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**Background**

This meeting was the third co-ordination meeting for the IFAD TAG 853 project entitled: Enhancing Livelihoods of Poor Livestock Keepers through Increased Use of Fodder. In brief, the project is designed to “Work with partners and farmers, to strengthen the capacity of poor livestock keepers to select and adopt fodder options and access market opportunities to enable them to improve their livelihoods and the sustainability of their farming systems”. Project activities are targeted in three countries: Ethiopia, Syria and Vietnam. The project uses an innovation systems framework and links closely with a sister project funded by DFID in India and Nigeria (DFID Fodder Innovations Project; DFID-FIP). The objectives of the current meeting were to:

- Understand progress and lessons from research conducted to date in each location
- Consider variation across the study countries and sites and identify the main issues limiting fodder innovation in different contexts
- Share experiences on ways of assessing feed scarcity and designing interventions that fit into the system. Discuss progress on feed assessment methods
- Share experiences on how actors have been engaged in the fodder/livestock development process in the three study countries and draw out some lessons on best practice principles for developing multi-stakeholder alliances.
- Discuss plans for 2010 activities.
- Find out what DFID-FIP project has been doing and talk about mechanisms for drawing joint lessons.
- Develop ideas for project outputs including an end of project symposium (possibly jointly with FIP?)
- Agree next steps and time frame

The Meeting Programme is included as an appendix to this report (See Appendix 1) and the various Powerpoint presentations made over the course of the meeting are included as pdf files in this report (with images removed to reduce size).

**Introduction**

Dr Truong Tan Khanh opened the meeting by welcoming participants.

Dr Nguyen Tien Dat made the opening remarks: animal production is a way of making a living for poor smallholders. 80% of the population of Vietnam is involved in agriculture and livestock is a major component. The considerable support for Tay Nguyen University from IFAD and from CIAT over the years was appreciated. Also the chance to host the 3rd Co-ordination meeting will have benefits both in terms of developing ways of helping farmers and will also benefit the University scientifically.
Werner Stür also made some remarks by way of welcome: Co-ordination meetings are a very important opportunity to get the three project countries together and to see how the project fits together and draw some lessons. It represents a good chance to develop joint plans and maximize benefits of having three countries involved. It is good to have the meeting at Tay Nguyen University so that we can see the field sites as well as hearing about what is going on.

Antonio Rota made some remarks on behalf of IFAD: this grant is a good example of allowing research centres to develop innovations and that work for poor livestock keepers. This is not a project for fodder but a project to allow poor communities to enhance their livelihoods. It is good to see poor communities really benefiting from fodder and cattle production. The IFAD IMPP project in Ha Tinh is looking to replicate what is going on in this project to a wider group of people. There are good opportunities for scaling out. There are good interactions between the three project countries. IFAD is interested in what we can learn across countries – what is common, what is different? There is also interest in what principles can be learned for an institution such as IFAD to help in project design.

**Field visit feedback**

Werner made a brief presentation to set some context for the previous day’s field visit

He then led a discussion on the field visit during which the following issues were voiced:

- Bruno: The impact on livelihoods is impressive. Farmer building a new house; sending 3 kids to university.
- Ranjitha: Issue of attribution. Has been an ongoing activity for a while – long term engagement paid off. A 2 or 3 year project doesn’t help. Good to see the impacts on farmer livelihoods. Some work to do on the quality/marketing side. What have we learned from this experience – are there principles that we can extract that would be useful in other contexts?
- Seyoum: Interesting to see livestock as a viable enterprise in coffee growing environment. Farmers quite happy to adopt livestock practices. Some key factors: market opportunities both domestic and export markets. Most farmers using both improved fodder and improved breeds – would it also work with indigenous animals.
• Sawsan: Market prices are reasonably stable – would it work with unstable prices?
• Antonio: Economics of the enterprises are important. Technologies also impressed – e.g. new grass varieties such as Mulato adopted since they are green during a period of feed scarcity. How do we reach the poor? In investment project, how do we involve the poor? Farming groups for applying credit, joint learning? Moving to small ruminants?
• Rod: Long-term engagement is important. Technical and market issues are important. Room to look for different forage species to fill gaps. Challenge to get cow/calf systems to allow them to complement fattening systems. Involving the poor? Non-livestock owning household are growing fodder to sell to cattle owners.
• Bruno: Something that was striking was the dynamism of systems – coffee has dropped and livestock has risen. How do we move with farmers to help them cope? Specialization was interesting. In dealing with access to credit need to tailor to household type to avoid excessive risk.

Output 1 Mechanisms for strengthening and/or establishing multi-stakeholder alliances that can enable scaling up and out of fodder technologies/innovations.

Vietnam

???? presented progress on Output 1 for Vietnam:

Vietnam Output 1

The subsequent discussion covered the following points:

• Rasheed: Interesting to see use of participatory market evaluation and exposure visits etc. But what about sustainability? What capacity is being created at district and provincial level to ensure sustainability?
• Werner: Funding for exchange visits is mainly coming from district. We still initiate though. Still need to work on the sustainability issue.
• Rod Lefroy: Price fluctuation was presented as problem but it can be opportunity – farmers can aim to supply market when price is high.
• Ranjitha: Do district extension staff have the necessary capacity to bring actors together in a strategic way?
• Werner: If project pulls out, capacity is there but is helped by having a research actor involved. Research component is useful but not essential.
• Antonio: You mentioned contract farming. Are there initiatives to organize farmers to remove the need for traders?
• Werner: Gains that can be made are through assured continuous supply rather than through high margins.
• Antonio: Talking about quality, is there any veterinary inspection?
• Khanh: Veterinary support is there at commune and village level. Private vet services well developed.
• Werner: Vet services fall into place when there is market orientation.

Syria

Sawsan presented progress on Output 1 for Syria:

The subsequent discussion covered the following points:

• Ranjitha: You mentioned increase in number of participating households. How were households selected? Which households are participating?
• Sawsan: Poorest and average. 2 groups.
• Bruno: You were working with small numbers of households. What about scaling up?
• Sawsan: Need more time. If there were more time we would get more farmers.
• Antonio: Good to see women involved. How does grant interact with IFAD investment projects? There is a new IFAD project coming in focused on livestock. What can you take from project findings that would help in designing this project?
• Sawsan: Next year, there will be more focus on interaction with investment projects. For new project there should be strong emphasis on livestock market aspects. There should be more emphasis on improved fodder since it is very nascent.
• Antonio: This is surprising given that ICARDA have been there for long time.
• Mui: Stakeholder analysis? Fodder price fluctuation – what about livestock prices?
• Sawsan: Need to study prices of fodder and livestock.
• Seyoum: Does fluctuation in fodder price relate to feed scarcity?
• Sawsan: Yes.
• Ranjitha: What is different here from what has been done before?
• Sawsan: New technologies have been introduced. Farmers very keen. More on-farm activity.

**Ethiopia**

Alan presented progress on Output 1 for Ethiopia:

![Ethiopia Output 1](image)

The subsequent discussion covered the following points:

• Rasheed: who are the actors? How did diagnosis lead on to action?
• Alan: Diagnosis helps to identify issues and as input into stakeholder group discussions.
• Antonio: Talk of x-bred animals. What about potential of local improved animals?
• Alan: Yes, lots of potential for bringing in local improved animals too.

**Update from SLP – Bruno Gerard**

Bruno Gerard presented a brief overview of a forthcoming SLP global study on Trade-offs in Crop Residue Use:

![Bruno overview CR study](image)

**Fodder Film from Ethiopia**

A short film documenting activities at the Ada’a learning site in Ethiopia was shown.

The following points were raised in discussion:

• Werner: who is the audience? Who is it aimed at?
• Alan: Substitute for conventional print media to disseminate project findings.
• Antonio: what about sustainability?
• Alan: Activities are only 18 months old. We need to look to longer time frames for innovation processes to bed in. 6-8 years.

Output 2. **Options for effective delivery systems including innovative communication strategies and on farm interventions to improve fodder supply.**

**Vietnam**

???? presented progress on output 2 for Vietnam

The subsequent discussion covered the following points:

• Antonio: interesting to see income gains from improved systems. What is the agreed poverty line for Vietnam?

**Syria**

Sawsan presented progress on output 2 for Syria:

The subsequent discussion covered the following points:

• Antonio: What was composition of different dairy rations? We saw feed gaps but did you plan strategies for conservation for periods of feed scarcity.
  • Sawsan: Not yet

**Ethiopia**

Alan presented progress on Output 2 for Ethiopia:
The subsequent discussion covered the following points:

Seyoum: did you measure quality? Yes.

**Output 3. Enhanced capacity of project partners to experiment with and use fodder technologies through effective communication, technical information and training in diverse aspects placing fodder interventions in the context of systems of innovation.**

**Vietnam**

???? presented progress on Output 3 for Vietnam:

The subsequent discussion covered the following points:

- Seyoum: how to reach policy makers?
- Werner: By involving them in activities but problems at higher level
- Rod: Could consider use of digital stories? Has advantage of being easily translatable into different languages.

**Syria**

Sawsan presented progress on Output 3 for Syria:

The subsequent discussion covered the following points:

- Ranjitha: What were extension leaflets about?
- Sawsan: Fodder production
• Anh: Not many women
• Sawsan: Project has been actively trying to engage with women.
• Seyoum: Gender balance. In Ethiopia we trained poultry farmers but only men were trained whereas women are the ones who raise chickens. Need to target training at the gender who are involved in the activities.
• Ranjitha: You can’t clearly separate gender roles for different activities. They share responsibilities. We have been training couples. Trainings need to be taken to the site otherwise women will not come. Trainings and bringing trainees together increase HIV transmission – better to take trainings to sites.
• Sawsan: In Syria culturally we can’t train men and women together.

**Ethiopia**

Alan presented progress on Output 3 for Ethiopia:

![Ethiopia Output 3](image)

The subsequent discussion covered the following points:

• Bruno: Innovation and communication – how much driven by project and how much emerging from project partners/actors
• Alan: Still very much project-initiated. Some cost sharing beginning to happen. Vision is for the initiation function to be taken up by others once the actors effectively coalesce.

**Output 4. Generic lessons with wide applicability on innovation processes and systems, communication strategies and partnerships that provide an enabling environment to enhance scaling up and out of fodder innovations**

Alan presented progress on output 4 for all countries:

![Output 4](image)

The subsequent discussion covered the following points:

• Bruno: Policy is a critical element. Is there an expertise gap in the team?
• Alan: The diagnosis activities are addressing some aspects. Communicating to policy makers should be discussed tomorrow. Extract and package lessons.
• Bruno: Channeling info will be country-specific and lobbying. Not a forte of researchers.
• Alan: some experiences from FIP to share. Fodder Round Tables in FAP. Impetus to take it to higher levels.
• Werner: varies with country and production systems. Farmers in Vietnam growing fodder on their own small bits of land. Not much for policy to do. Local level regulations important e.g., regulating grazing. Syria has huge subsidies and policies which have a huge influence on sector development and this is where a national policy analysis becomes critical.
• Alan: Local policies/institutional arrangements are as important as national policies. Very critical in Ethiopia. Happens through local policy initiatives.
• Werner: Marketing side – huge local level regulations on traders – permissions and certification etc to move animals in Laos. Much more relaxed and systematized and easy in Vietnam (one stop shop). Need to identify different types of policy interventions and at different scales and analyse.
• Antonio: what enabling conditions make possible scaling up and out? Which guiding principles would it be possible to extract?

Ranjitha then made a presentation on the ongoing FIP-FAP meta-analysis.

The subsequent discussion covered the following points:

• Bruno: Pro-poor. Are projects addressing the poor? Working in innovations mode, poor tend to get left out. Can’t take risks, don’t have time to sit in meetings. Doesn’t value chain exclude poor people? Context specificity is a problem. If we can’t produce blueprints then it is difficult to produce anything useful.
• Werner: Stakeholder groups are very dynamic. Any diagnosis is snapshot. Don’t need all the actors together – only relevant ones.
• Seyoum: What about transaction costs of the process?
• Ranjitha: Don’t really know how to make innovation pro-poor. Whole issue of who is leading networks needs more attention. Dynamism of stakeholder groups will be addressed. Will look at how stakeholder groups evolve.
• Alan: Maybe pro-poor agenda needs to be built into agenda of stakeholder alliance.
• Seyoum: Innovation happens even in absence of project – should we have control groups?
• Ranjitha: Different approaches e.g. ILRI’s fodder positive deviance study.
• Rod: Once you get into policy environment then pro-poor agenda disappears. Government is interested in improving GDP. Project’s job is to bring poor onto agenda. Is it really true that value chain focus excludes poor?

There then followed some general discussion along the following lines:

• Antonio: Worried about new activities starting now. Year 4 should be about consolidation.
• Alan: need to find ways of monitoring innovation.
• Antonio: Focus should be on farmer who has to make a decision. What can be done to foster enabling environment for farmers to be able to take risk/decision? How can we reduce risk? Pro-poor dimension – agrees with Bruno that value chain approach can exclude the poor. IFAD likes Technical Advisory Notes. New grants have this written in.
• Rod: IFAD seems to want Technical Advisory Note to contain major findings of the project. Not a summary of the project but a specific technology developed by the project that can be useful elsewhere.
• Ranjitha: Are there samples?
• Antonio: Yes. Around 70.
• Bruno: would be good to work with IFAD on production of Technical Advisory Notes.
• Sawsan: Good to get opportunity to see implementation in all 3 countries. Good to see scaling out processes in Vietnam. In Vietnam activities followed on from other ongoing projects. In Syria we were starting from scratch.
• Rod: At inception workshop there were concerns about diversity but realized that there was a lot to learn. Still going on.

**FIP Project – Rasheed Sulaiman**

Rashid gave an update on progress on the Fodder Innovation Project:

![FIP-II](image)

The subsequent discussion covered the following points:

• Bruno: Research questions/hypotheses not clear. More treatments than replicates etc.
• The FIP and FAP projects approach fodder innovation from different perspectives and the results of the two projects should be highly complementary.
• The presentation generated considerable constructive discussion comparing the different approaches and trying to identify commonalities and complementarities.
• Several questions related to the difficulty of drawing lessons from a small number of diverse case studies and develop convincing causal linkages as outcomes are affected by a multitude of institutional and policy factors.
• The FIP project uses a method of describing particular episodes and link these to change as a way of overcoming attribution and causal linkage issues.
• Another part of the discussion was devoted to the difficulties of working with a diverse range of actors and the influence of individuals and their interaction and relationship with other actors (the ‘human’ factor) as opposed to institutional effects. This is an area which may require more in-depth studies.

**Future plans**

**Vietnam**

Werner presented a summary of plans for 2010 for Vietnam:

*Vietnam Future Plans*

The subsequent discussion covered the following points:

• Mui: Should summarise all the outputs of the project for training purposes. 2 types of outputs – farmer extension leaflets, extension leaflet for extension staff.
• Bruno: Good strategy for scaling out at different scales from district to international. Quite a lot of work to do in the last year.
• Rasheed: Communication materials for which audience? Should be aiming at synthesis of lessons for CGIAR level.
• Werner: From impact point of view higher level
• Alan: Need communications at different levels – farm, extension and system (e.g. linking smallholders to markets)

**Syria**

Sawsan presented a summary of plans for 2010 for Syria:
Syria future plans

The subsequent discussion covered the following points:

- Bruno: many activities are mid-project type. What will the project produce that will be useful for IFAD investment projects. On-farm demonstrations in last year are unwise. Need some slick documents on synthesis of project lessons.
- Ranjitha agrees. Need to focus
- Werner: emphasis on women is interesting
- Alan: could use some consultancy to strengthen social science angle to diagnose the Syrian context.

Ethiopia

Alan presented a summary of plans for 2010 for Ethiopia:

The subsequent discussion covered the following points:

- Bruno: Exit strategy not yet strong. 2nd phase to consolidate? More specific plans for exiting?
- Alan: Need longer time frame for innovation processes to bed in.
- Bruno: Expectations of people on ground?
- Alan: Expectations being managed and involved actors aware that project will finish.
- Werner: Series of projects in Ea Kar, with some gaps. Commitment to sites. Might not need a lot of funds, we should find some ways to continue engagement..
- Alan: Capacity being built, behavioural change – term in Amharic now for “stakeholder platform”
- Ranjitha: Resurvey for impact assessment – towards end of project, livestock market studies in IPMS?
- Bruno: Usually no resurveys after collecting baseline.
- Seyoum: Need a phase 2 project. Ethiopian Government interested in documenting good practices in all livestock systems and has a strategy for scaling out in 2010 and beyond and they are interested in investing. However, the government needs inputs from CG and donors.
• Seyoum: In Oct 2010, Ethiopia will host an African Association for Animal Science Conference. Will invite contributions on innovation and impact, not just on technical aspects. An opportunity for project to share findings.

Having missed the field visit because of travel delays, Antonio had an impromptu field visit on Day 3 of the workshop – he gave some feedback to participants:

• Excited with what he saw.
• There is a model identified (innovation and trader involvement). If we give money to farmers, there is a risk of loan being diverted. Traders play an important role- source animal, give to farmer who after 3 months brings back the fattened animal and gets paid by the weight. What happens if the animal dies – well defined contract. First month – trader is responsible and checks intensively, vaccinate. After 2nd month- farmer is responsible. This needs to be upscaled.
• Challenges too - Illegal importation of animals from Cambodia and Thailand. Larger sized, but not preferred by farmers. Could small ruminants, rabbit be included? Enormous potential exists.
• Traders need larger capital to expand operations – However, limit on loans by commercial bank – need collateral. Approach Social Bank and amount is limited. Maybe a loan project by IFAD.
• Could the effort be more inclusive and include other species?
• What are they key elements that make this a successful initiative? How can we replicate this in other countries with a similar context and situation? A possible project/grant to continue the research.
• Alan: outcome of a process and scaling out the process is a challenge. Transferring technical aspects might not result in successful scaling out. Identifying essential elements and how to scale it out would be important.

Planning project outputs

We split into 3 breakout groups to brainstorm on a strategy for delivering some useful outputs from the project. The following table summarises the outcome of the subsequent plenary discussion:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Communication tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross-country/International</td>
<td>Development agencies, research, donors</td>
<td>FEAST</td>
<td>Web-based and CDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Generic lessons about livestock innovation processes and implications for upscaling – country cases and synthesis</td>
<td>International Conference/Symposium (with FIP?) – publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FIP-FAP</td>
<td>Popular articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>External projects</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Local Farmers</td>
<td>Awareness creation about drought resistant forage varieties</td>
<td>Leaflets, field days, trainings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extension agents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Extension system</td>
<td>Lessons learnt in involving women in dairy and milk processing</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IFAD livestock investment project</td>
<td>Lessons on process</td>
<td>Engaging through co-learning??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Local Farmers, Development Agents</td>
<td>Technical aspects of fodder and seed production</td>
<td>Training material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woreda/Zone Extension experts, BoARD</td>
<td>Rapid market appraisal</td>
<td>Training material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical aspects of fodder and seed production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IS approaches, processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National MoARD, EIAR, NGOs, other development agencies and donors</td>
<td>IS approaches, processes</td>
<td>Films, visual presentations, stakeholder field days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Co-learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Local Farmers, farmer clubs, extension agents</td>
<td>Technical notes on forage production, cattle fattening, cattle feeding</td>
<td>Leaflets, short videos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extension Decision makers</td>
<td>Organising a Village Learning Activity</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Livestock sector development using the multi-stakeholder approaches</td>
<td>Brainstorming with stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Researchers and Policy makers</td>
<td>Contract farming model – principles for upscaling</td>
<td>Policy briefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overcoming capital and credit constraints for promoting beef production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Donor</td>
<td>Contract farming model – principles for upscaling</td>
<td>IFAD Technical Advisory Notes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The final session was in plenary where we agreed a number of potential outputs from the project mainly in the form of Technical Advisory Notes. The following (incomplete) list was agreed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Advisory notes</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process of upscaling fodder development - Vietnam case</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>By 15 days before end of project workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smallholder fattening cattle in Vietnam – mix of process and technology</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>By 15 days before end of project workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit through traders – how to involve the poorest in fodder development</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>By 15 days before end of project workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of upscaling fodder development - experiences for 3 countries</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>By 15 days before end of project workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fodder development as an entry point for livestock value chain development</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>By 15 days before end of project workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drought resistant forages – Syria</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>By 15 days before end of project workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing an enabling environment for smallholder dairy - experiences in Ethiopia</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>By 15 days before end of project workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of upscaling fodder development - Syria case</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>By 15 days before end of project workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of upscaling fodder development - Ethiopia case</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>By 15 days before end of project workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to involve women in livestock development activities – a case study from Syria</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>By 15 days before end of project workshop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other outputs:

- FEAST
  - Alan
- RMA - livestock and fodder
  - Consultant to write
- From Vietnam?
- From Syria?

End of project symposium
- with FIP and others
Conclusion

The meeting concluded with a few words of thanks to hosts and participants from Alan Duncan.
Appendix 1 – Meeting Programme

Programme

Day 1  Tuesday 17 November

0700  Field visit to Ea Kar district
Ea Kar is one of the pilot learning sites of FAP; the district is located 52 km from Buon Ma Thuot City and it will take us 1.5 hours to reach the project site. There are more than 2500 smallholder farmers planting forages for their cattle employing different production systems in Ea Kar district. We will visit some of these farmers in 2 communes of the district.
Pickup for the field visit will be at 07.00 from the hotel.
- In the morning, we will visit several farmers who use forage-based cattle fattening cattle systems in Ea Mut commune.
- Lunch will be arranged in the district town
- In the afternoon, we will visit farmers who use planted forages for breeding cattle in Ea Dar commune.

Day 2  Wednesday 18 November

**Session 1. Welcome, introductions**
Chair: Truong Tan Khanh
0830  Welcome address: Dr. Nguyen Tien Dat, Vice Rector of TNU
0845  Opening remarks: Werner Stür CIAT
0900  Update from IFAD with opportunity for questions Antonio Rota
0915  Introduction of participants

**Session 2. Background, context and objectives**
Chair: Nguyen Thi Mui
0930  Objectives of the meeting and briefing on desired outcomes (things to think about during presentations) Alan Duncan
0945  Brief overview of project for uninitiated Alan Duncan
1000  Group photo and coffee break

**Session 3. Output 1: Mechanisms for strengthening and/or establishing multi-stakeholder alliances that enable scaling up and out of fodder technologies**
Chair: Rasheed Sulaiman
1030  Country presentation – Vietnam Werner Stur
Discussion
1050  Country presentation – Syria Mohammed Abdullah/Sawsan Hassan
Discussion
1110  Country presentation – Ethiopia Alan Duncan
Discussion
1130  Summing up and final discussion
1200  Update from SLP with opportunity for questions Bruno Gerard
1215  Lunch
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Session 4 Output 2 Options for effective delivery systems including innovative communication strategies and on farm interventions to improve fodder supply
Chair – Seyoum Bediye
1315 Country presentation – Vietnam Werner Stur
Discussion
1335 Country presentation – Syria Mohammad Abdullah/Sawsan Hassan
Discussion
1355 Country presentation – Ethiopia Alan Duncan
Discussion
1415 Summing up and final discussion

Session 5 Output 3. Enhanced capacity of project partners to experiment with and use fodder innovations through effective communication, technical information and training in diverse aspects placing fodder interventions in the context of systems of innovation.
Chair – Mohammad Abdullah
1430 Country presentation – Vietnam Nguyen Thi Mui
Discussion
1450 Country presentation – Syria Sawsan Hassan
Discussion
1510 Country presentation – Ethiopia Alan Duncan
Discussion
1530 Summing up and final discussion
1545 Tea/coffee

Session 6 Output 4. Generic lessons with wide applicability on innovation processes and systems, communication strategies and partnerships that provide an enabling environment to enhance scaling up and out of fodder innovations.
Chair – Ranjitha Puskur
1600 Cross-country presentation – Alan Duncan
1630 Final discussion
1700 Close
1900 Workshop Dinner
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Participants list

- Alan Duncan – ILRI-Ethiopia
- Seyoum Bediye - EIAR, Ethiopia
- Antonio Rota – IFAD Rome
- Mohammed Abdullah – MAAR Syria
- Sawsan Hussain – ICARDA Syria
- Bruno Gerard - SLP
- Werner Stür – CIAT SE Asia
- Rod Lefroy – CIAT Regional Coordinator
- Nguyen Thi Mui – NIAH Vietnam
- Nguyen Ngoc Anh – NIAH Vietnam
- Truong Tan Khanh – TNU Vietnam
- Rasheed Sulaiman (FIP India)
- Ranjitha Puskur - ILRI Ethiopia
- Others? Werner.