The ‘New Extensionist’
GFRAS Regional e-discussion Report

The thrust of the GFRAS purpose in developing a set of recommended activities to support the ‘New Extensionist’ capabilities at individual, organisational, and institutional levels in extension and advisory services (EAS) has been based on the following realities:

- Extension and advisory services are a critical institution supporting rural development in general, and smallholder producers in particular
- Extension and advisory services have new and expanded roles to play due to the increasing complexity of present rural development and new challenges
- To play this expanded role, EAS require new capacities at individual, organisational, and system levels
- GFRAS is spearheading an effort to clarify WHAT and HOW actions should take place to strengthen these capacities in EAS, and WHO should take the action at national, regional, and global levels

In 2012 a global e-discussion refined a draft paper on the ‘New Extensionist’, which was further discussed and refined in national, regional, global, and cross cutting round table discussions at the GCARD 2 conference in November 2012. In 2013 another e-discussion took place to:

- Prioritise the recommendations for each major region
- Determine who will take action and how within the next few years
- Determine ways of measuring these actions

Three weeks of e-discussions have been a lead up to develop a concrete action plan at the global level in a face-to-face meeting in Pretoria in March 2013. The e-discussion started with the question: Are you comfortable using the recommended actions in the latest summary paper as the starting point of the discussion? Overall the answer was yes with some qualifiers, emphasizing the need for concrete action and contextual specificity.

Criteria for prioritising the recommendations were suggested by the participants and quickly ranked on a small survey. The results are in Table 1. Participants suggested some criteria be merged, such as 1 & 2, and other qualifications were made.

The group then split into regional-specific discussions before coming back in the third week to focus on global actions. Before getting into which recommendations were suggested for each region, some contextual approaches and issues were emphasised during the discussions. These included:

- Focus on farmers’ expectations, which include working to increase farmers’ groupings into critical mass, farmer-to-farmer extension work, and specificity at the local, sub-national, national levels
- Focus on demand, including participatory approaches more than supply and technology transfer
- Take a pluralistic approach (and make use of all available contributors in a capacity and resource scarce environment)
- Focus on action more than talk, methodologies as well as theory
- Separate the ‘what’ is to be achieved such as farmers’ income, sustainable resource use and/or improvements in livelihoods, from the ‘how’ such as networking, clearing house functions, etc.
- Engage at least to the point of consent with official EAS leaders in the locality
- Increase the participation and power of women, youth, and marginalised farmers (forest and mountain dwellers, urban farmers, landless, hard to reach, etc.)
Explore self-financing mechanisms that work
Learn from each other, e.g. create regional and global consortia for curricula reform (such as EAS along the value chain and understanding innovation systems, markets, facilitation, etc.)
Contextualise: Take the exact role and status of national systems and the political economy into account. Take different (and similar) agroecological zones and types of agriculture into account.

Table 1. Criteria and Ranking for Prioritisation of Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Response count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>It has a high chance of impact in the field</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It is an extension activity that leads to agricultural development</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>It adds value to and is likely to be endorsed and implemented by existing relevant extension services</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>It is cost effective (low financial intensity)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>It meets real needs</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>It responds to a specific need and has relevance to the system (regional, national, and/or sub national contextual specificity)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>It is participatory</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>It will have long term use(fulness)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>It can reach and promote needy (and new) stakeholders</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>It focuses on social capital development</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>It requires low human resource intensity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>It has the potential to be turned into a business model</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>It creates an opportunity for quick wins</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>It can be used across many regions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>It is a commonly understood achievable task that can be improved</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>It is early in the logical progression (acts as a catalyst)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which recommendations were prioritised?

The online e-discussion mode did not lead to easy mutual agreement without more ranking or voting exercises. Nevertheless, in the Africa/Near/Middle East discussion group, N10 and N11 (training, curricula, capacity development, and sustainable agriculture) were widely agreed on as key priorities for the macro region along with R1 (networking) and G7 (long term financing). For a comprehensive list for Middle East and North Africa, see the report on week 2. N5 (collaboration and partnership) and G2 (regional networks) were also seen as some of the networking activities necessary to support the national activities. The idea of starting up a consortium of interested players to share information on curricula and training (N10/11), including at least CRS, EWB, SAFE/Winrock, MEAS, universities such as Universite D'Abomey-Calavi in Benin, RUFORUM, AFAAS, GCHERA, and ANAFE in Africa and extending into South East Asia was explored and will be taken forward in Pretoria.

Participants in the South Asia group explored frameworks, assessments, evaluations, and guidance for good practices and innovative extension approaches (R4). The network of Pakistan extension professionals held a brainstorming and noted the importance of capacities and incentives for extension agents, and inclusion of women and youth. Another issue for South Asia is the capacity needed to manage pluralistic extension if national and public sector extension services are no longer the only or key. The group focused around N1/N9 (diagnosis & monitoring), R4/G3 (frameworks), and support for advocacy and investment (G1/G5) as possible areas emerging from their discussion. This implies most action at the global level and begs the question of how GFRAS can best take advantage of the immense knowledge in South Asia and the many capable actors who can contribute? What role should AESA and other regional actors play?

Latin America

In Latin America a list of 11-12 recommendations was proposed. The main outcomes of their earlier e-discussion are added in Annex 2.
As the Latin American region recently had an e-discussion on the topic, Marisa Paredes summarised the main points under four headings:

- The extensionist works within a system and must be conceived in such complexity: Public-private sectors, on and off farm incomes, institutionalism, and extension multidisciplinary teams
- How to facilitate innovation processes
- Strengthening capacities and governance of the innovation system
- Types of knowledge that should be facilitated.

National forums in Latin America such as Paraguay plan to produce a profile on what the ‘New Extensionist’ should look like.

**Caribbean**

Extension actors in the Caribbean had a meeting at the end of February and developed a plan of action to take their network forward through capacity strengthening. They include:

- Discuss capacity gaps in the Caribbean, identify, prioritise, and implement action in the region, including how to attract youth and deal with a broad scope of work
- Discuss how to deal with conflicts of interests and political interference
- Discuss what the ‘New Extensionist’ means for the organisation of extension within the ministries of agriculture and connected fields such as health
- Influence education institutions, their curricula and their courses; include social capital, psycho-social aspects, organisational development, entrepreneurship
- Plan exchange of experience in symposia and workshops; coordinate with training programmes to strengthen capacity of RAS providers in-service and online
- Revive the Officer of Excellence Award
- Discuss and elaborate minimum standards for extension personnel
- Identify approaches for farmers’ contribution to RAS (e.g. through interest on loans), and public-private partnerships
- Reflect on considering results from the ‘New Extensionist’ discussions in registration of farmers

**Comments on other regions e.g. Central Asia**

In Tajikistan (Central Asia), the very basics of agricultural development are in short supply compared with the infrastructure of some African countries. Challenges include:-

- Farmers have limited agricultural education
- Extension staff have been trained under the Soviet system and are mostly specialists knowing about one aspect of large scale farming with all resources at hand
- There is little to no update of knowledge over time and lacking relevant expertise for smallholder farming, to which Tajikistan transitioned in the 90's
- Research is very limited
- Input supply very limited scale and poor quality, credit (at 30% interest/yr.) not within reach of smallholders,
- Average plot size 1ha
- Outdated machinery
- Depleted natural resources
- Cumbersome marketing of products
- Limited irrigation

Needs are regionally specific, we need coordinated efforts if one wants to achieve something and the speed of development will be slow.
One or two participants detailed the interconnected aspects of the recommendations (see Annex 3).

**Overall Key Issues**

*Frameworks/good practices/assessments*

This has been addressed above under the South Asia discussion. However, GFRAS has developed a ‘global good practices’ framework, which helps to identify and analyse good practices across 5 RAS dimensions (governance structures, policy, capacity and management, advisory methods, and cross-cutting issues). Using a typology based on RAS themes in different country contexts (socio-economic, political, organisational, and ecological), the initiative will systematically document cases of RAS provision to see what approaches worked where and why. It will provide decision support tools to RAS managers, RAS practitioners, educators and trainers, policy makers, and international development institutions.

*Curricula reform & education & training*

The need for curricula reform was prioritized and emphasized throughout. In particular for

- EAS along the whole value chain
- Teaching innovation systems and theory
- Adding in business and market understanding beyond agronomical production
- Teaching a demand-driven participatory approach

Issues that affect curriculum reform include:-

- Indigenous and sometimes ingrained patterns of behaviour and institution building sometimes complicating curricula development of a particular country
- Lack of gender mainstreaming
- Slow transition from conceptual agricultural extension systems to operational agricultural systems leading to a big gap existing between theory and practice
- Inaccurate application and implementation
- Inadequate relevancy to both farmers and EAS’ social, cultural, economic and political needs
- Need for more retraining programs to acquire the relevant knowledge, understanding, and skills necessary for the application of an all-encompassing curricula is necessary
- Inadequate funding to support the extension aspects of ‘tri-partite’ universities with research, teaching and extension mandates which can be resolved with dedicated departments of agricultural extension and rural development which offer diploma courses, postgraduate courses to the EAS

The proposal of creating a ‘curricula consortium’ that can network across at least the Africa, South Asia, and Latin America regions will be followed up and an action plan developed in the Pretoria global meeting.

**The importance of influencing policy**

Participants agreed that while policies are very important for extension to function, initiating change and development in extension services should not necessarily wait for policy reforms. It was clear it is very important to understand the current political and economic contexts and to ensure that initiatives were best timed with political processes and designed to most likely to succeed within the particular contexts.

**The importance of self-sustaining finance**

Participants felt that the rationale for public funding for (some) extension services is solid, but not often made convincingly by Ministries of Agriculture and others to the Ministries of Finance and/or for more funding in different countries from the for-profit private sector. Future financial sustainability will need income from multiple sources.

A detailed discussion focused on whether or not farmers have the resources to afford to pay for extension services with one suggestion that ‘The realization that advice is valuable comes with more sophisticated
agriculture’. A suggested solution stated that once public funds are available, some of the funding for extension be given directly to the farmers and farmers' groups (like a social development fund, including some clear rules of access). Those farmers can then go ‘shopping’ for the best advisers they could find who will quickly adapt to farmers demands. It was pointed out that smallholders will willingly pay for ‘paravets’ where the cost of advice is embedded into the cost of drugs supplied by the paravet. Further examples were shared of two recent fee-for-service developments in East Africa. One offered crop management advice with supply of inputs (seed and fertilizer) and the other supported creating savings and lending groups where CRS (Catholic Relief Services) 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.

Another participant shared that the One Acre Fund that has 130,000 smallholder farmer clients in Kenya, Rwanda, and Burundi offers 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. 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. It was felt that sustainable extension services depend on farmers paying for them (even if the price they are paying is subsidized by the public sector or by donors).

Additionally, in Kyrgyzstan a 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.

Another suggestion was that to gain experience, start with commercial crops. Set advisory services up as a business for agricultural advisers. Take advisory services as part of the production cost in the cost price calculations (should be no more than 2-3% of the total production costs). This will give the fee per ha. That fee in turn determines how many farmers an adviser needs to advise in order to have a fair income after subtracting his/her costs). Compare the costs the farmer pays for advise with the income increase he/she will get (and which you will guarantee him/her when they follow your advice); that will give you a cost benefit ratio for the farmer. Make a contract with the farmer. He/she pays 50% up front and the rest only if the income increase was realized. This will only work with (clusters of) farmers who can agree to these terms.

It was also suggested that in fact farmers have always paid for every aspect of agriculture as the prices of what is produced in the agricultural sector are determined somewhere else, not by the producers themselves. Cocoa, coffee or banana producers of the Central and West African countries have long suffered this dilemma. From input supply to marketing options and agricultural innovation, providing extension services can be facilitated through cooperatives, common initiative groups with micro-credit institutions providing a force to rural agriculture and extension services. It was emphasized that ‘this time action on the ground is needed and everyone should be a doer’.

The importance of developing farmers’ groups with firm management structures to collect and pay for extension services, (as well as bulk buy inputs) was emphasized as ‘left on their own, in the fragmented way there currently operating, its unthinkable that they can be able mobilise funds to pay for the services’. It was felt that the comparison between vet and crop producers is not a good argument, the animal producer in the LDC (least developed countries) takes his animal as his lifeline but when it comes to crops, they can be a ‘by the way issue’.

The National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS) in Uganda was shared as a good example of how payable extension services could not be consumed by very small-scale farmers. We should have in mind that most farmers in the LDC are too small.

Outputs and outcomes

Some participants responded to 6 questions:
1. What outputs and outcomes do you want to see in 2-4 years?
2. What actions can we take ...Who is going to do what?
3. Who should partner with us?
4. What resources are already available, what other resources do we need, where will we find them?
5. How will we use the GFRAS materials for advocacy and what support can they give at the global level?
6. What curricula reforms and other capacity strengthening activities should take place?

The ones posted during week two have been listed generically in the report at the end of week two, which will be uploaded to the web site. Some added since have been listed in this report in Annex 1 with their regional specificity maintained.

**Mini country/regional case study: South Africa**

Since 2005, a major part of my professional activities is aimed at capacity building for development and strengthening of EAS in South Africa. The focus of the work is on creating and enhancing the competence of training and education in extension.

A core group of trainers, employed by the ARC (the Agricultural Research Council), universities, colleges and ATCs, and the Human Resource Departments of provincial Directorates of Agriculture & Rural Development (DoARDs), is being trained through learning-by-doing in in-service training courses for extension officers. Simultaneously the management and administrative capacity of ATCs and Colleges is enhanced, and curricula (in extension and sustainable agriculture) for higher education and Further Education &Training are developed.

Up to now, these activities have enjoyed considerable political, managerial and financial back-up from the DoARDs, and DAFF, the National Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry & Fisheries. The reform actions have already led to structural changes in the Human Resource Departments of some DoARDs. Curricula and training staff are accredited through Agri-SETA (the Agricultural Sector Education & Training Authority).

In 2008 the Extension Recovery Plan was launched and parallel to the efforts on capacity development. DAFF is fully engaged in elaborating extension policies through interactive provincial consultations of all AIS stakeholders.

Based on a mechanism to survey the labour market in the agricultural sector and related industries and services, the demand for EAS in terms of capacity and competence is being determined, which feeds into the curricula and training programs for extension.

(Ruud Ludemann, Wageningen)

**The remaining issues**

The group now needs to build an institutional-specific cross regional/global action plan (mega plan). This plan needs to get much more specific than the discussion has been so far; e.g. instead of saying ‘universities’ we need to say ‘Makerere University will do such-and-such.’ Real action occurs at the national level. We need to focus there and see how regional and global actions can support this. For more on this please see Annex 3. Once the group has created a clear action plan there is a need to develop a monitoring plan with indicators of success.
Annex 1. Outputs and outcomes discussion

A generic list of outputs and outcome is available in the report for the end of week two. A few more specific ones were posted that are listed here.

Generic level

Remark: It is emphasised that we need to find a consistent spectrum typology to talk about the areas and levels of analysis so that sub-regional and regional refer consistently either to regions within large countries or consistently to geographic groups of nations within a global perspective.

1. What outputs and outcomes do you want to see in 2-4 years?

- Major output of the activities should be an effective and sustainable RAS, serving smallholder farmers.
- Major outcome: increased income for smallholder farmers and sustainable land management.
- It is anticipated that within 2-4 years, more hands will join at the national and regional level. If properly motivated to the extension professionals then more development is expected. Farmers will become more self-sustained as compared to past. New livelihood interventions can lead the poor farmers to the road to success.
- The EAS start attracting the farmers as clients who are willing to pay for the extension services may be in implicit forms like contracts.
- The existing EAS may be reviewed in terms of reach, effectiveness, constraints, & possibilities for improvements.
- New models may be tested by modifying or reforming the existing EAS.
- Coordination among different EAS may be ensured through joint workshops.

Funding

- Funds may be tapped from international agencies (FAO, IFAD, The World Bank, UNDP etc.) or donors by institutions like GFRAS [or regional networks] to be channeled to national institutions under Ministries of Agriculture & Rural Development. With the technical capacities & expertise available with the international agencies, the institutional reforms in EAS can be made in collaboration with the local institutions. The agencies under Ministries of Agriculture and some select NGOs and cooperatives could be the potential partners in studying the existing EAS and testing of new models. The funds may also be tapped by individual countries directly from donors, but here again, it would benefit them if they utilize the technical expertise of institutions like GFRAS.

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

- We have to mobilize the resources for the overall benefit of the farmers and extension field staff. In addition, research and extension collaboration, if magnetized, then desired results can be expected.
- National entities (rather more than GFRAS) could make a difference providing practitioners with a simple set of tools to determine who will pay, deliver, and sign off on the quality of extension. They also need to be the focus of concrete activities and not ‘disappear’ in being ‘scaled up’ to regional level or global level.
- 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.

3. Who should partner with us?

- International development organizations, especially donors, should intervene with zeal and zest. Still more research and capacity building programmes are needed at national, regional, and international level.
1. 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.

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

- Human and natural resources are available in plenty form but we firstly have to manage them. Secondly, we are lagging behind due to financial constraints due to which we are still in the queue of developing countries.

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

- As a matter of fact, GFRAS is the eye opener for all of us. This international organization has channelized the RAS process. Moreover, reports generated by GFRAS can act as guidelines exclusively for developing countries. Surely, GFRAS as a platform revitalized the development process.
- Similarly, GFRAS can provide capacity development trainings at regional and international level. I foreshadow that there will be more affiliations in the long run as compared to the existing situation. GFRAS can act as link among various development and donor organizations at global level.

6. What curricula reforms and other capacity strengthening activities should take place?

- Curricula should be shaped on the state of the art footings. New challenges and their possible solutions should be incorporated in the scheme of studies. Similarly, technical skills oriented capacity building should be launched under the umbrella of GFRAS.

Africa/Near East

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

- Map the AIS in the countries concerned (=N1), and facilitate N2 and N3
- Establish a kind of `standardized format’ for periodic reporting on the initiatives and progress in extension reform. A periodic news bulleted to share information among practitioners on their activities can boost motivation tremendously! It is an excellent tool to sensitize people and organizations on the need and utility of M&E for learning and effective management, and can greatly facilitate the sharing and exchange of information (at national, regional and global level). Moreover, it helps government, donors, NGOs, and the private sector to get their acts together.

2. Who should partner with us?

- It seems worthwhile to engage the donor organization chairing the coordination of the activities of donor organizations and (I)NGOs in the countries concerned (e.g. in Ghana, IRDC, AFC, or ACDI/VOCA).

South Asia

1. Outputs and outcomes in 2-4 years

- Better gender representation at the national, regional and global level
- 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

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

- Players at national, regional and global level are required 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

* The agencies under Ministries 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 Ministry 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?

* 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?

* Strong technical capacity at NARS, ICAR, BRAC, Sri Lanka

* Success and failure examples at ICAR, CG system, NGOs, 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?

* 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.

* 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.

* 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. 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

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!

Many changes are happening automatically, in response to 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.

**Latin America**

1. **Outputs and outcomes in 2-4 years?**

I find it difficult to prioritize because each country has different realities. The important thing is to focus on participation, logic indicates that it occurs from the local and the global level, but it seems to be a contradiction because technology is produced in the global level and transferred to the local. I think that there is where the debate on agrarian spaces occurs, about how to work in within this reality.

- To achieve strengthened public extension services.
- To have extension services organised by producer organisations of producers that have this goal.
- Research about processes of research-extension.
- Analyse the relationship between cases since generalizing will implicate ignoring local and cultural realities.
- Give more importance to women, as producers and in the level of organizations.
- Training and knowledge about the methodological frameworks of extension-research

2. **What actions can we take...who is going to do what?**

I think that most of the actions have been stated in RELASER’s meeting in 2012 and its’ midterm Strategy. These actions depend on the institutional contexts where the different members play and the commitment they have. The important thing is to develop and apply the ideas stated, to continue the work and the meetings.

3. **Who should partner with us?**

This depends on the topic, the scope or level of the activities.

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

I think that the steering committee of the RELASER network will have more weight or strength for promoting projects and finding funds. Some people think that we can offer services and make contributions for the operation as well as generating proposals.

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

Posting on [the GFRAS] webpage and on the ones of the regional networks, generating newsletters for institutions, producers and producer organizations that should have videos and audio features to address the producers properly.

6. **What curricula reforms and other capacity strengthening activities should take place?**

Rural extension must be in the curricula of agricultural sciences as well as rural extension majors. Training courses for extension workers and farmers are also important elements for displaying "The new extensionist" in different situations.
Central Asia

2. 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.

3. Who should partner with us?

Organizations, projects in SLM [sustainable land management], across Central Asia

4. 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.

5. 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.

6. 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.
Annex 2. Latin American points from December 2012 e-discussion

1. The extensionist works within a system and must be conceived in such complexity

At least in Latin America, the work of the extensionist is increasingly acknowledged as part of a complex system where several components interact:

- Different types of producers: the presence on a territory of small, medium and large farmers is seen as an opportunity for extension to facilitate equitable access to technology and associated services, but also access to markets. Methodologies should be sought to bring together producers and to create incentives to develop common interests.
- Public and private sectors: currently much of the technology and the whole market are provided by the private sector. Herein lies the capacity of innovation, however many of the outreach programs are designed from the public sector, focusing on family farming. It is essential to consider extension as an articulator of access to public and private goods and services. We must work more on understanding the private world, its organization and interests.
- In and off Farm Incomes: the systemic view involves considering the different incomes generated within the household and in the territory. It has been shown that escaping from poverty in Latin America involves taking a diversified strategy, for which extension, and institutions behind, should be flexible and have the required ability to capture potentials and make a link between the existing opportunities.
- Institutionalism: the traditional operation of institutions accesses independently families and territories, artificially separating components of research, education and extension. Only with articulated institutionalism around common goals it would be possible for extensionists to achieve its role adequately with possibilities of success.
- Extension multidisciplinary teams: it is recognized that building and working in teams allows the complementation of skills and generating synergies in programs that have the proper conditions and resources.

2. How to facilitate innovative processes

It is known that innovation is the key for having a modern agricultural world and to generate greater wealth and opportunities. At least in Latin America, after many years of fostering public institutions and investing heavily in innovation, it is not clear if we are getting the desired results. We believe that this occurs in part because the process too public (too dominated by a sense of innovation that has little anchorage on producers and companies), too institutional. We believe that we must take into account the following aspects:

Innovation can occur when a range of services and incentives are complemented, such as financial, market information and access, technological knowledge and access, development of entrepreneurship and partnership capacities, among others. Certainly, extension or the extensionists by themselves will generate innovative processes, but they can encourage them if they recognize and fulfill their role as intermediaries, rather than transferors.

In Latin America remains, in general, extension and research as separate entities, independently that in some cases they coexist in the same institutions. If research does not make fundamental changes in establishing a dialogue with extension, there would not be substantive changes. These changes should be at least in: recognizing and valuing non-scientific knowledge, developing research from the demand, be willing to work articulated with extension and education. It is essential to rescue what companies and producers are doing and to identify failures that prevent or limit the impact of technologies (hard or soft) on producing changes in the value of products.

3. Strengthening capacities with the extension systems.

To have an effective innovation system is necessary to strengthen the capacities and governance in the three defined levels: public and private institutions that design policies, the public and private institutions locally implementing policies, and extensionists. The identified tasks are:
What to do to allow information and knowledge flow in both directions and to have a learning system that allows a permanent rebuild of the system.

What are the skills required at different levels.

Have training programs for extensionists that address the reality of the countries, and at the same time covers the need to strengthen the technical and soft skills.

4. Types of knowledge that should be facilitated
Valuing traditional knowledge of communities, and at the same time recognize and appreciate the scientific input, allows a process of building knowledge different to the traditional and can give space for a better articulation between actors.
Annex 3: GFRAS New Extensionist recommendations at global, regional and national level by Ruud Ludemann (Wageningen)

In the image above I tried to show how recommendations at the 3 levels are inter-related. Because implementation of the recommendations on global and regional level is instrumental to create ‘an enabling environment’ for the real changes to take place at national level and below, I positioned them around the recommendations at national level. To achieve sustainable improvement of any organization it is necessary to work at 3 interdependent levels at once (its staff, the organization itself and its institutional surroundings) I took the liberty to interpret and rearrange the GFRAS recommendations as seen from my own vantage point within the AIS, working in HRD for institutional strengthening in EAS.

At the core: N7 & N8
I put N7 & N8 at the bull’s eye of the image, because clients to whom the EAS provide their services should acquire effective leverage on the quality of these services, and the major actors in the AIS should improve the EAS content and methodologies in close collaboration.

In the GFRAS paper N7 & N8 are indicated as Technical Backstopping:
- N7 is exclusively ascribed to organisations in research, but I found EAS can benefit (perhaps even more and certainly faster) by learning from effective M&E, which is seldom brought about by research, but rather by training, facilitation and interactive policy-making.
- Under N8 only farmer institutional development is called for through producer organizations, but EAS also need institutional development themselves.

How to go about strengthening EAS
N1, N2 & N3 (mapping the AIS; comparing models, research to support evidence-based reform & EAS policy advocacy; enhance capacity self-diagnosis): no attempt to improve and/or strengthen extension practices can do without. N4, 5, 6 & 9 all refer to the need for institutional embedding, and highlight that results of reform efforts – and their sustainability – also depend on the quality of interaction with their environment.

**Capacity development**
N10 & 11 zoom in on the essential role of the institutions for building and strengthening capacity and competences for EAS.

**Funding**
N12 signals the need for public funding, but there is no recommendation concerning the need to gauge the potential for diversification of funding mechanisms for EAS and/or enhance such modalities in partnership with other actors in the sector, which can be sustained in the future.

Note that the three GFRAS functions can also be super-imposed over the diagram. The three GFRAS functions are (1) advocacy, (2) evidence, and (3) capacity building through networking. Function 1/advocacy covers spokes G5, G1, G4/7, R2, R3, N5, N6, N9, N12. Function 2/evidence covers the spoke G8/G3/R4/N4. Function 3 capacity covers spokes G6/R5 and G2/41/N10/N11.