



THE KIGALI MOVEMENT

STRENGTHENING CAPACITY FOR AGRICULTURAL INNOVATION IN POST-CONFLICT AND PROTRACTED CRISES COUNTRIES: A CONSULTATIVE LEARNING WORKSHOP

6 – 8 September 2012, Hotel Des Mille Collines, Kigali, Rwanda

PROVISIONAL REPORT

“Rwanda suffered much and nobody believed it could come out of it but we managed to build a state which is currently strong and proud. (...) The best way to reach sustainable socio-economic rehabilitation is investing more in agriculture.”

Dr. Agnes Kalibata,
The Honorable Minister of Agriculture and Animal Resources, Government of
Rwanda,
Laureate of the JARA Price 2012 for Green Revolution in Africa



This report was composed by Rob M.G. van Poelje (PSO) and Nelson K. Olang'o Ojjo (FARA) on the basis of input from Claire Gatayire and Josaphat Mugabo (RAB). Many thanks to Irene Annor-Frempong (FARA) and to Thomas Price (GFAR Secretariat) for their constructive feedback.



Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| List of Acronyms | 2 |
| Purpose, audience and organization of this report | 3 |
| About the Organizers | 3 |
| Background and Justification..... | 3 |
| Objectives | 4 |
| Participants | 5 |
| Working Vocabulary | 5 |
| <i>Contextual elements</i> | 5 |
| <i>Capacity</i> | 6 |
| <i>Capacity Development</i> | 6 |
| <i>Capacity Development Support</i> | 7 |
| Preparations | 7 |
| Workshop process steps..... | 8 |
| Proceedings | 8 |
| <i>Opening Ceremony</i> | 8 |
| ASARECA | 10 |
| CORAF/WECARD | 10 |
| RUFORUM | 11 |
| AFAAS..... | 11 |
| RWANDA | 11 |
| BURUNDI | 12 |
| ETHIOPIA..... | 12 |
| AFGHANISTAN | 12 |
| TAJIKISTAN..... | 13 |
| SIERRA LEONE | 13 |



| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| LIBERIA | 14 |
| TCHAD | 14 |
| SOUTH SOUDAN | 14 |
| GUINEE CONAKRY | 14 |
| CONGO BRAZAVILLE..... | 15 |
| UGANDA..... | 15 |
| DRC | 15 |
| <i>Lessons from the World Café on the Country Cases</i> | <i>16</i> |
| <i>The Kigali Movement: towards a joint Capacity Development Support plan</i> | <i>17</i> |
| <i>Closing remarks from GFAR</i> | <i>20</i> |
| <i>Closing remarks by the Rwandan Ministry of Education</i> | <i>21</i> |
| <i>Evaluation by the participants.....</i> | <i>21</i> |
| Annexes: | Error! Bookmark not defined. |



List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

| | |
|--------------|--|
| 2PC | Post-conflict and protracted crisis |
| AFAAS | African Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services |
| AR&D | Agricultural Research and Development |
| AR4D | Agricultural Research for Development |
| ASARECA | Association for the Strengthening of Agricultural Research in East and Central Africa |
| CD | Capacity development |
| CGIAR | Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research |
| CORAF/WECARD | Conseil ouest et centre Africain pour la Recherche et le Développement Agricole / West and Central African Council for Agricultural Research and Development |
| CSO | Civil Society Organizations |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations |
| FARA | Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa |
| GCARD | Global Conference on Agricultural Research and Development |
| GFAR | Global Forum on Agricultural Research |
| HRM | Human Resource Management |
| ICT | Information and Communication Technology |
| NARI | National Agricultural Research Institute |
| NARS | National Agricultural Research Systems |
| NGO | Non-Governmental Organizations |
| RAB | Rwanda Agricultural Board |
| RUFORUM | Regional Universities Forum for Capacity Building in Agriculture |
| SADC/FANR | Southern Africa Development Cooperation/Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Directorate |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Program |
| USAID | United States Agency for International Development |
| WFP | World Food Program |



Purpose and organization

This report is intended as aid to disseminating the valuable lessons and findings adduced at the “Strengthening Capacity for Agricultural Innovation in Post-conflict and Protracted Crises (2PC) Countries: A Consultative Learning Workshop” held in Kigali, Rwanda, 6 – 8 September 2012, especially by the workshop participants back in their home countries. The report deliberately outlines the learning process adopted during the workshop. Documenting the process is equally important as documenting the results so that subsequent workshops or engagements of a similar nature may benefit from the outlined methodology.

Starting with background information, the report presents a summary of the plenary presentations of the workshop, which includes a brief on the post-conflict and protracted crisis environment in the 15 participating countries. A section is thereafter dedicated to process steps that eventually led to the final action plan. An immediate outcome of the final action plan was a synthesis paper presented to the “High Level Expert Forum: Addressing Food Insecurity in Protracted Crises” jointly convened by the Committee on World Food Security and FAO on September 13 – 14 in Rome, Italy. The synthesis paper will also form the basis for a presentation during the 2nd Global Conference on Agricultural Research for Development (GCARD 2) to be held in Punta del Este, Uruguay on 29 Oct – 1 Nov 2012.

Organizers and scope

At the instance of GFAR, the workshop was organized by FARA and hosted by ASARECA in Rwanda. The choice of Rwanda was for very significant reasons thus: 1) the near-celebrated post-conflict macro-economic progress, 2) pioneer CAADP post-compact country, and 3) the significant role that agriculture has played in the reconstruction process. Other sub-regional partners of FARA, CORAF/WE CARD and SADC/FANR, provided all necessary support to the workshop. FARA convened the workshop in its facilitative and agenda-setting role for continental capacity strengthening for agricultural innovation in Africa and as a component activity in the CAADP Pillar 4 Strategy. The workshop intended to have a global cast for post-conflict and protracted crises countries. These countries fall in Africa, Asia and the Caribbean. However, due to logistical reasons, the Caribbean representatives were unable to attend the workshop.

Background and Justification

Violent conflicts engender destruction of human life, livelihood support systems, the environment, physical and economic infrastructure, and social fabrics. Large populations – often rural and urban poor - suffer in-country or cross-border displacement into congested camps far removed from their homes. Coping mechanisms under such extremely morbid circumstances principally relies on relief supplies but also involve individual and collective innovations to restore a semblance of normalcy through re-establishment (however



fleeting) of institutional frameworks, social contracts, livelihood sustenance, and other rudimentary economic activities. For the vast numbers of rural households, agriculture constitutes the prevalent livelihood base and is a key driver for recovery and overall economic growth. Indeed, for all countries represented in the Rwanda workshop, agriculture is the predominant contributor to GDP and employs the majority of the population. Hence, initial development programming in post-conflict and protracted crises necessarily has to target agriculture. The role of agriculture in the embryonic development of countries emerging from conflict rests on the fact that, on average, GDP growth originating in the agricultural sector is considered at least twice as effective in reducing poverty as GDP growth originating from other sectors.

However, a number of obtaining factors militate against agricultural reconstruction in post-conflict countries. Next to asset depletion due to theft and destruction, access to land, water, pasture and forests in post-conflict settings is no longer guaranteed. Clashes of customary and statutory land regimes, loss of historical memory, weak statutory titling, and the destruction of recognized landmarks lead to sustained uncertainty and low motivation to invest in agrarian economic activities. Further, loss of human life, displacement and rural-urban migration lead to erosion of agricultural knowledge, skills and labor force. Systemic incapacity characterized by dysfunctional organizational structures and market systems, infrastructural damage, and weakened institutional linkages is often collateral to violent conflicts and protracted crises. As a result, communities are without a voice, farmer institutions do not function, service providers are hardly accountable to end-users, the presence of the private sector is weak, and the capacity for marketing and agro-processing is reduced.

The agricultural research and development systems in post-conflict and protracted crises countries invariably suffer from poor research infrastructure and financial means, high staff turnover, weak regional and international collaborative research ties, and virtually in-existent intra-country collaboration between research, universities, producer organizations and the private sector. Nevertheless, the post-conflict environment offers a window of opportunity for re-inventing the agricultural innovation capacity in view of changing (inter) national contexts and development agendas. To ensure viability and sustainability in unstable settings, it is crucial to build from the ground up with local institutions representing the people and reflecting their needs and priorities. Moreover, in those countries characterized by sustained hostilities between parties to the conflict, agricultural innovation faces the additional challenge of having to contribute to peace building and reconciliation.

Objectives

The workshop sought to:

1. Identify how agricultural capacity and capacity strengthening programming can contribute to sustainable peace and development of post-conflict and protracted crisis countries



2. Define key issues and an appropriate approach to capacity strengthening for agricultural innovation in post-conflict and protracted crises countries
3. Engage key partners in identifying opportunities for multi-actor engagement in the strengthening of agricultural innovation capacity of post-conflict and protracted crises countries in Sub-Saharan Africa.
4. Develop a joint action plan for concerted and country-specific agricultural capacity strengthening interventions in post-conflict and protracted crises countries

Participants

Practically all participants in the Rwanda workshop came from countries either emergent from or undergoing recurrent violent conflicts in Africa and Asia. These were Rwanda, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Congo Brazzaville, Sierra Leone, Burundi, Ethiopia, Uganda, Central African Republic, Chad, Guinea Bissau, Guinea Conakry, Liberia, Afghanistan, and Tajikistan. Some countries like Afghanistan qualified all in one as conflict, post-conflict and protracted crisis country. Other countries subscribed to various shades in the continuum ranging from normalcy and conflict/crisis situations. The causes of conflicts in these countries vary but include mainly historical ethnic animosity, internal political subjugation, international political alliances, inept governance, economic disparities, discriminatory policies, and control of resources.

Working Vocabulary

Contextual elements

Comparing the stories from different 2PC countries is complicated, as the contexts are often very diverse. In order to be able to draw some generic lessons from the rich country experiences, we needed a basic joint understanding of the continuum between a 100% conflict situation and a 100% stable situation. It became clear that the way one looks at the continuum depended very much on one's perspective and objectives.


Various agencies have demarcated the continuum depending on the dictates of their relief or development programming objectives. The WFP distinguishes the phases "Food aid", "Food Assistance" and "Food Security". According to FAO, countries in protracted crises are those reporting a food crisis for eight years or more, receive more than 10 per cent of foreign assistance as humanitarian relief, and is on the list of Low-Income-Food-Deficit countries". UNDP, on the other hand, considers country contexts as dynamic and constantly changing and distinguishes three phases as follows: Phase 1 - humanitarian, Phase 2 – transition, and Phase 3 - towards self-sustaining development. Quite pessimistically, USAID avers that a country context does not always change in a positive direction and identifies stages in the continuum as deterioration, transition, arrested development, and early recovery (UNDP, 2005). From the academic perspective, Brinkerhoff (2008) uses capacity and leadership as variables to distinguish country contexts as follows: "at risk" - weak capacity, weak leadership; "weak but willing" - weak capacity, emerging leadership; and "strong but unresponsive" -



strong capacity but weak leadership. The fourth category “strong capacity and strong leadership” refers to stable development contexts.


Capacity


During the workshop, the working presumption was that capacity is the outcome of collaborative action by individuals, organisations, networks and alliances within an enabling environment. The concept of capacity gets meaning when it refers to a specific entity or system. The workshop specifically looked at the agricultural development capacity of communities in post-conflict or protracted crisis settings. As pointed out in the background and justification above, the agricultural research and development systems in post-conflict and protracted crises countries invariably suffer wide-ranging capacity components such as poor research infrastructure and financial means, high staff turnover, weak regional and international collaborative research ties, and virtually in-existent intra-country collaboration between research, universities, producer organizations and the private sector. Moreover, agricultural development strategies face the additional challenge of having to contribute to peace building and reconciliation.



Capacity Development

To facilitate joint reflection, the workshop assumed that capacity development is a continuous, cyclic, and action learning process. Following a cyclic learning process allows us to progressively fine-tune our capacity development strategies and instruments based on evidence gained from the field.





The workshop focused on the more “soft” capacity development interventions that are within the scope of the agricultural innovation system: training and Learning, organizational development, chain and network development, and lobbying and advocacy. “Hard” capacity development interventions such as infrastructural improvements and improved access to land were considered part of the enabling environment. As usual, the nature of the capacity development interventions must be based on a thorough needs assessment and, in post-conflict settings, on careful

context monitoring.

Capacity Development Support

Because of the uniqueness and sensitivity of each post-conflict situation, a “joint action plan for concerted and country-specific agricultural capacity strengthening interventions in post-conflict and protracted crises countries” (Objective 4) could only be formulated in terms of general support that could be rendered regionally and internationally to the locally formulated capacity development strategy. This was referred to as Capacity Development Support.

Preparations

In preparation for the consultative learning workshop, the participants were asked in advance to prepare a country presentation with specific attention for:

- The post-conflict context
- The national agricultural development policy: what capacity was supposed to be strengthened?
- The intervention logic of the capacity development strategy, with special attention for what knowledge and communication networks were used;
- How was the strategy supposed to contribute to sustainable peace / stability?
- What were the operational dilemma's that arose along the way?
- How successful was the strategy been and what were the determining elements for its success/failure?



Workshop process steps

The workshop process was designed to foster an optimal balance between individual processing of evidence (2) and experiences (3), and giving meaning to this newly acquired information in interactive groups that were each tasked to decipher the following specific issues from the country stories: context, agricultural capacity and capacity development.



The World Café methodology (4) led to a cross fertilization between the three groups, thus giving a broad reflection to some of the generic insights. The participants were also requested to draw a “personal letter to a close colleague or your boss” (5) meant to re-connect the participants to their situation back home. The “planning exercise” (6 and 7) intended to assure the commitment of the participants to the follow up activities.

Workshop Progress

Opening Ceremony

The opening ceremony was facilitated by Dr. Irene Annor-Frempong from FARA.

- The Director General of RAB, Dr Jean Jacques Mbonigaba, extended a warm welcome in Rwanda to the participants
- Dr Joseph Methu, the representative of ASARECA, welcomed the participants from outside the sub-region.



- The Executive Director of FARA and Chair of GFAR Prof Monty Jones stressed that in post-conflict situations, provisions of peace depend on robust economic growth. For many post-conflict countries in sub-Saharan Africa and elsewhere, the economies largely depend on agriculture and investment in agricultural development is the best bet for stimulating aggregate GDP growth. He explained that the present workshop is held in Rwanda because Rwanda successfully came out of the conflict situation and that workshop could learn a lot from Rwanda.
- The Director General for Science, Technology and Research, representative of Ministry of Education in Rwanda, Dr Marie-Christine Gasingirwa, highlighted in her opening remarks the important role of research and well trained researchers for post-conflicts countries to recover from the crisis.
- The Honorable Minister for Agriculture, Government of Rwanda, Dr. Agnes Kalibata, shared with her audience the Rwandan experience by specifying a number of lessons learnt that could be useful for post-conflict and protracted crisis countries. She observed that conflicts affect agriculture, food production, human resources, infrastructure, and capacity; that Rwanda suffered much and nobody believed it could come out of it, yet Rwandans managed to build a state, which was currently strong and proud. She indicated that special attention should be paid to gender empowerment as women are most affected in conflict situations through sad experiences such as rape, killing of husbands and children. The Minister observed that Rwanda came out of a deep hole thanks to capacity building, clear policies and eagerness to develop the nation. She stated that the best way to reach sustainable socio-economic rehabilitation is investing more in agriculture. The rural poor in post-conflict situations rely on agriculture for livelihood, nutrition and food security.

The Keynote Address

Prof. Monty Jones, Executive Director (FARA) and Chair (GFAR) addressed the participants on the subject of “Agricultural Development in Conflict and Protracted Crisis Situations: A Capacity Strengthening Perspective”.

- He stressed the importance of preventing conflicts in the first place and the importance of disaster preparedness in areas prone to natural disaster. He indicated that protracted crisis countries had increased from 5 in 1990 to 22 in 2010, 77% of them being located in the Africa region, which constitute one third of African countries. With regard to numbers of people (rather than countries), prof. Jones said that about 20% of hungry people were located in a protracted crisis countries and that agricultural development in protracted crisis countries required special attention because it was integral to improving food security and livelihoods essential to recovery. A country whose agricultural research, extension and education capacity is severely eroded could not stimulate the agricultural productivity increases needed for it to recover from a crisis or from a further shock such as a disease outbreak.
- Prof. Jones further stressed that unless the world addressed the special AR&D needs of protracted crisis countries, they will not be able to achieve their aspirations of winning the battle against hunger. It could be assumed from the trend of food prices, which were set to increase this year, and from other drivers of crises such as climate change, increased water scarcity etc. that post conflict and protracted crisis countries were likely to be trapped in a cycle of recurring crises and more countries were vulnerable to descending into crisis. Therefore, special attention must be paid to protracted crisis countries, especially on food security. The High Level Expert Forum on protracted crises, which was to be held in Rome 13-14 September 2012 was an expression of this will.
- Prof. Jones observed that capacity development meant rebuilding infrastructure and rebuilding institutions to recover from the crisis. This rebuilding must be rooted in the local mobilization of all



relevant stakeholders from both the public and private sector and from civil society: smallholder farmers, producer organizations, service providers, traders, and researchers. Prof Jones stressed that FARA's contribution to rebuilding AR&D capacity in post-conflict and protracted countries consists in providing networking support among agricultural research, extension and education stakeholders to enhance their innovation capacity & effectiveness.

Regional Perspectives

We highlight here the ideas and lessons learnt that we deem relevant to the theme of the workshop. The entire presentations can be accessed at <http://www.erails.net/FARA/secretariat/kigali-movement/post-workshop/>

ASARECA

Lessons learnt:

- The capacity of the national agricultural innovation systems varies widely and depends on the time that has passed since the conflict.
- An arrangement for staff exchange with the relatively stronger NARS/CGIAR would be useful in the short-term; there is greater need to strengthen cooperation between universities, NARIs, and CGIAR Centers to make maximum utilization of the human resource in the country
- Even in post-conflict settings, it is important to have a long-term training program for PhD and MSc to better manage the research system. Universities need to be supported and strengthened to offer quality graduate program in priority areas
- In general, mechanisms for remuneration & incentives must be defined to retain trained staff and substantial investments are required to put in place the basic research infrastructure and equipment

CORAF/WECARD

During crises CORAF provides

- modest support for development activities to encourage / retain staff in “safe” areas
- strong support to Civil Society Organizations (CSOs)—NGOs active in Agriculture, farmer organizations, agribusiness
- support for genetic resource conservation and seed production
- facilitation of information / knowledge sharing using practical tools
- distance learning and e-extension tools to inform and educate staff

In post crises CORAF provides/brokers

- systemic to Institutional analysis to determine competence and skills needs
- facilitation of training and succession plan development for personnel
- support to internal and external communication infrastructure & ICT skills development
- facilitate governance, leadership & management skills enhancement
- coaching & mentoring grants
- internships & networking and learning
- higher degree training
- skills enhancement training



RUFORUM

Lessons learnt:

- post-graduate studies must focus on the long term priority areas e.g. plant breeding & biotechnology, food science, fisheries and aquaculture and environment and natural resources management
- In post conflict settings organizational structures must allow for the creation of centers of excellence around champions/leaders in agricultural innovation
- language support: Francophone students should be supported to learn English before starting their programme.
- priority must be given to the establishment and strengthening of e-libraries
- priority must be given to exchange programs for students and staff of RUFORUM universities

AFAAS¹

Lessons:

- post-conflict development and innovation require participatory and bottom-up planning;
- short term intervention should take into account the future facilitating of the transition from supply led programs to demand driven systems for service delivery
- heavy lobby and advocacy is needed, as national governments are critical in addressing post conflict issues on agricultural development. Comprehensive strategies, policy and programs for capacity development at all levels is a priority
roles, rights, responsibilities and linkages of various actors must be agreed upon and facilitated/reinforced

Challenges:

- agricultural Advisory Services (AAS) are expected to play multiple roles, from organizing farmer groups, facilitating linkages, training on agricultural, nutrition and health issues etc. – under different situations. This requires a new human resource capacity development program.
- in-depth conflict analysis is crucial, but it is often overlooked. The relevance of local knowledge is often underestimated by local researchers
- defining relationship between agriculture, rural livelihoods and conflict is paramount
- define how agriculture-related matters can be a driver of conflict, and/or a prevention or mitigating factor

Country Stories

From the rich variety of Country stories we have tried below to capture per story some significant lessons or insights that are relevant in the light of the present workshop. The complete papers are available at this link: <http://www.erails.net/FARA/secretariat/kigali-movement/post-workshop/>

RWANDA

Lessons

- agriculture and livestock have become a major concern of the Government in the reconstruction period after the Genocide. The goal was to reverse the trend and bring about well-being of the

¹ Due to health problems the AFAAS contribution was not presented during the workshop



population through identification of a liberalized and market-oriented agricultural economy, food security and poverty reduction.

- elaboration of the agricultural policy and related strategies to implement it were initiated to favor participatory approach to agricultural research.

Challenges

- low involvement of the private sector in agriculture sector
- reluctance of financial institutions in lending to agriculture
- insufficient skills in key domains
- low public investment and funding agriculture vs. targets

BURUNDI

Challenges

- formulation of a Master Plan that enables research priorities to follow national priorities thus gaining in direct relevance;
- organizational development of the NARS to make it more efficient and demand driven
- establishment of management system for human resources for a better harmonisation of missions and profits
- re-establishment of infrastructures and acquisition of equipment to enable ISABU to implement its priority programmes,
- inspire research staff to implement priority programs at a decentralized level, closer to the ground.

ETHIOPIA

Lessons:

- as a solution to the weak research-extension linkage Research-Extension Advisory Councils (REACs) were established at the federal, regional, and zonal levels. (systematic approach – each level addresses the issues that are relevant at that level)
- farmers must be represented in the research management cycle to verify/monitor the relevance of the research interventions so called Agricultural Development Partners' Linkage Advisory Councils (ADPLAC). The ADPLACs are multi-stakeholder platforms that are operational at federal, regional, zonal and Woreda levels.

Challenges:

- retention of trained staff
- low level of skill of Das in areas of linking farmers to market and value chains. (High production with low market support leading to subsequent low adoption of improved technologies)

AFGHANISTAN

Lessons:

- increased agriculture productivity and production leading to food and nutritional security; and employment and income generation ensuring access to food is the key to bring the stability and peace in Protracted Crises Countries
- evaluation and introduction of off-farm livelihoods for men and women: Processing, value addition, and marketing of medicinal plants
- diversification of wheat based cropping system



- intensification of cropping systems: Evaluation, Introduction and promotion of short duration legumes between two wheat crops
- research and promotion on crop-livestock system: Introduction and promotion of small ruminants (goats), feeding systems, development of local feeds, milk processing and value addition (1000 women)
- evaluation and Introduction of drought resistant forage crops and perennials
- increased coordination between all the actors (national, regional and international)
- pre-emptive/ proactive action to avoid conflict and crisis, NOT as a reaction to crisis (positive bonding of actors on the basis of win-win)

Challenges:

- identification of capacity development priorities, more client-driven Capacity Development services
- more emphasis on medium term CD (3-4 months), less on short-term
- integrate funds for action-learning in training and curriculum
- close linkages and coordination between agriculture education-research-extension
- continued training of community and farmers
- speed up HRM procedures and adapt to composition of the population (focus on young, women). staff retention through smart deployment
- CD in computer application and language skills
- linkages/internship/ sabbatical/ seconding staff to regional/ international organizations
- linkage to CGIAR centers
- improved agriculture education in universities

TAJIKISTAN

Challenges

- advocate for more state support to scientific research and its application in production chains
- improve the level of staff training and re-training through international cooperation with peer professionals (access to the latest achievements of science)
- develop consulting services for commercial agricultural producers (unprecedented in a former communist country)

SIERRA LEONE

Lesson:

- dependence on foreign interventions during the war created a dependency syndrome which Sierra Leone is currently dealing with. Investments in agricultural development and innovation currently face the problem of sustainability.

Challenges:

- low investment in agriculture, poor road network, weak extension system, lack of access to finance for agricultural production, and the lack of adequate capacity to implement programs.
- revitalizing the shattered economy requires macroeconomic management reform, as well as efforts to fight corruption and mismanagement.
- the task is to penetrate the regional market with high value-added products.



LIBERIA

Lessons

- the Ministry of Agriculture, in collaboration with some agricultural-based companies is sponsoring students at the Liberian Agricultural Universities;
- over 30 agricultural-research personnel are pursuing graduate and post-graduate degrees in West, North and South Africa. Others are studying in China and India.

TCHAD

Challenges:

- short term needs for extension of knowledge and technologies:
 - Promotion of agricultural advisory services
 - Gender sensitive economic chain development for better access to markets
- short term rehabilitation of training infrastructure
- advocate for appropriate land rights to regulate access to land by women, young people, IDP and refugees
- long term strengthening human resource capacity through training in biotechnology, biometrics; communication, dissemination and the application of research results

SOUTH SUDAN

Key strategic lessons from period – 2005 – 2011:

- overarching need to “put state-building first” and to ensure that all development programs (including the agricultural) contribute to the process of building credible, functioning and accountable government structures.
- need to balance focus on core executive functions with support for oversight and accountability, including citizen participation, and with building strong relations between the center, States and society.
- need for more appropriate and credible approaches to the transition from humanitarian relief to development, focusing on building core service delivery capacities that enable the Government to take responsibility for the delivery of services to the population.
- need to ensure that the post-conflict programs are better focused, with an emphasis on transformative programs that can be scaled-up.

GUINEE CONAKRY

Lessons learnt:

- stronger scientific partnerships
- training of young researchers is a priority
- research institutions are working according to competitive principles and generating their own funds
- NARS has been established in 2008
- HRM policy in place (recruitment and training)
- state budget for agriculture went up to 10%

Challenges

- continued training
- mentoring of the juniors by the seniors (program)
- sustainability and diversification of funding for agricultural innovation
- reinforce scientific partnerships



CONGO BRAZAVILLE

Lessons learnt

- political support is crucial
- diversify financial resources!
- the normal functioning of research institutions is perceived as an indicator for peace and stability

Challenges

- national, regional and local coordination of agricultural innovation
- training needs assessment

UGANDA

Lessons learnt:

- crises are complex and multifaceted. Need articulate, multilayered and highly integrated and coordinated approaches and responses.
- multiple levels: regional; national/central and decentralized Government; community; household. Research; policy; coordination; service delivery.
- multiple dimensions, some more related to agriculture, others of somehow different nature (basic services and safety nets, for example), are all needed to enhance resilience
- some issues and challenges that need sustained attention:
 - Analysis of conflict-agriculture relationships
 - Strengthen management of transition
 - Parallel tracks: crisis response and building resilience at the same time
 - Adapt funding streams: for humanitarian response and for longer-term track (resilience)

Challenges

- analysis of conflict-agriculture relationships
- articulate, multi-layered and multifaceted response, but also highly coordinated
- strengthen management of transition
- parallel tracks: crisis response and building resilience at the same time
- adapt funding streams: adequate, flexible, predictable for humanitarian response and for simultaneous longer-term track (resilience)

DRC

Challenges:

- knowledge on appropriate credit systems (e.g. agricultural Credit Bank network)
- promotion of horticulture
- expertise in organizing and enhancing access to markets and market information.
- create and strengthen multi-stakeholders partnership in the local value chain (including private sector)
- strengthen formal education through harmonization and international exchange
- establish contract continuity and to identify good local consultants to undertake high quality research in Public research centers.
- utilize partnerships between international and national actors, or between government, the private sector and civil society, to leverage existing capacity and transfer skills to local stakeholders.



- prevention of the rural exodus mainly made by younger people by developing appealing agricultural opportunities
- re-vitalizing extension services throughout the country

Lessons from the World Café on the Country Cases

Engagement at the Kigali workshop involved initial plenary presentations of background information by representatives of participating countries based on an earlier agreed format. Participants were assigned to three groups and each member of the group tasked to glean points from the background presentations as follows: Group 1 – context of conflict or crisis, Group 2 – agricultural capacity in conflict, post-conflict and protracted crises, and Group 3 – agricultural capacity development in conflict, post-conflict and protracted crises. At the end of the plenary session, the group members came together and gathered points gleaned from the presentations. During a World Café setting, the issues and dilemma's raised by the groups were further elaborated and discussed.

Insights about the enabling environment for 2PC country agricultural capacity development included:

- leadership and vision
- human resources strategies to be based on what is available (short term), what can be persuaded to return home (medium term) and what can be developed (long term).
- primary emphasis on agriculture or rural development as key primers for inspiring progress from the crisis or conflict situation.

The imperatives for the success of 2PC country agricultural capacity included:

- regional integration and solidarity
- multi-actor and multi-sector platforms
- management and rehabilitation of former combatants/fighters
- political and policy dialogues on the importance of agricultural development as an engine to economic growth.

The following avenues for capacity development in post-conflict and protracted crises were outlined:

- developing an institutional approach to capacity development that encompasses institutional analysis to strengthen both management and technical capacity;
- client-driven approach to capacity development inclusive of farmers and producer organizations;
- improving linkages between agricultural research and education at national, regional and international levels (including NGOs, service providers and other actors);
- competitive selection of regional experts as resource persons to provide on-the-job training, while filling gaps for scientists undergoing training on identified priority areas elsewhere
- promoting local, regional and international innovation platforms around specific products.



The Kigali Movement: towards a joint Capacity Development Support plan

The 45 delegates attending the Kigali Workshop elaborated a number of intended outcome, results and activities. They expressed their individual and possibly institutional commitment to a number of collective actions. This collaborative effort was then dubbed “the Kigali Movement” for agricultural development in post-conflict and protracted crises countries. The outcomes and results are summarized below:

| |
|---|
| <p>Outcome 1: A Consultative Learning Platform for cooperation between “Protracted Crisis Countries” (PCC) in Africa and Asia</p> |
| <p>Result 1.1. A functional Consultative Platform for cooperation between “Protracted Crisis Countries” (PCC) in Africa and Asia</p> |
| <p>National level activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1.1. Development, sharing and implementation of an advocacy plan for research and innovation to be top priorities for Government and Counterparts 1.1.2. Identify and nomination of Nodal person in each participating country 1.1.3. Appraise the concerned Government department/ institution/ Ministry about the platform, and its possible benefits |
| <p>Regional and international cooperation and support is crucial that can be conduit through existing bodies (GFAR, FARA, GIFRAS, CACCARI, APAARI; and CGIAR centers)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1.4. Nodal persons from each country interact electronically 1.1.5. Exchange ideas and explore the potential of the platform 1.1.6. Mutually Identify replicable successes in capacity development, research, increasing production & productivity, nutritional security, increased income, employment generation, and agro-based small scale industries etc. |
| <p>International Level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1.7. The GFAR site can offer a portal page to important links to all other organizations and websites. 1.1.8. A virtual learning group to be set up with e.g. Google Groups. |

| |
|--|
| <p>Outcome 2: Availability of adequate policy frameworks for short-, medium- and long-term capacity development for agricultural innovation</p> |
| <p>Result 2.1. Short term policy that facilitates decentralized deployment of inter-disciplinary teams</p> |
| <p>National activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1.1. Vision paper: importance of concerted inter-disciplinary support to rural communities 2.1.2. Stakeholder analysis, leader identification and stakeholder management strategy 2.1.3. National meeting of concerned ministries and donors, leading to policy doc. |



| |
|---|
| <p>Regional activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1.4. Facilitate inter-country exchange on lobby strategies and tools 2.1.5. Identify “champions” and organize peer counseling between ministers and directors from neighboring countries |
| <p>International activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1.6. Facilitate E-exchange |
| <p>Result 2.2. Medium- and long-term policies available</p> |
| <p>National activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.2.1. Make inventory of available medium- and long-term policy documents 2.2.2. Share with other countries |
| <p>Regional activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1.6. Facilitate E-exchange |
| <p>International activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.2.3. Establish consultants database |

| |
|---|
| <p>Outcome 3: Regional integration of agricultural research & development strategies</p> |
| <p>Result 3.1. National needs assessment for short, medium and long term trainings of policy makers, managers, researchers, extension workers, and farmer’s associations;</p> |
| <p>National activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.1.1. Organize a team to do the needs assessment, 3.1.2. [with support] Identification (questionnaire) and prioritization of needs (December 2012) 3.1.3. [with support] Development of the training plan (March 2013) |
| <p>Regional activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.1.3. [with support] Offer appropriate methodology for Agric. Devt. Cap. Dev. needs assessment in PC/PCC |
| <p>Result 3.2. Bilateral and regional agreements on the cross-border collaboration and exchange of human resources (including students) and infrastructures</p> |
| <p>National activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.2.1. National needs inventory |
| <p>Regional activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.2.2. [with support] Organization of a Regional Market Place 3.2.3. [with support] Identification/recognition regional centers of expertise 3.2.4. [with support] Competitive fund for exchange program |
| <p>Result 3.3. Develop an extension model specific for cross-border pastoral areas</p> |
| <p>National activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.3.1. Preparation of country cases (SWOT basis) |



| |
|--|
| <p>Regional activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.3.2. [with support] Regional Consultative Workshop 3.3.3. [with support] Implement Advocacy and Training plan |
|--|

| |
|---|
| <p>Outcome 4. Support strategy for value chain development and market access in post-conflict settings.</p> |
| <p>Result 4.1. Creation of national innovation platforms (multi actor and multi sector)</p> |
| <p>National activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.1.1. Identification of local value chains 4.1.2. [with support] Organize value chain workshops with all local actors 4.1.3. [with support] Implement value chain improvement plan |
| <p>Regional activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.1.4. [with support] Facilitate exchange and linkage between local value chain actors |
| <p>Result 4.2. Training of value chain advisors</p> |
| <p>National activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.2.1. [with support] Training Value Chain Facilitators |
| <p>Regional activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.2.2. [with support] On demand organization TOT Value Chain Facilitation |
| <p>Result 4.3. Regional exchange aiming at development of regional chains</p> |
| <p>Regional activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.3.1. [with support] Develop database with local value chains |
| <p>International activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.3.2. [with support] Broker between national value chains and international investors |

| |
|--|
| <p>Outcome 5: Availability of sufficient skilled human resources</p> |
| <p>Result 5.1. Capacity of advisory services strengthened</p> |
| <p>National activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5.1.1. Human Capacity Needs assessment: institutional analysis, community, individual levels (short, medium and long-term). Create national and regional HR databases 5.1.2. [with support] Exchange of experiences 5.1.3. [with support] Build capacity of Development agents (extension), with special emphasis on gender issues. 5.1.4. [with support] Building capacity for support staff for research 5.1.5. [with support] Recruitment or researchers / develop targeted postgraduate programs 5.1.6. [with support] Strengthening research and extension skills on livestock |



| |
|---|
| <p>Regional activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5.1.7. Coordinate with Universities and research centers in the region 5.1.8. Building capacity for scientists, with focus on young 5.1.9. Leverage regional capacity for building national capacity 5.1.10. Strengthen post-graduate program; outsourcing within the region. Leveraging regional capacity 5.1.11. Strengthen coordination among extension services |
| <p>Result 5.2. Private sector based agro-dealership system</p> |
| <p>Regional activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5.2.1. [with support] Identify international best practices in PC/PCC 5.2.2. [with support] Develop field manual 5.2.3. [with support] Develop TOT strategy 5.2.4. [with support] Identify private sector sponsors 5.2.5. Implement regional training program |
| <p>Outcome 6. Availability of physical resources (outside the scope of this workshop, but coming up time and again in the discussions)</p> |
| <p>Result 6.1. Inventory of existing physical resources</p> |
| <p>National activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6.1.1. Assessment of needs in terms of physical resources (infrastructure, equipment) 6.1.2. Plan for infrastructure and equipment (based on the assessment) |
| <p>Result 6.2. Organization of a regional market place on a non-profit basis</p> |
| <p>Regional activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6.2.1. [with support] Advise national systems on marketability of their infrastructure 6.2.2. [with support] Fair organization |
| <p>Result 6.3. Set up “closed wallets”/non-monetary accounting system for settling cross border mutual services</p> |
| <p>Regional activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6.3.1. [with support] Hire consultant (NGO STRO?) 6.3.2. [with support] Administration of national accounts |

Closing remarks from GFAR

The Chairman of GFAR, Prof. Monty Jones, summarized that throughout the workshop, country stories highlighted three important things: every crisis is unique and generalization would be very difficult. In addition, crises are complex but the good thing is that all stories have home-made solutions or ingredients leading to



clear solutions. Moreover, there was a sound need to identify visionary leadership to inspire and back up other citizens and put them on the right track, rebuild human and institutional capacity and prioritize rural and agricultural development while harnessing ownership at national level, thus minimizing the fragmentation of received support. Prof. Monty Jones requested the participants to spearhead the changes expected at national level. He concluded that the workshop reached its objectives as each region prepared valuable elements to regional action plan. He promised that the outcome of the workshop will be presented to the coming meetings in Rome and Uruguay where the heads of agricultural organizations will meet donors around one table. He lastly acknowledged the contributions of the many people to the success of the workshop.

Closing remarks by the Rwandan Ministry of Education

The Director General of Science, Technology and Research Dr Marie Christine Gasingirwa hailed the participants for the workshop achievements because they showed a clear ownership that lead to determination and commitment to pull out our countries from crisis and post-conflict situations. She quoted the Rwandan Minister of Agriculture and Animal Resources by saying “if Rwanda was able to make it, others who are still struggling can come out as well”. She urged the participants to put more emphasis on agricultural research and extension while improving service delivery, which would contribute much in farmers’ mobilization. As financial support is highly needed, collaboration at all levels would bring friends and partners on board through regional and global organizations. She closed her speech with hope that the workshop deliberations will help to reduce the number of post-conflict and protracted countries.

Evaluation by the participants

About 18 of participants used the opportunity to give feedback to the organizers through a brief questionnaire. The satisfaction of the participants with the contents of the workshop was 4.4 on a 1 to 5 scale. The mix of different backgrounds of the participants was highly appreciated. Some participants missed the farmer and the private sector perspective. The country presentations were perceived as somewhat “overcrowded” and not always to the point. Some issues were perceived as being too complex considering the number of participants and the available time.

The satisfaction of the participants with the methodology of the workshop was 4.4 on a 1 to 5 scale. The participants remarked that some clarity in the beginning as to the end product might have sped things up. The instructions for the country presentations could have been more precise. Many participants would have liked more time for the breakaway groups. An outing to a successful Rwandan experience was dearly missed.

The satisfaction of the participants with the logistical arrangements was 4.9 on a 1 to 5 scale, which is to be interpreted as a big compliment to the FARA Secretariat, the RAB staff and the interpreters. The satisfaction of



the participants with the facilitator was also 4.9 on a 1 to 5 scale, although some participants remarked that he should have refrained from contents input and stick to his facilitation role.



ANNEXES

GCARD Synthesis Paper

Rebuilding Livelihoods in Post-Conflict and Protracted Crisis Countries: Results of the Kigali Workshop on Strengthening Capacity for Agricultural Innovation

By

Irene Annor-Frempong and Nelson K. Olang'o Ojijo
Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa
Accra, Ghana

Context – the challenges addressed

The Rwanda Workshop, held 6-8 September 2012, focused on strengthening capacity in agricultural innovation in post-conflict and protracted crisis (2PC) countries. It was the first workshop of its kind that attempted to bring participants from 2PC countries around the globe to rally around a common cause. The participants came from 14 countries either emerging from or undergoing recurrent violent conflicts in Africa and Asia: Rwanda, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Congo Brazzaville, Sierra Leone, Burundi, Ethiopia, Uganda, Central African Republic, Chad, Guinea Bissau, Guinea Conakry, Liberia, Afghanistan, and Tajikistan.

Current situations in these countries variously fall somewhere within the continuum of normalcy to conflict or crisis. Some countries like Afghanistan have undergone a succession of conflict, post-conflict and protracted crisis conditions. The causes of conflicts in these countries vary but include historical ethnic animosities, internal political disputes and oppression, international political tensions, inept governance, economic disparities, discriminatory policies towards some groups, and abusive control of resources.

Violent conflicts engender destruction of human life, livelihood support systems, the environment, physical and economic infrastructure, and social fabrics. Large populations – often rural and urban poor - suffer in-country or cross-border displacement into congested camps far removed from their homes. Coping mechanisms under such extreme circumstances principally rely on relief supplies but also involve individual and collective innovations to restore viable livelihoods through re-establishment of institutional frameworks, social contracts, household resilience, and basic economic activities.

In post-conflict situations, sustenance of peace depends on robust economic growth. For vast numbers of rural households, agriculture constitutes the prevalent livelihood base and is a key driver for recovery and overall economic growth. Indeed, for all countries represented in the Rwanda Workshop, agriculture is the predominant contributor to GDP and employs the majority of the population. Thus, investment in agricultural development is the best bet for stimulating aggregate GDP growth, and initial development programming in post-conflict and protracted crises necessarily has to target agriculture. The role of agriculture in the embryonic development of countries emerging from conflict rests on the fact that, on



average, GDP growth originating in the agricultural sector is at least twice as effective in reducing poverty as GDP growth originating from other sectors.

However, a number of factors militate against agricultural reconstruction in post-conflict and protracted crises countries. In addition to asset depletion due to theft and destruction, access to land, water, pasture and forests in post-conflict settings is no longer guaranteed. Clashes of customary and statutory land regimes, loss of historical memory, weak statutory titling, and the destruction of recognized landmarks lead to sustained uncertainty and low motivation to invest in agrarian economic activities.

Further, loss of human life, displacement and rural-urban migration lead to erosion of agricultural knowledge, skills and labor force. Systemic incapacity characterized by dysfunctional organizational structures and market systems, infrastructural damage, and weakened institutional linkages is often collateral to violent conflicts and protracted crises. As a result, communities are without a voice, farmer institutions do not function, service providers are hardly accountable to end-users, the presence of the private sector is weak, and the capacity for marketing and agro-processing is reduced.

Agricultural research and development (AR4D) systems are basic to finding the long-term solutions to the sources and motors of recurrent crises. AR4D in post-conflict and protracted crises countries invariably suffers from poor research infrastructure and financial means, high staff turnover and loss, weak regional and international collaborative research ties, and virtually in-existent intra-country collaboration between research, universities, producer organisations and the private sector.

Nevertheless, the post-conflict environment offers a window of opportunity for re-inventing the agricultural innovation system in view of changing (inter-)national contexts and development agendas. Moreover, in those countries characterized by sustained hostilities between parties to the conflict, agricultural innovation faces the additional challenge of having to contribute to peace building and reconciliation. The emergence of alliances and collective actions across sectors from scientists to farmers, from research to extension and local knowledge, offer new opportunities for finding enduring solutions to crisis and conflict through agricultural innovation.

Issues presented and discussed in the Kigali Workshop

To set the stage, representatives of the participating countries in the Kigali Workshop presented background information based on a common format in an initial plenary session. Participants were assigned to three groups and each member of the group tasked to glean points on crosscutting issues from the plenary presentations as follows: Group 1 – context of conflict or crisis; Group 2 – agricultural capacity in conflict, post-conflict and protracted crises; and Group 3 – agricultural capacity development in conflict, post-conflict and protracted crises. A world café group dynamical model assisted in cross-validating group points summarized below.



Group 1: The contextual issues highlighted included:

- a) leadership and vision;
- b) human resources; and
- c) primary emphasis on agriculture or rural development as key primers for inspiring progress from the crisis or conflict situation.

Group 2: The imperatives identified for agricultural capacity included:

- a) regional integration and solidarity;
- b) multi-actor and multi-sector platforms;
- c) management and rehabilitation of former combatants/fighters; and
- d) political and policy dialogues.

Group 3: The avenues outlined for capacity development in post-conflict and protracted crises included:

- a) developing an institutional approach to capacity development that encompasses institutional analysis to strengthen both management and technical capacity;
- b) client-driven approaches to capacity development inclusive of farmers and producer organizations;
- c) improving linkages between agricultural research and education at national, regional and international levels (including NGOs, service providers and other actors);
- d) competitive enlistment and cross-border mobility of regional experts to provide technical support, on-the-job training and mentorships in research and academic institutes of post-conflict and protracted crisis countries, while filling gaps for scientists from these countries undergoing training on identified priority areas; and
- e) promotion of innovation platforms.

The 45 participants attending the Kigali Workshop then elaborated the next steps to arrive at “intended outcomes” and “commitment to collective actions” by 2014. This collaborative effort was collectively dubbed “The Kigali Movement” for agricultural research for development in post-conflict and protracted crisis countries.

Intended Outcomes of The Kigali Movement by 2014

Outcome 1: A Consultative Learning Platform for cooperation between 2PC countries in Africa and Asia

- Result 1.1. A functional consultative platform for cooperation among 2PC countries established in Africa and Asia

Outcome 2: Availability of adequate policy frameworks for short-, medium- and long-term capacity development for agricultural innovation

- Result 2.1. Short term policy that facilitates decentralized deployment of inter-disciplinary teams elaborated
- Result 2.2. Medium- and long-term policies elaborated

Outcome 3: Regional integration of agricultural research for development strategies

- Result 3.1. National needs assessment for short, medium and long term trainings of policy makers, managers, researchers, extension workers, and farmers’ associations
- Result 3.2. Bilateral and regional agreements on the cross-border collaboration and exchange of human resources (including students) and shared infrastructure



- Result 3.3. Develop an extension model specific to cross-border pastoral areas

Outcome 4. Support strategies for value chain development and market access in post-conflict and protracted crisis settings

- Result 4.1. Creation of national innovation platforms (multi actor and multi sector)
- Result 4.2. Training of value chain advisors
- Result 4.3. Analysis of existing and potential local value chains
- Result 4.4. Regional exchange aiming at development of regional chains

Outcome 5: Availability of sufficient skilled human resources

- Result 5.1. Capacity of scientific and advisory services strengthened
- Result 5.2. Private sector based agro-dealership systems stewarded

Outcome 6. Availability of physical resources

- Result 6.1. Inventory of existing physical resources necessary for effective AR4D
- Result 6.2. Organization of regional market places to stimulate agricultural innovation

Commitments to collective actions in 2012 – 2014 (national, regional and international)

i. With existing resources

1. Establishment of a consultative platform for global cooperation between 2PC countries. This may include preparation of an advocacy plan, identification of nodal persons in each participating countries, online interactions and exchange of ideas on the platform, and setting up of a portal and virtual learning group.
2. Needs assessment for identifying priorities for concerted actions. Activities here may include organizing the team to do the assessment and outline of methodologies.
3. Inventory of physical resource endowments of 2PC countries. Activities here may include inventorying existing physical resources at national level, organization of a regional marketplace on a non-profit basis, setting up “closed wallets” or non-monetary accounting systems for settling cross-border mutual services.

ii. With additional support

1. Establishment of policy frameworks for capacity development. Activities here may include preparation of vision paper; stakeholder analysis; leader identification; stakeholder management strategy; national meeting of donors, ministers and directors from participating countries; identifying champions and lobby strategies and tools
2. Regional integration of agricultural innovation strategies. Activities here may include development of capacity development programs, bilateral agreements on cross-border collaboration and exchange of human resources and pooling of research infrastructure, establishment of regional centres of expertise, establishment of competitive fund for exchange programs; development of extension models for cross-border pastoral communities

iii. With specific large scale programme investment

1. Value chain development strategy and market access in 2PC countries. Activities here may include creation of national innovation platforms (multi-actor and multi-sector), training of value chain advisors, development of regional value chains.



2. Development of skilled human resources. Activities here may entail strengthening the capacity for advisory services at national level, regional coordination of universities and research centres, building capacity of scientists, leveraging regional capacity pools to strengthen national capacities, strengthening post-graduate programs and coordination among extension services
3. Developing private sector agro-dealership systems. Pertinent activities here include identifying best practices, elaboration of field manuals and ToT strategies, identifying private sector sponsors, implementation of regional training programs



Workshop Program

STRENGTHENING CAPACITY FOR AGRICULTURAL INNOVATION IN POST-CONFLICT AND PROTRACTED CRISES COUNTRIES: A CONSULTATIVE LEARNING WORKSHOP

6 – 8 September 2012, Hotel Des Mille Collines, Kigali, Rwanda

WORKSHOP PROGRAM

| DAY/DATE | Time | Activity | |
|------------------------------------|---------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| DAY 1, 6 SEPT. 2012 | 9.00 – 9.30 | Registration | |
| | 9.30 – 10.15 | Opening remarks (Dr. Irene Annor-Frempong, Facilitating): 1. Director General, RAB, RWA 2. Executive Director, ASARECA 3. Executive Director, FARA (& CHAIR, GFAR) 4. Director General for Science, Technology & Research, Ministry of Education, RWA 5. Minister of Agriculture, RWA | |
| | 10.15 – 10.20 | Getting to Know One Another | |
| | 10.20 – 10.45 | Keynote Address by Prof. Monty Jones, Executive Director (FARA) and Chair (GFAR). Tentative title: “Agricultural Development in Conflict and Protracted Crisis Situations: A Capacity Strengthening Perspective” | |
| | 10.45 – 11.00 | COFFEE/TEA BREAK (Group photo, media engagement) | |
| | 11.00 – 11.15 | Are You on Board? (Facilitator, All) | |
| | 11.15 – 11.40 | Introduction to the Workshop Process (Facilitator, Mr. Rob van Poelje) | |
| | 11.40 – 12.30 | Regional Perspectives (SROs, Higher Educational Networks, AFAAS, FAO) | |
| | 12.30 – 13.30 | LUNCH | |
| | 13.30 – 15.30 | Country Stories (Rwanda, Burundi, South Sudan, DRC) | |
| | 15.30 – 16.00 | COFFEE/TEA BREAK | |
| | 16.00 – 17.00 | Country Stories (Afghanistan, Iraq, Tajikistan, Haiti) | |
| | DAY 2, | 9.00 – | Recap of Day 1 and Outline for Day 2 |



| | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| 7 SEPT. 2012 | 9.30 | |
| | 9.30 – | Country Stories (Congo Brazzaville, Guinea Conakry, Guinea Bissau, Sierra Leone) |
| | 10.45 | |
| | 10.45 – | COFFEE/TEA BREAK |
| | 11.00 | |
| | 1.00 – | Country Stories (Liberia, Chad, Central African Republic, Ethiopia) |
| | 12.30 | |
| | 12.30 – | LUNCH |
| | 13.30 | |
| | 13.30 – | Analysis of Country Stories: Core Questions |
| 14.30 | | |
| 14.30 – | World Café: Exploring & Answering the Core questions | |
| 17.00 | | |
| DAY 3, 8 SEPT. 2012 | 9.00 – | Recap of Day 2 and Outline for Day 3 |
| | 9.30 | |
| | 9.30 – | When/What Capacity in PC/PCC? |
| | 10.45 | |
| | 10.45 – | COFFEE/TEA BREAK |
| | 11.00 | |
| | 11.00 – | When/What Capacity Development in PC/PCC? |
| | 12.30 | |
| | 12.30 – | LUNCH BREAK |
| | 13.30 | |
| | 13.30 – | When/What Capacity Development Support? |
| | 15.00 | |
| | 15.00 – | COFFEE/TEA BREAK |
| | 15.15 | |
| | 15.15 – | Formulation of Recommendations |
| | 16.15 | |
| | 16.15 – | Presentation of Recommendations |
| 16.45 | | |
| 16.45 – | Workshop Evaluation (Facilitator) | |
| 17.00 | | |
| 17.00 | Closing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Director, Capacity of Capacity Strengthening, FARA • GFAR • Minister of Education, Rwanda | |



List of participants

Strengthening Capacity for Agricultural Innovation in Post-conflict and Protracted Crises Countries: A Consultative Learning Workshop

KIGALI, 6TH - 8TH SEPTEMBER, 2012

| No. | COUNTRY | INSTITUTION | NAME | Position | E-mail | Address/Telephone |
|-----|-----------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 1 | Ghana | FARA | Prof. Monty Jones | Executive Director | mjones@fara-africa.org | 233 302 772823 |
| 2 | Ghana | FARA | Dr. Irene Annor-Frempong | Director, Capacity Strengthening | ifrempong@fara-africa.org | 233 544 338 278 |
| 3 | Ghana | FARA | Dr. Nelson Ojjo | Capacity Strengthening Programme Officer | nojjo@fara-africa.org | 233 302 772823 |
| 4 | Ghana | FARA | Dr. Aggrey Agumya | Technical Advisor to the Executive Director | aagumya@fara-africa.org | |
| 5 | Ghana | FARA | Ms. Marie Gbolie | Accountant, NSF4 | mgbolie@fara-africa.org | |
| 6 | The Netherlands | PSO | Dr. Rob van Poelje (Facilitator) | Burgzatenstraat 12 - 3813 CJ Amersfoort - The Netherlands | Poelje007@planet.nl | Tel: 31 33 4757146 /31 6 57572769 |
| 7 | Senegal | CORAF | Dr. Sidi Sanyang | Programme Manager Capacity Strengthening & Knowledge Management Programme | sidi.sanyang@coraf.org | 221 33 869 96 18 |
| 8 | Burkina Faso | TEAM-Africa | Prof. Hamidou Boly | Team Africa Coordinator | boly@univ-ouaga.bf ; hamidou.boly@yahoo.fr | 226 20 987758 ; Cell: 226 70 151212 |



| | | | | | | |
|----|----------------|---------|-------------------------|---|--|--|
| 9 | Sierra Leone | SLARI | Dr. Matthew L. S. Gboku | Deputy Director General & Research Coordinator, SLARI | gbokumls@yahoo.co.uk | 232 77755878 /232 78 738433 |
| 10 | Liberia | CARI | Mr. Aaron Marshall | Team Leader, Interim Management CARI, Suakoko, Bong County PMB 3929 Monrovia Liberia | agarway@yahoo.com | Mob. 231 77 37 25 21 /231 649 42 61 |
| 11 | Guinée Bissau | INPA | Marcos Antonio Lopes | Marcos Antonio Lopes Président Instituto Nacional de Presquisa de Agraria (INPA) B.P. 505 - Bissau | inpabis.pesquisa@yahoo.fr | Tél. (245) 660 5550 |
| 12 | Guinée Conakry | | Mr. BEAVOGUI Sékou | Mr. BEAVOGUI Sékou Chercheur à l'Institut de Recherche Agronomique de Guinée (IRAG) Boulevard du Commerce Conakry, BP : 1523, Guinée | beavogueisekou@yahoo.fr | (+224) 62 781 95 82 |
| 13 | Uganda | ASARECA | Dr. Joseph Methu | Head Partnership and Capacity Development, Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern & Central Africa, Plot 5 Mpigi Rd POBox 765 Entebbe, Uganda | j.methu@asareca.org | 254 (722) 765809 / 256414323314 |
| 14 | Uganda | RUFORUM | Prof. Adipala Ekwamu | Regional Coordinator RUFORUM, Plot 151 Garden Hill, Makerere University, P.O. Box 7062, Kampala, Uganda | e.adipala@ruforum.org | 256-772-601875 / 256 (772) 601875 |



| | | | | | | |
|----|----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|--|
| 15 | Uganda | AFAAS | Dr. Silim Nahdy | Executive Director, AFAAS | msnahdy@yahoo.com / msnahdy@afaas-africa.org . | |
| 16 | Kenya | ANAFE | Dr. Aissetou Yayé | Executive Secretary ANAFE, United Nations Avenue, Gigiri I P.O. Box, Nairobi 30677-00100, Kenya | a.yaye@cgiar.org | Cell: 254 729 730688 / 254 20 7224135 / 254 20 7224000 |
| 17 | Botswana | CCARDESA | Dr. Molapong Keoagile | Senior Program Officer - Agricultural Research and Development, SADC Secretariat P/Bag 0095 Gaborone, Botswana | kmolapong@sadc.int | 267 3951863 Cell: 267 71749637 |
| 18 | Ethiopia | Haramaya University | Dr Jemal Yousuf Hassen, | Dr Jemal Yousuf Hassen, Head, Department of Rural Dev't & Agri. Extension, Haramaya University | jemaly2001@yahoo.com | +251(0) 25 55 30 403 (Office) +251 (0) 9 15 76 84 63 (Mobile) |
| 19 | DR Congo | INERA | Prof. Mondjalis- Poto | Direction Général INERA 13 Avenue des Cliniques P.O. Box 2037, Kinshasa 1 D.R. Congo | thomasmondjalis@yahoo.fr | 243-818137967 |
| 20 | Centrafrique Republique | ICRA | Dr. Salomon NAMKOSSERENA | Directeur Général Institut Centrafricain de Recherche agricole (ICRA), B.P. 1762 – Bangui | namkossere2000@yahoo.fr | Tél. 236 61 62 75/ 50 33 12 Cel. 236 05 14 68 /236 77 01 39 30 / 75 05 14 68 |
| 21 | Tchad | ITRAD | Dr. DJONDANG Koye | Directeur Scientifique ITRAD BP 5400 Route de Farcha - N'Djamena - Tchad | djondang_koye@yahoo.fr | 00 235 66 26 83 09 |



| | | | | | | |
|----|-------------|---|----------------------------|--|---|--|
| 22 | Congo | DGRST-CRAL | Mr. BANI Grégoire | Directeur du Centre de Recherche Agronomique de Loudima (CRAL)DGRST - BP 2499 Brazzaville - Congo | craldgrst@yahoo.fr | 00 242 06 668 81 75 |
| 23 | Burundi | ISABU | Ir. Dévotte Nimpangaritse | Executive Director Avenue de la Cathédrale B.P. 795, Bujumbura, Burundi | dписabu2011@yahoo.fr , dedenimp@yahoo.fr | 257-22 227352 / Cell: 257-79 955694 |
| 24 | Italy | GFAR | Dr.Thomas Price | Senior Officer-Agricultural Innovation and SocietyGFAR Secretariat c/o FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153, Roma (Italy) | Thomas.Price@fao.org | |
| 25 | Afghanistan | ICARDA-Afghanistan | Dr. Syed Javed Hasan Rizvi | Country Program Manager, ICARDA; Afghanistan Program | J.RIZVI@CGIAR.ORG | 0093-799216325 (Int. Roaming) 93 - (o) 789440396 |
| 26 | Tajikistan | The Institute of Agricultural Economics | Ms. Tanzila Ergasheva | Head of department of multisectoral economy at the AIC, Institute of Agricultural Economics Republic of Tajikistan. Tajik Academy of Agricultural Science, | ntr29@mail.ru tanzila.e@gmail.com skype ntr29 | 992 37 2355612 Cel: 992 91 9174140 |
| 27 | Burundi | FAOBI | Manirambona Ernest | FAO Representative, Burundi | ernest.manirambona@fao.org | |



| | | | | | | |
|----|--------|---|---------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 28 | Uganda | FAO | Mario Samaja | Senior Emergency and Rehabilitation Coordinator, FAO Uganda, Plot 88, Buganda Rd., Wandegeya, Kampala P.O. Box 521 | mario.samaja@fao.org | 256-41-340324/5, 256-41-349916/7, ext .251 Mobiles 256-712-100286, 256-776-100286 |
| 29 | Rwanda | Minister for Agriculture | Hon. Dr. Agnes Matilde Kalibata | Minister of Agriculture, Government of Rwanda, Kigali, Rwanda | kalibatts@yahoo.co.uk | |
| 30 | Rwanda | The Director General for Science, Technology and Research | Dr Marie-Christine Gasingirwa | Minister of Education, Government of Rwanda, P.O Box 622 Kigali | cgsingirwa@mineduc.gov.rw | |
| 31 | Rwanda | RAB | Dr. Jean Jacques Mbonigaba | Director General, Rwanda Agricultural Board (RAB), Rwanda | mbonjac@yahoo.fr | |
| 32 | Rwanda | RAB | Dr. Daphrose Gahakwa | Dr. Daphrose Gahakwa Deputy Director General, Rwanda Agricultural Board (RAB), Rwanda | daphrose.gahakwa@gmail.com | |
| 33 | Rwanda | RAB | Dr. Vicky Ruganzu (LOC) | ASARECA National Focal Person for Rwanda, 47 Avenue Depute Kamuzinzi B.P. 5016, Kigali, Rwanda | rugavicky@yahoo.fr | 250 788382760 or 788562938 |
| 34 | Rwanda | RAB | Dr. Josaphat Mugabo (LOC) | Dr. Josaphat Mugabo (LOC) Rwanda Agriculture Board B.O box 5016 Kigali | mugabojosa@yahoo.fr | |
| 35 | Rwanda | RAB | Ms. Gloriose Nsengiyumva (LOC) | Ms. Gloriose Nsengiyumva Rwanda Agriculture Board B.O box 5016 Kigali | ngloriose@gmail.com | |



| | | | | | | |
|----|----------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| 36 | Rwanda | RAB | Ms. Gloria Batumuliza (LOC) | Ms. Gloria Batumuliza (LOC) Rwanda Agriculture Board B.O box 5016 Kigali | batagloria@yahoo.com | |
| 37 | Rwanda | RAB | Mr. Bernard Musana Segatagara (LOC) | Mr. Bernard Musana Segatagara Rwanda Agriculture Board B.O box 5016 Kigali | bmusana@yahoo.fr | |
| 38 | | RAB | Mrs Claire Gatayire (LOC) LOC) | Rwanda Agriculture Board (RAB) | clairegatayire@yahoo.fr | |
| 39 | Rwanda | Symposia Consult (East Africa) | Aimable R. Rumongi | Conference Interpreter (AIIC) Managing Director Symposia Consult (East Africa) P.O. Box 5234 Kigali, Rwanda 7, Rue Ntsinda, Nyarutarama Estate | 250- 788-300-380/0788-302-777 250- 788-304-662 arumongi@hotmail.com | |
| 40 | DR Congo | | Ms. Gisele Batembo Faïda | Minister of Agriculture, South Kivu | giselefaïda@yahoo.fr | |
| 41 | DR Congo | | Dr. Patrick Mzee Somora | Minister of Plan, South Kivu | somora71@yahoo.fr | |
| 42 | DR Congo | | Dr. Lievin Chirhalwirwa Mwilarhe | Regional Coordinator of Development Projects, South Kivu | arch2002chiral@yahoo.fr | |