

**Enhancing Livelihoods of Poor Livestock Keepers through
Increased Use of Fodder**

(Fodder Adoption Project)

Report on Innovation Experience Sharing Workshop

3-4 June 2009

Adama-Dire Hotel, Ethiopia

Prepared by Alan Duncan, Kebebe Ergano and Aberra Adie

Summary

This workshop brought together grass-roots stakeholders from the 4 IPMS pilot learning woredas in which the Fodder Adoption Project is working. The **aim** of the workshop was to provide a forum for experience sharing around the whole area of the usefulness of stakeholder groups to accelerate innovation within the livestock/ fodder sector. Participants represented the diversity of actors from the study sites including representatives of the regional research system, the extension service, private and NGO sectors and the international research sector.

On **Day 1** the workshop started with a **series of presentations** from Ada'a, Mieso, Atsbi and Alamata woredas outlining what different participants had been doing so far on livestock feed development. Presentations showed the breadth of constraints and experiences found at the different sites. The presenters were asked to cover a range of topics including their own views on the Major Fodder Issues, Historical Livestock Feed Initiatives, the Stakeholders Involved and Changes since FAP arrived.

There followed a presentation by **Mona Dhamankar** of the Fodder Innovation Project (India and Nigeria) on what the FIP approach to livestock development has been. FIP has initiated formation of networks around the feed scarcity issue using innovation facilitators which they term Key Partner Organisations. The project is studying the functioning of these networks to learn lessons about network formation and performance and the extent to which they build *innovation capacity* in the livestock/fodder sector.

The next phase of our discussions was focused on **Visioning**. Participants were asked to develop a vision for improved livelihoods through increased use of fodder and to set out the steps needed to get there. Various issues emerged in discussion; visions need to be achievable; the visions developed tended to involve development of the input side with less attention to outputs and the extended value chain; market orientation is an important element of the vision since without market pull, feed interventions are unlikely to succeed; fodder needs to be considered as part of a larger system which includes breed and health aspects.

Seife Ayele then gave a presentation on innovation networks covering issues such as network formation, drivers of innovation and scaling up issues. In the subsequent discussion various issues arose; how to resource networks and how to make them self-sustaining; the difficulty of imposing rules and accountability within voluntary networks; the difficulty of drawing the private sector into networks.

The next task presented to participants was to think about the stakeholder groups, their aims, operating principals and rules of engagement. This was a fruitful session highlighting a number of issues: how wide should a group be – if too wide, difficult to focus on activities – if too narrow, activities are ineffective; how should group performance be monitored – we need a mechanism; group leadership – should this rotate?; need to define roles and responsibilities for each actor and avoid too much overlap; does the group need to agree a ToR?; meetings have high transaction costs – are there lighter ways to maintain group coherence and progress (e-mail, telephone, newsletters etc)?;

The meeting was concluded by Alan Duncan who promised to circulate workshop proceedings, a draft Innovation Charter, and a proforma for defining Roles and Responsibilities of each actor.

1. Background

The issue of innovation and technical change sits at the heart of agricultural development and remains a potentially critical driver of social and economic transformation in the agrarian based economies of many developing countries. Building the scientific, managerial, entrepreneurial and facilitative capacity of development practitioners has become instrumental to solve community's pressing social and economic problems and have a positive impact on the livelihoods of the poorest strata of the society. This requires enhancing the actors' level of understanding on the concepts of innovation systems approaches, its ways of working and sharing experiences among other things. Fodder Adoption Project has been engaged in facilitating the evolution of new institutional arrangements by which the various actors in fodder-livestock development can operate for mutual benefit since it started operation in 2007 in four IPMS pilot learning Woredas (PLW), viz., Ada'a, Miesso, Alamata and Atsbi of Ethiopia. FAP strives to build effective and trust-based links between actors within the "fodder innovation system", between 'suppliers' and 'users' of research-based knowledge and the many "service providing organizations" required to facilitate interactions within the system and to broker support services such as finance, technical advice and capacity building.

An Innovation Experience Sharing Workshop was convened in Adama town during 3-4 June 2009 to enhance the understanding of important actors about the importance of Innovation Platform (IP) as part of capacity building to reduce fodder scarcity. The workshop was organized to share the learning experiences of the evolving fodder innovation platforms in each PLW. The Innovation Platform is expected to create a level playing ground between researchers, advisory service providers, farmers and private sector, allowing interactive learning. Ultimately the Innovation Platforms will develop plans for research and development activities and organize experience sharing visits and workshops.

The workshop brought together participants from R&D service providers, viz., the heads and experts of Office of Agricultural and Rural Development of the four pilot sites, directors of Agricultural Research Centers operating in the selected PLWs; representatives of Land O' Lakes, Coordinator of Ethiopian Sheep and Goat Productivity Improvement Program, Ada'a Dairy Cooperative and representatives of the private sector. The discussions were guided by paper presentations interspersed with group discussion sessions (Meeting agenda is attached in the Annex). The workshop was skillfully facilitated by Julius Nyangaga of ILRI-Nairobi.

Update on FAP including international activities (*Dr. Alan Duncan*)

Alan gave the overview of the project and set the scene of the workshop. His presentation highlighted the goal, purpose and expected outputs of the project; concept of innovation systems and workshop objectives. He stated the major objectives of the workshop as follows:

- To bring together actors from four sites in Ethiopia to share experiences of fodder/livestock development
- To consider how actor groups are working and to build consensus on the way forward
- To draw some lessons on what makes actor groups work and what some of the pitfalls are

This was followed by presentations on the experiences of the four pilot learning Woredas on efforts to deal with feed scarcity.

Updates on efforts to deal with feed scarcity in the four PLWs through joint action (*Representatives of Alamata, Atsbi, Mieso & Ada'a*)

Ada'a Pilot Learning Woreda

Major Fodder Issues

- Near absence of grazing land
- Shortage of cross-bred dairy cows
- Feed shortage mainly due to fierce competition between large number of draught oxen kept for farm power and dairy animals
- Land and labour shortage
- Poor integration among stakeholders involved in livestock development

Livestock Feed Initiatives in Ada'a Woreda before the start of FAP activities.

- Training and technical advices to experts, DAs, and farmers in the area of feed production, management and utilization, etc
- On station demonstration of improved fodder production
- Linking livestock products to market opportunities

Stake holders involved:

- OoARD – Overall coordination and facilitation, routine follow up of all activities
- IPMS – Training, market linkage, facilitating credit opportunities, establishment of knowledge centers
- National Livestock Development Program (NLDP) – Training/ capacity building
- Debre Zeit Agricultural Research Center (DZARC) – Training, on-farm demonstration
- Land O'Lakes – Training and promoting new fodder options

Fodder development activities (after FAP involvement in 2008)

- On-farm production and utilization of improved fodder
- Addition and consolidation of "Fodder Stakeholders Group"
- Facilitating the acquisition of improved dairy cattle breeds and improved forage species

- Increased awareness of farmers about improved forages and their management
- Increase in the number of farmers participating in fodder development
- Initiation of commercial fodder producers group

Stakeholder composition and their roles after FAP

- OoARD - Overall coordination and facilitation, routine follow up of all activities
- IPMS - Training, market linkage, facilitating credit opportunities, strengthening knowledge centers
- DZARC - Training, on-farm demonstration, supply of improved dairy cows
- FAP – Facilitating integration of stake holders, introduction of improved fodder options, technical back stopping, facilitation of the acquisition of improved dairy cows, etc.
- EMDTI – Training, supply of improved dairy cows
- Ada’a Dairy Coop – Experience sharing, market linkage
- Cooperative Promotion Office – Facilitate formation of coops
- Land O’Lakes (NGO) – Training and promoting new fodder options
- Eden Field Seed Enterprise (Private fodder seed trader) – Fodder seed production and marketing

Opportunities

- Regional government accorded semiautonomous status to livestock sector
- Increasing demand for livestock products
- Increasing awareness of farmers
- Availability and variety of stake holders

Alamata Pilot Learning Woreda

Major Fodder Issues

- Uncontrolled grazing and land degradation
- Recurrent drought and dry season feed shortage
- Lack of awareness about improved forages
- Poor integration among stakeholders involved in livestock development

Activities underway to mitigate feed scarcity

- Forage development activities (Backyard forage development, intercropping of cowpea & lablab, over sowing of grass seeds & planting seedlings in watershed)
- Improving forage utilization & management (Hay & crop residue management, Urea treatment of straw, urea mineral block)
- Seed multiplication at selected sites (Ula Ula & Babokorima, FTC, Farmers’ plots, nursery sites)
- Capacity building (Training & Visit to woreda experts , DAs & farmers)
- Encouraging animal feed conservation techniques
- Utilization of cactus leaves with crop residues
- Facilitating area closure and zero grazing
- Platform formation among stakeholders

Stakeholders & their roles

S/N	Stakeholders	Roles
1	WoARD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation, monitoring & evaluation of forage development in the woreda • Organising & facilitating roles of all stakeholders in the woreda
2	IPMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introducing adaptable forage species • Capacity building activities • Organizing & assisting research activities • Facilitation role
3	TARI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Testing & validating adaptive fodder cultivars • Training & technical fact sheet preparation • Popularization of technologies in collaboration with other stakeholders
4	World Vision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of adptable forage seeds • Capacity building activities
5	Abergele Plc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstration & multiplication of adaptable forage species • Supplying green grass (Rhodus), grass hay & concentrates on market basis to the farmers

Atsbi-Wonberta Pilot Learning Woreda

Major Fodder Issues

- Feed scarcity
- Feed quality
- Highly degraded grazing lands
- Erratic rainfall distribution
- Large number of livestock
- Limited understanding of farmers towards production and conservation of animal feed

Initiatives taken to deal with feed scarcity

- Grazing land enrichment: by splitting and sowing of forage grass varieties (Phalaris and Rhodes) and forage legumes (Tree lucerne and *Sesbania sesban*)
- Enclosing degraded grazing land (applying cut and carry system on bottom lands)
- Forage development on gully areas (elephant grass, Phalaris, Rhodes, 'disho', Setaria and forage legume trees)
- Applying the zero grazing system by encouraging cut and carry system.
- Fodder development on irrigation sites (*Alfalfa, Vetch, Oats elephant grass, cow pea and tree legumes*)
- Fodder development on farmers homesteads.
- Introducing urea straw treatment on voluntary farmers.

- Cactus pear plantation for fodder development on degraded hillsides and backyards.
- Series of study tours conducted within and out side the woreda to grasp fodder development experiences.

Stake holders involved

- | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| • OoARD | • REST |
| • BoARD | • TARI |
| • IPMS | • GTZ |
| • WVE | • Woreda rural road office |
| • PA administration | • Atsbi town Municipality |
| • Woreda administration | • Land o' lakes |
| • FAP | |

Changes since 2007/08

- Enrichment of grazing land: 783ha\1383ha
- Grazing land enclosure:1746ha-2805ha
- Urea straw treatment beneficiaries:150\450
- Strengthening capacity of the forage multiplication centers:0.5ha\0.75ha
- Fodder development on gullies of watersheds developed.
- Fodder development on back yards and irrigation sites.
- FAP has intervened in: provision of starter fodder seed for FTCs, forage training, facilitating fodder stakeholder meetings and fodder innovation workshops.

Miesso Pilot Learning Woreda

Major fodder issues

- Drought and erratic rainfall
- Over stocking
- Shrinkage of grazing land
- Water problem
- Sporadic conflict
- Quality deterioration of crop residues
- Poor presentation of feed resources
- Lack of planting materials of fodder
- Pest attack to both standing crop and grain/ fodders crops-Cow pea & lablab
- Poor utilization of some of the tree legumes already established

Initiatives put in place to deal with feed scarcity

- Smallholder farmers based fodder planting materials/legume seedlings, grass cuts & seeds/ supply system
- Communal and individual enclosures enrichment and experience sharing
- Introduction of Molasses Urea block and/or Molasses Urea mix
- Use of FTC as experience sharing center

Major Stakeholders and their roles

Actors/Actor Groups	Responsibility
Oromiya BOARD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finance, guidance and coaching
Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall implementation, dissemination, linking with the commodity development
SHF supplying PM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sources of planting material
IPMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finance, knowledge management, training, linkage, commodity linkage, mentor, logistic, foster partnership, field days, new approach and tools, planting materials, documentation
MARC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supply of planting material
WARC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supply of planting material
ATARC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training, Supply of planting material
NGO's/Mercy, IRC/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sources of planting material
FAP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge sharing, mentoring, training, facilitate acquisition of forage planting material

Some changes since the involvement of FAP at Meisso

- More focused work with larger number of farmers
- More sense of ownership and partnership in addressing the issues of livestock feeds
- The Demonstration of practical fodder utilization
- Facilitate direct contact with specialists and mentors
- New approach in addressing fodder issue-Fodder Clinic
- Support in training

Discussions were held after the presentations and among points raised were the following:

Are there participants from government offices to address issues pertaining to policy intervention?

Yes, but it shouldn't be only government policies which influence the process but also local policies like community by-laws. Example: Tigray experience of engaging by laws for area closure

What is the facilitation role of the OoARD in practice? OoARD plays over all responsibility of following up the process and bear ownership.

How do actors integrate? How did you come to these initiatives?

IPMS experience: IPMS and OoARD held meeting and selected priority commodities including livestock products and identified fodder as a major impediment to livestock production.

FAP experience: Focus group discussion and problem identification with target beneficiaries to link fodder to livestock commodities. Options were listed and

stakeholders were invited to deal with the problems and suggested options. This was followed by awareness creation with farmers by facilitating experience sharing visits and practical trainings and livestock fairs, etc

Group Breakout Session 1

In the afternoon, the participants from each PLW were assigned discussion points around the whole area of stakeholder groups and their functioning. The following were among the major issues came out from group breakout session:

Ada'a Group

- 1) What has worked well so far in terms of actor group?
 - Discussion on common issues
 - Multi-actor platform formation
 - Responsibility sharing realized (common goal set)
 - Information and experience sharing improved
 - Different inputs consolidated
 - Some more partners influenced
 - Awareness enhanced
 - Marketing and market linkages created
- 2) What could we improve?
 - Scale up/out forage market
 - Record keeping
 - Integration of environmental management system
 - Common understanding about innovation systems approach by all actors
 - Need for exhausting opportunities
 - Institutionalize platforms
- 3) Key lessons
 - Organization of resources is important to achieve common goal
 - Conservation and effective utilization of resources is important
 - Aiming for proactive outcome
- 4) Way forward
 - Local knowledge identification as source of innovative interventions
 - Measuring our Effectiveness
 - Ensure sustainability and multiplier effects
 - Influence policy makers at different levels

Mieso Group

- 1) What has worked well so far in terms of actor group?
 - Meetings and communication among actors
 - Input supply, training, establishment increased
 - Common ownership established

- Mediation: Mediation worked in our cases by enhancing the legitimacy of the process through increasing transparency, bringing all perspectives to the table, providing rules of conduct, and establishing criteria for decision making.

2) What could we improve?

- Participation of private sector
- Strengthen and recognize farmer to farmer seed distribution and transfer
- Strengthen integration between different discipline-natural resource management, pest management, harness farmers' indigenous knowledge

3) Key lessons

- Farmers realized the importance and benefits of improved forage as evidenced by their witness about increased milk yield, body condition of animals, improved soil fertility, etc.
- Forage seed supply system established at local level
- Sense of ownership among actors
- Actor rallying to solve key problems of the community

4) Way forward

- Organizing more actor workshops
- Scale of operation should be increased into other Woredas

Atsbi-Alamata Group

1) What worked well?

- Forage intervention entry point identified
- Actor platform created
- Actor roles identified in joint planning meetings
- Actor tour identified as best knowledge sharing tool

2) What could be improved?

- Strengthening M&E of platform
- Clarity of resource sharing/contribution is required for more integration
- Institutionalization of platform's activities

3) Key lessons

- Zero grazing is found effective in solving feed shortage
- Study tour and experience sharing found to best tools for scaling out
- Awareness creation and good community mobilization
- Plat form created synergy

4) Way forward

- Bets practices should be scaled out/up
- More activity is required on fodder utilization
- Encourage private sector on fodder marketing and forage seed production

Questions and suggestions on group presentations

What indicators do you suggest for M&E of actor platforms?

We can evaluate if every partner has delivered its responsibility according to the agreement. But there is no enforcement mechanism if any of the partners fails to fulfill promises. One way is measuring interactions using score board as employed in FIP. It is a measure of performance compliance of actors.

Attendance to meetings is one of the indicators

What is the role of innovation platform drivers (leaders)?

Lead organizations must play a big role in that.

Miesso group should enlarge next steps

How zero grazing and improved forage preceded each other?

Enclosure encourages growth of natural leguminous species. Zero grazing improved feed supply. Initially zero grazing was started based on decision by the regional government. Actor alliance helped experience sharing visits and establishment of by laws

What are the drivers of actor alliance?

Proven technology that really addresses the priority problem of the society is the gathering principle. Attaching fodder development with livestock commodities is a way out. Look at larger picture (value chain) rather than narrow down to forage as an end by itself. (Remember a saying about 6 persons' perceptions of an elephant)

Sustainability of actor platform is a key challenge. Who is responsible for facilitation of the alliance in the long term?

The so called champions may not have the power to enforce. This may be a new role to extension.

How do we practically involve private sector in actor group?

This needs special skills and arrangements and understanding of the way private sector works. In Miesso there is farmer to farmer seed distribution mechanism that is working well. We need to capitalize on this indigenous ways of seed distribution rather than trying to introduce a stranger from the private sector into the system. This needs to be recognized.

Feed shortage is partly due to storage problems.

This needs technical solutions.

Keynote presentation on innovation platforms for dealing with fodder scarcity in India (Dr. Mona Dhamankar - Fodder Innovation Project -India)

Her presentation emphasized the following points:

- Principles
 - Strengthening existing networks and establishing new ones
 - Different organisations can take a lead
 - Working towards a common goal/cause
 - A set of interrelated changes
 - Adding value to existing resources and initiatives
 - Working in a new way

- Learning by doing enhances capacity

This was followed by questions and suggestions:

Why FIP worked with NGO's instead of government offices?

Phase I of FIP emphasized on technology transfer with government offices and didn't have success. Government offices are still there in phase II but the NGO's play the major role. Involvement of government offices is vital because they have all the infrastructure and sustainability.

How was actor selection made in FIP?

Key actors selected first and then looked for including more as needed.

Visioning

The vision for improved livelihoods through increased use of fodder and the steps needed to get there discussed in breakout groups. The major points of the group reports are summarized as follows:

Group Breakout Session 2

Each PLW group was asked to discuss the following points and report back:

- What is our vision for improved livelihoods through increased use of fodder?
- What steps do we need to get there?

The major issues discussed after group presentations are summarized below.

- *Some visions are ambitious?* Visions could be aspirations for future achievements, but shouldn't be over ambitious and should take in to account the internal and external environmental changes
- *Most activities are on the input side and less on the out put side?* The whole value chain to be considered in the process.
- *Is the out put for home consumption or market?* Yes, satisfying home need is important but we have to look ahead as far as commodity commercialization if we aim for sustainability and livelihoods improvement
- *Factors like livestock breed and health are overlooked in some of the visions and steps?* True, we have to think broadly and include all the factors and involve the relevant actors in the group to address such issues
- *Should we include figures in vision setting?* There are different schools of thought with this who say yes and no, but in general it is wise to set vision which could inspire us for achievement.
- Mission and vision setting should consider: Target population, pathways to get there, tangible statements, the whole value chain

Developing an innovation charter – rules of the game (Dr. Siefe Ayele)

His presentation was framed based on the following major points:

- Concepts of innovation systems approach
- Innovation network formation
- Innovation networks and innovations
- Drawing lessons: learning, action research, communication...
- Some lessons and out and up scaling innovations
- Innovation networks and drivers
- innovation networks capacity

This was also followed by questions and discussions.

- *The steps taken in net work formation are long and require resources to implement?* Yes. Organizing net work is a challenging activity. There are lots of transactions involved and we need to get ready for it.
- *Net works are different from partnership and as such difficult to impose rules and also difficult to analyze.* However, there needs to be at least a guiding principle which creates room for learning by doing
- *Involving private sector is a major challenge as this sector is more profit oriented than any other sector wants to see tangible benefits?* Yes. The net work should consider things like this for the rest of the actors too and look for opportunities not only problems to involve actors in the value chain.
- *We have to capitalize on past experiences in order to develop guiding principles*
- *Who is to drive the innovation agenda after projects?* It should be the net works driven by the problems/opportunities from the ultimate users side
- *Innovation is not a new idea, but sustainability?* It is the capacity to be sustained not necessarily net works

Group Breakout Session 3

Following the presentation on developing an innovation charter the participants were grouped by each pilot learning district and discussed on the following points:

- What is the aim of the actor group?
- What principals should apply to make it work?
- What are the rules of engagement?

The consensus of the groups were presented at plenary and discussed. The major points came out of the group discussion are presented as follows:

Alamata

What is the aim of the actor group?

- Improve feed quantity and quality to improve livestock production

What principals should apply to make it work?

- Creation of awareness among actors to gain their will and commitment

- Agreement and understanding on common goal and mutual benefit
- Define roles and responsibilities for each actor
- Assess performance of each actor
- Facilitate meeting through rotating and equal contribution

What are the rules of engagement?

- E-mail communication
- Telephone contacts
- Through knowledge centers
- Fodder innovation news letter
- Field days
- Experience sharing visits
- Through research and review process

Atsbi-Wonberta

What is the aim of the actor group?

- Bring about diversified knowledge and capacity from different corners and sharing of knowledge which will help to fodder development
- To optimize the use of available resources in the area and integrating every stakeholder's responsibility with respect to the core objective

What principals should apply to make it work?

- Mutual understanding and mutual respect
- Recognition of every stakeholder's contribution
- Establish clear set of responsibility to stakeholders and monitor and evaluate accordingly

What are the rules of engagement?

- Set up guideline for implementation
- Strong linkage among stakeholders
- Set TOR that indicates how stakeholders share of responsibility and report

Mieso

What is the aim of the actor group?

- Identify and articulate priority problem (fodder scarcity)
- Seeking common ground for networking
- Share responsibility
- Share information, knowledge and skills, experiences, approaches, etc.
- Avoid duplication of effort
- If we understand that the challenges we face are shared, and our failure to meet them will hurt us all.

What principals should apply to make it work?

- Make concrete contributions to the realization of poverty reduction goals;
- Mutual benefit and mutual respect
- Common purpose
- Transparency
- Overlapping interests and goals
- Flexibility
- Accountability
- Synergy
- Documenting lessons
- Proactive networking
- Scaling up/out
- Striving for balanced representation of relevant partners from research, development practitioners and private sector
- Shall be undertaken in a manner that maintains the integrity, impartiality and independence of the partner organization;

What are the rules of engagement?

- Define roles and responsibilities accordingly the capacity of each actor
- Develop detailed joint plan of action
- Identify innovation platform leaders (champions) and rotate leadership
- Establish M&E mechanism
- Strong commitment to draw resources (financial, technical, facilitation, etc.)

Ada'a

What is the aim of the actor group?

- Creation of synergy through pooling resources from multiple actors
- Ensure improvement of livelihoods through sustainable fodder adoption

What principals should apply to make it work?

Target beneficiaries and users

- Regular meetings and participation
- Capitalize on past experiences
- Participatory approach at all levels
- Nothing is impossible if well planned and devoted

What are the rules of engagement?

- Clear responsibility, benefits and accountability
- Agree on values, norms, beliefs and rules
- Full commitment

Comments on group presentations

What do you mean by 'agree on rules, norms and values'?

It means the actors need to be accommodative and appreciative of others values, rules and norms.

How effective can TOR be?

It helps to gauge if each actor has fulfilled its promises and measure contributions

How can we influence our bosses as we return home?

The participants have a big responsibility to brief their bosses and other colleagues about what they gained from the workshop. It is always important for a few people who had a chance to such trainings to influence others around them.

It is important to register successes to influence other actors. We need to see champions. Ideally it can be individual commitment. The individual trained should influence others.

Finally the representatives of the four pilot learning Woredas were given a package of extension materials as part of capacity building. Participants were asked about their impression on the workshop. They indicated that the conference has given them better understanding about actor groups. We need to identify important actors and their roles. We should also identify missing actors and engage in the actor platform.

Annex 1: List of participants

No.	Name	Affiliation	Position	Tele	E-mail
1.	Abate Tedla	ILRI-FAP	F.agronomist		
2.	Abera Adie	ILRI-FAP	Research ast.		
3.	Abraham G/Hiwot	IPMS-Alamta	RDA		
4.	Amare Feleke	Land O' Lakes	BDS		
5.	Art Goetsch	Langston Unv.	Professor		
6.	Dawit Negessa	Ada'a Coop	Borad Chair		
7.	Dawit W/Mariam	IPMS-Atsbi	RDA		
8.	Deresse Kassa	"	Expert		
9.	Driba Geleti	EMDTI	Feed Technologist		
10.	G/Kiros G/Selema	OARD-Atsbi	Forage expert		
11.	Girma Abebe	ESGPIP	Program Officer		
12.	Hailu Megressa	Ada ARD-Office	Head		
13.	Kassahun Zewdie	Private farm	Agronomist		
14.	Kebebe Ergano	ILRI	Researcher		
15.	Kebede Manjur	TARI-Alamata	Director		
16.	Mehari Kebede	TARI	IR-II		
17.	Million Teshome	Research	Tech.Asst.		
18.	Misgina Bisrat	OARD-Atsbi	Extension		
19.	Mohammed adem	Ada livestock office	Section head		
20.	Mona Dhamankar	ILRI-FIP	Consultant		
21.	Nigatu Alemeyehu	IPMS-Ada'a	RDO		
22.	Seife Ayele	ILRI	Researcher		
23.	Sofian Abdulah	OPRD Mieso	Head		
24.	Solomon Mengistu	EIAR-DZ	Researcher		
25.	Tadesse assefa	ATARC	Researcher		
26.	Teferra Gebremeskel	ESGPIP	DCOP		
27.	Tesfay G/Egziabher	OARD-Alamat	Head		
28.	Tesfaye Zerfe	Ada'a Coop	Office head		
29.	Weldeyessus G/Yohannes	TARI	IR-II		
30.	Yemene Melese	OARD-Alamata	Forage expert		
31.	Zewdu Ayele	ILRI-IPMS	RDO		

Annex 2: Workshop Programme

Innovation Experience Sharing Workshop

Venue: Dire Hotel in Nazareth

Dates: 3-4 June 2009

Wed June 3

Morning rapporteur: Aberra

0900 Welcome and introductions – Julius Nyangaga

0930 Update on FAP including international activities – Alan Duncan

1000 Coffee

1030 Updates on efforts to deal with feed scarcity in IPMS PLWs through joint action

Alamata

Atsbi

Mieso

Ada'a

Guidelines for PLW presentations

10 minute presentation plus 5 minutes for questions

To cover:

- What are the major fodder issues in the district? (3 slides)
- What past initiatives have there been to deal with feed scarcity? (2 slides)
- Who are the actors involved in fodder/feed issues and what are their roles? (2 slides)
- What has happened since FAP came on the scene last year (2 slides)?

1130 Keynote presentation on innovation platforms for dealing with fodder scarcity in India – Mona Dhamankar - Fodder Innovation Project (India)

1230 Lunch

Afternoon rapporteur: Kebebe

1400

Breakout groups to consider the following

- What has worked well so far in terms of our actor groups
- What could we improve on?
- What are some key lessons to be drawn from our experiences
- Where do we go from here

1500 Tea/coffee

1530 Reporting back

1630 Summing up of the day

Thu June 4

Morning rapporteur: Aberra

0830 Welcome and introduction to the day

0845 Breakout groups to consider:

- What is our vision for improved livelihoods through increased use of fodder?
- What steps do we need to get there?

0945 Reporting back

1015 Coffee/tea

1045 Developing an innovation charter – rules of the game (Seife Ayele)

1115 Breakout groups to consider the following:

- What is the aim of the actor group?
- What principals should apply to make it work?
- What are the rules of engagement?

Afternoon rapporteur: Kebebe

1230 Lunch

1330 Reporting back

1430 Summing up – Alan Duncan

1500 Close