services to all categories of farmers. The current investment in agricultural extension is far less than what is considered appropriate for making an impact on agricultural productivity.
   - An enhanced capacity of agricultural extension professionals to deliver the services to the clients with efficiency and effectiveness.
   - The EAS start attracting the farmers as clients who are willing to pay for the extension services may be in implicit forms like contracts.
   - Better gender representation at the national, regional and global level.
   - Players at national, regional and global level require to participate in an effective way. NARs have excellent technical knowledge, KVKs have field experience, regional and global players
can think out of box tools and techniques, workshops, consultations.

2. What actions can we take ...Who is going to do what

- The agencies under Min. of Agriculture, Agricultural research institutions, agri-universities and some select NGOs and cooperatives could be the potential partners in studying the existing EAS and testing of new models.
- Directorate of Extension under Min. of Agriculture may be made nodal agency to coordinate joint workshops (many may not like the idea, but in order to see the things moving in the public sector dominated extension systems, it is important to keep ministry agency in focus.
- The NGOs, agencies like GFRAS may work for capacity building measures to improve efficiency of EAS.

3. Who should partner with us?

- National Agricultural Research system (NARS) comprising national research institutes and state agricultural universities having technical competence and practical experiences (KVKs, ATMA in case of India) may be ideal partner to partner with. Also, this would be comparatively easier to work with.
- Partners who deliver results should partner who can give results. ICAR, State level Universities, CGIAR, FAO, IFPRI, ILRI, World Bank, BMGF, USAID, GIZ, EC, IFAD, DFID etc

4. What resources are already available, what other resources do we need, where will we find them?

- Qualified manpower is available which need to be trained through capacity building initiatives on new approaches.
- Infrastructure is available in the form of Directorates of Extension, Farm Science centres (KVK), ATMA, Farmer Training Centres (FTCs).
- Trainers and funds are required to buy equipment and training costs.
- Strong technical capacity at NARS, ICAR, BRAC, Sri Lanka. Success and Failure examples at ICAR, CG system, NGO's, FAO, World Bank, IFPRI, ILRI Donors etc.; collaboration between different level players/stakeholders; North-South Collaboration in terms of pilot projects; Cross country experts visits

5. How will we use the GFRAS materials for advocacy and what support can they give at the global level?

- GFRAS has made good efforts by identifying the priorities for EAS at global, regional and national levels, which will help shape extension policy development for the countries by triggering further discussions at national levels. The GFRAS documents may serve as good material for discussions in the national level workshops. The GFRAS can collaborate with national agencies to discuss the priorities identified and possibilities of incorporating them in the EAS at national level. At global level, GFRAS documents may help in lobbying for more support in terms of policies and funding in desired/required directions. Once the GFRAS documents are ratified through wider discussions and consensus, the international agencies may support them towards convincing the national governments, since GFRAS on its own without support of international agencies like FAO, CGIAR, ILRI etc may not be as effective. The GFRAS may push for needed reforms based on the evidences and experiences drawn from different countries.
- The publications like New Agriculturist are good means of dissemination likewise New Extensionist publication can be made. Mostly we hear about successful models, we want to know failure models as well. I think we should introduce curriculum on Partnerships and Networks. Creation and sustainable innovation platforms and networks at global, regional and national level. Value chain approaches in EAS.
6. **What curricula reforms and other capacity strengthening activities should take place?**

The curricula should include case studies to know what works and what doesn’t under different circumstances, making it more practical/field oriented. The situation in countries in the region may differ. For instance, in India, the development of agriculture is largely state subject (Federal governments are mostly responsible directly for delivery of EAS), with little direct role of central agencies at implementation level. The institutions under NARS may be best to provide technological backstopping and the state agencies delivering the services. Here, much needed coordination and collaboration is often missing, can GFRAS help in this someway!! Happily many changes are happening automatically, realizing the need, potential and opportunity to do business. The integrated contracts in dairy sector, broiler production, oilseed production, tomato/potato production for companies are some emerging examples where EAS are reaching to farmers as successful business models.

Kristin concluded that these were ‘excellent points from Million, Willem, and others. So where do we go from here? Taking us back to the New Extensionist recommendations, it sounds as if Million and others may be advocating for N8 as the priority: focus on farmer institutional development by working through producer organisations. In other words: empowering farmers to drive their own development. R M Prasad warned that ‘Yes, empowerment is the concept now widely misused, which has to be addressed properly. The process part is to be captured properly. The success story in one region should not be "up-scaled" exactly as it is. We have failed miserably in understanding the process part of innovations. The extension system should be very cautious in ensuring that corporate sector is not exploiting the farmer producer organisations and making their functioning unsustainable.’

**Africa and Near/Middle East**

A key discussion point here was whether or not farmers can pay for training services and what mechanisms can be used to allow them to do so. Michel shared that in francophone countries of West and Central Africa, like many others (Willem) , levels of training of small farmers and advisors are generally low. ...Small farmers cannot afford the full cost of advisors. While John also expressed reservations in Uganda, Willem shared that as many farmers cannot afford extension, government needs to be convinced that spending money on extension makes sense. Then they need to decide how to spend that money. In Estonia, some of the funding for extension was given directly to the farmers and farmers groups (like a social development fund, including some clear rules of access). Those farmers then went ”shopping" for the best advisers they could find. The farming community fast matured into savvy shoppers for good quality, relevant advice! Advisers adapted at speed to the demand from the farmers!

This is not the only way, or even the best way of funding extension, but claiming to be a new extensionist carries the responsibility to focus on results where they count: in the pocket of the farmer, and her husband. Making sure farmers are empowered is then key.

Rupert (CRS) shared that there are some cases where smallholder farmers and rural households are willing to pay for services that they value. Some of these include:

- Veterinary service provided by paravets where the cost of advice is embedded into the cost of drugs supplied by the paravet.
- Two recent fee-for-service developments in East Africa, one to do with crop management advice with supply of inputs (seed and fertilizer) the other to do with support for creating savings and lending groups. You can get more information at the following web pages: [http://fipsafrica.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=12&Itemid=26](http://fipsafrica.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=12&Itemid=26) and [http://www.crsprogramquality.org/microfinance/](http://www.crsprogramquality.org/microfinance/) respectively. In the latter ‘savings and lending’
case, CRS are looking at the feasibility that the private service providers take on additional fee-paying services such as support in business identification and planning for both individuals and groups that want to invest the money that they have saved to start enterprises.

Rupert commented that the Estonia example seems to mirror – or have some similar characteristics to - the attempt of the National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS) in Uganda, which may not have worked as was planned.

Stephanie agreed that for extension services to be sustainable, farmers must pay (even if the price they are paying is subsidized by the public sector or by donors). She described that the One Acre Fund that has 130,000 smallholder farmer clients in Kenya, Rwanda, and Burundi offer farmers seed and fertilizer on credit, paired with extension services and market facilitation. Farmers pay for everything—the inputs, interest on the loan, and a fee for the extension services. However, the extension service fee is "bundled" into the seed and fertilizer loan and seems to be successful at convincing farmers to pay for extension services. The fee structure is transparent—farmers know that they are paying for training—but at the same time, they can’t "opt out" of the extension fee. If a farmer wants a loan, she has to pay for extension services. Willem shared that Kyrgyzstan a similar approach of bundling extension service costs is practiced by taking them inside the contract between the farmers and processors of tomatoes and cucumbers. Here also there is transparency about the costs of the farmers which are deducted from the final payment for the produce, after delivery to the processors.

Willem emphasized that many farmers are willing to pay for advice they consider relevant, important and timely such as for about their sick cow, and planting density or water harvesting techniques may not have the same demand. GFRAS could make a difference providing practitioners with a simple set of tools to determine who will pay, who will deliver, and who will sign off on the quality of extension. Tcharbuahbokengo shared that he is working with cooperatives and microcredit institutions to provide opportunities to farmers directly and enhance micro financing as a force to rural agriculture and extension services.

Another key discussion was the best level of analysis and whether splitting into smaller sub regional groups was more relevant to Africa. There seemed to be some consensus to remain at the regional and macro level of discussion and try and look for priorities across Africa. Willem also suggested one approach could be to focus on expected outcomes; of which increasing the positive impact on farmers’ lives became a centre point. John agreed that the outcome of trained farmers that leads to increased income for smallholder farmers and sustainable supplies to market is the priority goal of EAS in Uganda.

Over the course of the week, quite a few in this group shared their lists of prioritized actions. While there was a general agreement to work at the regional level, recommended activities at the national and global level were prioritized with the idea that ‘G is scaled down to and N scaled up to the regional level.’

- Diagnose roles and functions in the Agricultural innovations systems John (Uganda) N1
- Establish collaborations and partnerships with different actors in AIS and value chains. Anabela, John (Uganda) N5
- Establishment of National Networks . Miriam EWB Canada N6
- Monitoring & learning (but more focus on accountability) from Moumouni (Benin), Ismail (N9)
- Training and education from Max (AFAAS) Bernadette, Ismail, Tom, John and Jackson (N10 and N11)
- Supporting regional networks and helping them intervene from ANAFE (Sebastian), Miriam EWB and Moumouni (R1)
- Collecting & synthesizing evidence from ANAFE (R2)
- Develop and promote new knowledge, framework and methodologies related to EAS and support up and out scaling. R4 Anabela Max
- Organising regional consultations to share experiences from ANAFE (R5)
- Developing frameworks, tools, training modules from AFAAS/Max (G3)
- Promoting inter-regional experience sharing from AFAAS/Max (G6) (and merging with G3 as a core function)
- Providing long-term financial/technical support (including business models) from Moumouni, Bernadette, Ismail, Max (G7)

The North Africa Group included Mohamed, Emad, Hala, Laila, Hassan, Heba and Radwa (a group of extensionists, rural sociologists and environmentalists) went through a serious brain storming session. Including the outcomes of a meeting in Amman (FAO and AARINENA) where most of North Africa, Sudan, Yemen Lebanon and Jordan were present and the findings of the quick survey that Hala applied during the meeting. Each one of the experts suggested (his/her) three recommendation choice which were then prioritized down to:

- N5: Establish collaboration and Partnership
- R1: Support establish regional and Sub-regional networks
- G2: Strengthening regional networks

The group collective thinking assumed that those three are the mother of all recommendations action is required at national, regional and global as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N5 Establish collaboration and partnerships with actors in AIS, value chain</th>
<th>R1 Support establish regional and sub-regional networks and engagement in Design M&amp;E EAS</th>
<th>G2 Strengthen, support and coordinate regional networks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Expected outcomes/impacts** | - Terms of collaboration and partnership are developed, agreed upon, documented and published  
- Different types of partnerships are created and activated  
- Priority areas of (action research and learning by doing) are identified and agreed upon among partners  
- Emphasis & facilitate roles of women producers and service providers | - Regular (annual) meetings of network members are held  
- New networks are established  
- Networks interventions in national EAS's are well perceived/recognized.  
- Startup of an extension leadership training program in the North Africa region  
- Emergence of new generation of young professional high qualified EAS leaders | - EAS systems advocacy and lobbying power at national levels enhanced  
- EAS greater influence on policy formation  
- EAS gain higher profile at international development events  
- Real, active partnership between EAS and ag. research global bodies |
| **Actions to be taken** | - Conduct all needed types of situational analysis  
- Organize consultations, roundtables, meetings among stakeholders  
- Draft and document terms of collaboration | - Produce and disseminate policy briefs on the concept, philosophy and suggested networking arrangements.  
- Invite policy makers and official leader to support networking initiatives  
- Provide (non-monetary) incentives to networking | - A set of EAS global objective linked to MDG and beyond are developed and adopted |
| **Responsibilities** | - Universities, | - Association of African | - GFRAS |
Max commented that while N5, RI & G2 more or less focus on networking, the priorities also need to focus on how extension and advisory services will impact small holder farmers. So beyond networking, sustainable financing and use of appropriate tools and approaches in delivery through a holistic advisor remain key. As such Max felt that the priorities at regional level are nearer to: G3 - approaches, tools, training modules etc. which has some correlation with N10 & 11; and G7 - Sustainable financial and technical financing remain a priority.

Miriam shared that Engineers without Borders (EWB) has spent the last year+ doing an analysis of the extension sector in Ghana and identifying leverage points for greatest impact. In detail, from their analysis of the extension sector in Ghana and following the ranking of last week, they recommended:

- **N6**: Establishment of national EAS networks. This could be brought to the regional level through

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources Available</th>
<th>Resources Needed/where find them?</th>
<th>Capacity Building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>Networking, administrative and managerial, M&amp;E expertise, (Regional and International bodies,...AFAAS, GFRAS)</td>
<td>Inventory of the training and teaching material of different levels at national levels and the sub-region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICA, international cooperative alliance</td>
<td>Information communication technologies for training and activation of commodity chain value.</td>
<td>An exchange of EAS curricula among regions and sub-regions is achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional training centers</td>
<td>Innovation platforms, websites</td>
<td>A call for suggestions to strengthen contents of curricula and training material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFRAS AFAAS</td>
<td>Guidelines for regional + sub-regional strategies</td>
<td>An international meeting/conference on extension education and training is held (including official leaders of education and agriculture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARENENA</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership training institute</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **GFRAS**
- **GFAR**
- **CIGIAR**
- **CIMMITY**
- **UN organizations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Resources Needed/where find them?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAS systems</td>
<td>Networking, administrative and managerial, M&amp;E expertise, (Regional and International bodies,...AFAAS, GFRAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education systems</td>
<td>Information communication technologies for training and activation of commodity chain value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag. research</td>
<td>Innovation platforms, websites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade unions</td>
<td>Guidelines for regional + sub-regional strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers Associations</td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traders and Markets</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned Governmental bodies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
prioritization of country fora support regionally and G 3 and G6 would be applicable here in terms of linking the national fora with higher levels and sharing information across levels in the extension system. R4 is also relevant here in terms of ensuring sharing best practices, as networks can be a relevant fora in which to operationalize (scaling up and out) R4 outputs.

- **N10&11**: regarding training centres and vocational curriculum for EAS providers. Content, approaches and resources developed for these national level recommendations could be shared and developed collaboratively across the region, while still being cognisant of regional diversity. Training material needs to be relevant, which can be achieved through partnerships with the private and civil society sectors...as well as build skills in learning, critical thinking and testing and implementing innovative approaches to extension. This is fundamentally critical to the 'new extensionist' approach in which service providers must be dynamic, able to learn on the field and adapt... in Ghana, the current level of training in these 'softer' skills is relatively low.

Kristin wondered if it would be helpful to distinguish between the actual results in extension services, such as higher farmer incomes, through better funded and managed advisory services, and how to get there, though networking and clearing house functions. She suggested a common target may be increased farmers income, sustainable resource use and/or improvements in livelihoods but how to how to achieve it may depend on the particular country. A real challenge is to identify which changes within the extension sector (and in this context, recommendations) will have the greatest impact on farmers. And then, how do we know the impact that education, networks, and other extension changes will have on smallholder farmers?

Mercy shared that most (West African) governments now have agricultural transformation agenda which includes extension and advisory services. Nevertheless most of the EAS in the public service do not yet have the needed skills and knowledge to deliver EAS along the value chain and the curricula of most of our training institutions (Universities and colleges of Agriculture) are still production biased. This calls for training of EAS in market oriented advisory services and the review of training curricula. Willem commented that even so, rather than focusing on the supply-side of information/advice/education/organization, it could be important to help the Ministries of Agriculture to map the demand-side first. It needs to be a participatory and iterative process to accommodate the heterogeneity of farmers and it ought to result in an action plan, with the formulation of some key results, in terms of farmer income and/or livelihoods. The formulation of the demand-side should not become a goal in itself, ending in expensive studies, however it is important to focus on farmer expectations, get their commitment to the exact formulation of the expected results, be prepared to work on that, and monitor with the farmers progress towards those results.

Max and Tcharbuah Nfinn agreed that how many farmers’ lives are improved is a key measure for EAS and action in every ‘arm’ of the value chain is critical.

Mohamed emphasized that a bottom up approach, developing sustainable agricultural practices through local communities’ involvement and traditional agricultural practices, supported by the EAS advice and support from sub-regional and regional organisations. The local ‘dimension’ must be endorsed and integrated in regional and national policies as too often, directives are from a top down perspective, with little results at local level. In detail, Mohamed and John shared that:

1. **What actions can we take ...Who is going to do what?**

   🟢 EAS has an important role to play in the ‘field’ for the identification of specific problems pertaining to the community needs and problems. The EAS then addresses and reports to the sub-regional and regional representatives, who then transfer the EAS recommendations to the national level.

   🟢 Accountability must be enforced and the sub-regional and regional organisations should become accountable for the delivery of information to the national representatives. This would prevent
delays, and avoid corruption when financial contributions from donor/other agencies are at stake, as often encountered in top down approaches.

Create farmers groups (as in Uganda) to develop a platform to discuss issues pertaining to production and their welfare and engage government in advocacy issues.

2. Who should partner with us?
- A bottom up approach is necessary and partnership must be established with local communities, EAS, local, sub-regional and regional organisations (ADA for agriculture, Department of Water and Forestry for other natural resources), local ONG, and other national representatives (Ministry of Agriculture, Interior, etc.).
- Development Partner organisations, e.g.: FAO, COLEACP, etc. and MoA.

3. What resources are already available, what other resources do we need, where will we find them?
- Local communities already have considerable local traditional knowledge, the ‘know-how’. The credibility of these traditional practices needs to be endorsed by the organisations. There is also a need for the EAS in-depth knowledge of the communities internal ‘drawbacks’, weaknesses and difficulties that jeopardise the community engagement/or the valuable assets which contribute to innovative agricultural strategies/or other. It is also necessary that the EAS have knowledge of value, market chains and what is feasible. It is no use developing goods at the local level if these cannot be sold on a small scale, either locally or as a niche products (I am thinking here more about natural resources that have potential value for external markets, as in the case of aromatic plants where I work).
- Women hold a major place in agricultural, gardening activities, but often cannot be heard because of lack of voice, representation. We are talking here about patriarchal village situations and this need to be taken into account. For this issue, it is therefore desirable to have EAS feminine input to facilitate approach and develop trust, and the promulgation of women’s voice for active participation. The EAS has an important role in gathering all this information at the local level and to liaise his/her diagnosis to the sub-regional, regional organisations/authorities.
- Land, Infrastructure and to come extent human, funds, human resources, national governments and development partner organisations.

4. How will we use the GFRAS materials for advocacy and what support can they give at the global level?
- GFRAS needs to advocate for a partnership between communities/ sub-regional, regional organisations for collaborative action. It is important that partnerships be established between local communities, local and regional representatives, and that all be engaged in implementing initiatives at the local level.
- Through discussion platforms at international levels and dialogue with the local governments through farmers associations.

5. What curricula reforms and other capacity strengthening activities should take place?
- In rural and isolated settings (as in mountains for instance), local communities must be educated in enhanced agricultural techniques, and remain informed about new developments. Capacity building with the local communities is important, but these must also become responsible and accountable for their participation in the agricultural programmes. Clientelism is common especially in remote areas, power can be hijacked at the local level (as I have witnessed for natural resources initiatives). It is important to ensure that representation is global and everyone able to voice and participate at the local level. Women have an important part to play in these strategies and must be enabled to voice their needs. Local inhabitants need input and guidance from external professionals and the responsibility to implement these measures need to rest on the sub-regional,
regional level. Offices run locally by communities’ representatives should be set up, where information about new initiatives, new technologies, financial aid can be freely available and enquiries answered.

Modernisation of Agricultural and extension knowledge is needed, adapted to existing situations of small-holder farmers. Also sensitize farmers to engage in farming as a profession (professionalise farming)

**Latin America and Caribbean**

Marisa suggested
National level: N5, N8, N10 & N12
Regional level: R1, R3 & R4
Global level: G1, G2, G3 & G5
It was pointed out this is not three. The group shared the report of RELASER’s e-discussion last year however have not moved forward to further narrow this proposed list of recommended activities.

**Asia Pacific**

No decisions were made during the week.

**Other regions**

Willem (Tajikistan) shared that his choice of actions would be:
N4. Create innovation platforms
R5. Organise regional and sub-regional consultations and training programmes to share experiences and influence conditions in the enabling environment
G5. Conduct policy advocacy on strengthening the role of EAS in agricultural development and poverty reduction, enhanced funding support, and institutional and policy reforms in AIS

Further he suggests combining N1, N2, N4 and N12 into one topic and to enhance N9 to be much stronger on accountability for results, and build G2 into a clearing house function for GFRAS

**What he sees as important is:-**

1. It has a high chance of impact in the field
2. It adds value to and is likely to be endorsed and implemented by existing relevant extension services
3. It is cost effective (low financial intensity)

**2. Outputs and outcome:** Major output of the activities should be an effective and sustainable RAS, serving small holder farmers. Major outcome: increased income for smallholder farmers and sustainable land management

**3. What actions can we take ... Who is going to do what?** Within the Caritas projects we gained experiences which we can share, national and international. We also try to establish platforms or participate in, e.g. on introduction of energy saving technologies, sustainable pasture management and conservation agriculture.

**4. Who should partner with us:** Organizations, projects in SLM, across Central Asia

**5. What resources are already available, what other resources do we need, where will we find them?** National exchange is easy and cheap, for international exchange you need special resources, which are not easy to find.

**6. How will we use the GFRAS materials for advocacy and what support can they give at the global level?** For our region the first need would be to make them available in Russian as English language is not widely spoken here.

**7. What curricula reforms and other capacity strengthening activities should take place?** Modernization of agricultural and extension knowledge is needed, adapted to the existing situation of the smallholder farmers.

We/GFRAS could lobby for more realistic salaries and basic facilities like mobile phones and laptops. Together with the modernization of agricultural knowledge this would greatly capacitate existing extension services