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1. BACKGROUND

The need for farmer-centered education has been recognised particularly in the last decade. Previous agricultural extension systems such as T&V (training and visit) have proven to be insufficient in improving farmers’ livelihoods. Secondly, financial and human resources to support agricultural extension systems have become increasingly inadequate in developing countries like Malawi. Alternative approaches building on the concept of farmer-led extension are therefore being sought. One of such approaches is the Farmer Field Schools (FFS).

Farmer Field Schools (FFS) is an approach that involves farmers in learning through field observations and experimentation. The approach also helps them to build up social capital and re-create agricultural knowledge and skills which enable them to better cope with their own problems. The approach was first practiced in Asia and the main aim was to help farmers tailor Integrated Pest Management (IPM) practices to diverse and dynamic ecological conditions. The approach has been tested and found to be effective in Asia and Latin America.

Despite the fact that FFS approach has been successfully implemented in some African countries, such as Kenya, there is only limited documentations on its success in Malawi. Since FFSs were first introduced in Malawi in the late 1990s, a number of efforts have been made in different parts of the country. The experiences and lessons from these efforts have however not been shared among organisations in the past. There has been no consolidated information to enable understanding on what has been done in the country and what the impacts have been. There also exists confusion as to the understanding of the concepts of FFS by different implementing bodies.

Consequently staff from various sub-sector of the agricultural sectors noted a number of constraints regarding the implementation of FFSs in the country. These constraints included:

- Confusion in the understanding of FFS concepts;
- Limited knowledge sharing on FFS experiences in Malawi;
- Lack of integrated information on FFS;
- Lack of coordination between organisations implementing FFS activities.
The group organised itself into a committee whose main objective was to organise a workshop to various FFS experiences in Malawi. A two-day workshop was therefore organised, and the main objectives of this workshop were to share and document the existing experiences on FFS in Malawi, and to advance initiatives in a more integrated manner.

The members of organising committee were from the following institutions:

- Department of Agricultural Extension Services & Department of Crop Production, Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MoAFS)
- Bunda College, University of Malawi
- WorldVision Malawi

This organising committee obtained some funding pledges for the workshop from The Agricultural Research and Development Programme (ARDEP) at Bunda College, and Food and Agriculture Organisaion (FAO) Malawi. Pledges for additional in-kind contributions were obtained by MoAFS, Midori Yajima and various non-governmental organisations (NGOs).

2. WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

As indicated earlier, there were a series of FFS-related initiatives carried out by different stakeholders in Malawi. However, these attempts did not always follow the FFS principles. It was therefore important to define FFSs under Malawian context, identifying its relevance, strengths weaknesses. Since there is a growing interest in FFS approach by various stakeholders, this workshop was considered to be an important opportunity to discuss future plans and to promote cooperation among the participants in terms of experience and knowledge sharing on FFS.

The objectives of the workshop were therefore:

- To provide an opportunity for participants to share common, accurate and up-to-date understanding of FFS concept;
- To learn about various experiences on FFS in the country as well as in other African countries;
- To discuss relevance and effectiveness of FFS in Malawian context;
- To map a way forward;
- To strengthen cooperation among different stakeholders and organisations.
3. STRUCTURE OF THE WORKSHOP

The workshop was conducted from 24th to 25th April 2007, and participants came from both public and private sector. The participants included members of staff at the Departments of Agricultural Extension Services and Crop Production as well as from all the eight Agricultural Development Divisions (ADDs) in the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security, Staff from Bunda College as well as representatives of the following NGOs.

- WorldVision International
- Concern Universal
- Catholic Relief Services
- Plan International
- OXFAM Malawi
- Emmanuel International
- IDEAA Malawi
- WorldRelief Malawi
- Trustees of Agricultural Production Programme
- Smallholder Coffee Farmers Trust

The workshop was also attended by representatives from two UN agencies operating in Malawi, namely the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and the World Food Programme (WFP). The complete list of participants is provided in annex 2.

The workshop started with some introductory remarks, made by Dr. Masangano who was the master of ceremony and Mr. Kimani of CABI Africa, it was supposed to be followed by an official opening ceremony. Attached to this report is the copy of the opening speech by the Principal Secretary for the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security and aw well as welcoming remarks by the Principal of Bunda College. A number of key note presentations were made and these included: a policy paper by the Director of the Development of Agricultural Extension Services, an overview of FFSs in Malawi which discussed the opportunities and challenges, basic principles of FFS, and the role of FFS in IPM. These key note presentations were followed by presentations on various experiences with FFS in Malawi. These included experiences of FFSs by Ministry of Agriculture staff in Karonga, by Concern Universal as an NGO, and Junior Farmer Field and Life Skills by FAO Malawi, and by Smallholder Coffee Farmers Trust a private farmers agency and by CABI in Eastern and Southern Africa. A detailed workshop programme is attached in the appendix.

On the first day of workshop (April 24 2007), a number of papers were presented followed by questions and discussions (see below).
4. Workshop objectives / expectations by Masangano, & Kimani
Dr. Masangano, who was the master of the ceremony started the workshop by describing its objectives. In his introductory remarks, Dr. Masangano welcomed the participants and informed them that the Principal Secretary who was supposed to officially open the workshop had been called at a short notice for another meeting. He went onto provide a brief background and workshop objectives to the participants. He indicated that:
• The representatives from Departments of Crop Production and Extension department of MoAFS, Bunda College, and WorldVision were involved in the committee to organise this workshop.

• Farmer Field Schools (FFS) is a powerful tool in extension; however, there were major differences in the way various stakeholders had implemented the approach in Malawi.

• The workshop was organised in order to share experiences in the implementation of FFS within Malawi as well as in other countries in Eastern and Southern Africa.

• The workshop was going to look at possibilities for developing a policy framework and its operationalisation as well as funding issues.

• The workshop needed to come up with modalities for developing a guiding document for the implementation of FFS in Malawi.

• Dr. Masangano also commended the presence of Mr. Kimani from CABI in Kenya, a person with vast experience in the FFS in the workshop. He revealed that Mr. Kimani has been involved in development and implementation of FFS in various parts of the world through CABI and Global IPM Facility of FAO.

Dr. Masangano’s remarks were followed by Mr. Kimani’s comments. In his remarks Mr. Kimani pointed out that the FFS approach started in Asia but mainly focusing on monocrop (rice) and its pest management. This is in contrast to the African context where farmers commonly grow many crops on the same piece of land. Hence, the FFS approach in Africa needs to be adapted to these conditions. He is currently involved in coffee stemborer FFS in Mzuzu. He further pointed out that different people have been exposed to different components of FFS, therefore, perceive it differently. He then emphasised the importance to have a common and complete understanding of FFS.

5. Policy framework for FFS by Malindi
Mr. Kimani’s speech was followed by a policy paper by the Department of Extension Services of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security. The paper was presented by Dr. Grace Malindi, the Deputy Director of the Department of Agricultural Extension Services responsible for Agricultural Gender Roles,
Extension Support Services (AGRESS). The major issues that came out of this paper were that:

1. The policy focuses on promoting pluralistic (involvement of various stakeholders), demand-driven and decentralised extension services.

2. Extension is facing various challenges to be addressed, which include:
   (A) Dwindling landholding sizes;
   (B) Declining soil fertility;
   (C) HIV/AIDS pandemic;
   (D) Market liberalisation;
   (E) Decentralisation;
   (F) Democratisation;
   (G) Shrinking public sector resources.

3. For extension to succeed there is a need to set clear guidelines for the many extension service providers to provide quality services, promote equalisation in service provision, improve coordination, promote pluralism among others.

4. The FFS is an appropriate methodology to be used in the ‘model village’ approach, which involves participatory research and development in its three phases of transformation.

5. The current agricultural extension policy provides an enabling environment for farmers to be empowered in decision-making, hence, FFS could easily be implemented because of the existence of this policy.

Additional discussions on the paper were:

1. A lot of maize produced this year. What messages is MoAFS conveying to farmers in terms of marketing?
   (A) Crop storage messages (leaflets) are going out as well as trainings conducted by district teams.

2. On conventional farmer clubs, what is MoAFS doing to develop them further (to be associations)?
   (A) Our agribusiness section is currently facilitating formation of association and cooperatives from farmer clubs.

3. FFS could include various issues affecting farmers’ livelihoods outside pest management or agronomy. As is taking place in other parts of Africa, HIV/AIDS issues could to be addressed in FFS as an important production constraint. The FFS graduates could also access the market as a group. Storage issues too can be
incorporated. A multi-stakeholder approach is recommended in implementation of FFS to expand.

6. Overview of FFS in Malawi: opportunities & challenges by Kayuwe,
The policy paper was followed by a paper on opportunities and challenges of FFS in Malawi and it was presented by Mr. E.N. Kayuwe.

1. History of FFS in Malawi
   (A) In 1997 and 1998, FAO sponsored five Malawians to Zimbabwe and Ghana who went through ToTs in IPM to use in cotton, vegetable-cropping systems.
   (B) Graduates established schools in Malawi with funding from FAO.
   (C) Orientation workshop for policy makers was organised in 1999 followed by establishment of pilot schools in MZADD, LADD, SALIMA ADD, MADD.
   (D) In 2003, ToT was conducted at Kambwili Sele Irrigation Scheme in Salima on 30 extension officers on maize, tomatoes, cabbages, and onions. This training was funded by FAO and SFPDP.

2. Challenges faced: It was noted that ideally two facilitators are required to implement FFS which are backstopped by the core trainers. Although some Salima ToT graduates established their own FFS after the training, very few follow-ups have so far been conducted. This was due to lack of logistical support in terms of finances. There should be increased understanding by middle and higher-level government officials and multisectoral support.

3. Various stakeholders in Malawi have shown interests in FFS. NGOs such as Concern Universal and WorldVision are implementing the approach. Care Malawi is preparing to start theirs too.

4. Conclusion: FFS has been shown as an effective extension approach in Malawi, since it can be adjusted to suit local conditions. Though FFS has not yet received necessary attention in the country, it can speed up the adoption and strengthens research-extension-farmer linkages.

Additional discussions on the paper were:

1. Some people confuse FFS with demonstrations. At the end of the day, it is the farmers who get more confused by the disintegrated messages.
2. The participants felt that the commitment from higher level is sometimes insufficient. Previous experience shows that very few people from higher level came to supervise FFS on the ground. There is need for increased commitment from a higher level.
3. Some of the participants felt that FFSs require intensive financial support for their establishment.
4. There is a need for joint planning by all stakeholders for effective implementation of FFS.

7. Basic principles of FFS by Kanyimbo
The paper on opportunities and challenges of FFSs was followed by a paper on basic principles of FFSs and this paper was presented by Mr. E.M. Kanyimbo of Karonga District. The major issues raised in the paper included:
1. What is FFS:
   (A) A participatory group extension training methodology based on adult non-formal education.
   (B) It takes place in the farmer’s field and it utilises adult learning principles.
   (C) Farmers knowledge is shared in a group.
   (D) The approach advocates understanding of the ecology of agricultural production.
2. The Basic concepts of FFS include:
   (A) Adult non-formal education through experimentation and discovery.
   (B) Technically strong facilitation put farmers through season-long sessions.
   (C) Based on time specific crop phenology through regular meetings
   (D) Group study (with at least 25 farmers with common interests)/ group dynamics
   (E) Identification of specific site required, ownership and preparation of inputs
   (F) Uses of Basic principles of science- involving test and validate
3. FFS provides a learning environment by empowering farmers.
4. It is a process not a goal.
5. The extension worker works him/herself out of a job.
6. Requires at least one follow-up session to be conducted.
7. Participants with high attendance are awarded certificates after a post-test.
Discussions after the paper were on the following issues:

1. FFS differs from ordinary demonstrations (as well as on-farm trial or farmer participatory research) in the sense that it accommodates farmers' views in trials whereas demonstrations focus on recommendations coming from research. FFS approach enables farmers to generate and own technology and innovations. It takes a major perception change whereby practitioners (research, extension) and farmers all learn from the field together. This means that communication model in FFS differ significantly from demonstrations (and on-farm trials and farmer participatory research) as shown below. There is a one-way communication model in (A) representing demonstrations and two-way communication in (B) representing on-farm trials and farmer participatory research, and FFS model (C) where interactive communication and learning process take place.
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2. Communication models
   
   (A) One-way communication model in demonstrations
   
   ![One-way communication model](image)
   
   In this linear system, research is a technology generator, while extension delivers the message; farmers are recipients. Knowledge is generated far away from farmers’ fields and there is very little room for adaptation.

   (B) Two-way communication model in on-farm trials and farmer participatory research
   
   ![Two-way communication model](image)
On-farm trials and farmer participatory research uses an adaptive (on-farm) research, where there are two-way communications between research, extension and farmers. The main role of farmers is to provide land for trials and they do not own the research but for researchers and extensionists to do it. Farmers can express their views in this two-way communication, but the research agenda is driven by research.

(C) Interactive learning model (FFS model)

FFS approach, on the other hand, provides a forum where all stakeholders participate and everybody learns from the group and the field. It facilitates effective interaction between research, extension and farmers. This interaction is more properly represented by Joharri’s window where researchers and extensionist and farmers knowledge can vary from window 1,2,3 and 4. The roles of these researchers, extensionists as well as farmers need to vary according to these four situations.

3. Joharri’s window

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Farmers know We don't know</th>
<th>2. Farmers don't know We know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(we can tap on farmers knowledge)</td>
<td>(we can facilitate a learning process)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Farmers don't know We don't know</td>
<td>4. Farmers know We know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(it is a fertile ground for joint experimentation)</td>
<td>(we can share and see how to scale-up)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experts need to remind themselves that farmers may sometimes have ample
knowledge in situations where the experts may not know as shown in window 1. Although they as experts tend to feel more comfortable when they are seen as a source of knowledge (window 2), this is an appropriate situation for experts to tap knowledge from farmers (window 1). Experts may face the challenge of changing their attitudes and start learning from farmers. This requires practical approach rather than theories and effective facilitation ideally by season-long training of trainers (ToT). There are opportunities. In other situations, farmers don’t know while experts know as shown in window 2. This is where it is more appropriate for the experts to facilitate learning process for farmers. The third situation is where both experts and farmers do not know as depicted in window 3. this is a situation where it is appropriate to conduct joint experimentation. Situations where both the experts and farmers know, as shown in window 4, are appropriate for scaling up of technologies.

4. The use of produce from FFS
   (A) There is need for farmers involved in FFSs to decide in advance for the proceeds of the FFS should be used. For example, some groups in Karonga have decided that the proceeds from their FFS be sold and the money be deposited into the group account.
   (B) It is actually important to pay attention to the intensions and existing interests of the owners of land and crops on the study plot.

5. What happens to the FFS farmers after graduation?
   (A) It is also important to consider what happens to the FFS farmers after their graduation from the FFS.
   (B) Some farmer groups continue working together after graduation, while some others volunteer to become facilitators and start conducting their own FFS, which consequently becomes a direct contribution to the extension services.

6. How far in terms of distance can people travel to the FFS sites? Should they come from one village?
   (A) It is also important to consider the distance people can travel to attend FFS sessions.
   (B) The community needs to decide on the distance but ideally it should be within easy walking distance to reduce absenteeism to attend regular meetings.
(C) Distance is crucial. Experiences from Training and Visit (T&V) extension have shown that it is very difficult to have high attendance when distance is long.

(D) It is also important for the group of farmers in FFS to have common interests. The interests of farmers should be established before starting the FFSs. These interests should be established during the baseline surveys prior to the onset of FFS sessions.

(E) Scaling-up of FFS activities can be conducted in neighbouring localities so as to allow farmers to help each other. This also helps extension staff to provide backstopping to the facilitators.

8. Role of FFS in IPM by Nyirenda
The paper on basic principles of FFS was followed by a paper on the role of FFS in integrated pest management (IPM). This paper was presented by Dr. G.K.C. Nyirenda of Bunda College. The paper raised a number of issues as follows:

1. Crop loss due to pest damages is about 20%, and importance of controlling pests prudently should be better recognised.

2. The IPM technology can be better understood through FFS. With the introduction of FFS, it is expected that the adoption of IPM technologies will be enhanced and the use of insecticides will be improved. The amount of insecticide sprays used in cash crops such as vegetables, particularly hazardous ones, is likely to be reduced. Increased understanding of the role of natural enemies and biological control will help farmers better control the pests. Proper insecticide application and use of protective clothing and protection of the environment will be enhanced.

3. FFS will likely catalyse the identification of type of pests that are candidates for IPM and research will concentrate on these key pests. Importance of use of non-pesticide technique is likely to increase.

4. Collaboration of FFS farmers, extension and research staff will encourage joint planning of research programmes, leading to motivation of the farmers. Participation of farmers depends on the value they place on FFS/IPM, which should include farmers’ ideas

5. To undertake IPM studies there should be proper funding and staffing. Appropriate
funding and commitment from government and donors is a must for FFS and IPM.

6. The success of IPM/FFS on the other hand rests on appropriate government policy. Proper funding is required.

7. The limited success of IPM and FFS is considered to be due to limited expertise, financial resources and lack of government policy in Malawi.

8. The presenter concluded by arguing that:
   (A) FFS/IPM should be encouraged in Malawi through establishment of a proper government policy.
   (B) Dissemination of IPM or integrated crop management (ICM) should be one of the programmes

9. Finally, the presenter emphasised that: the types of pests should be known and IPM developed for pests requiring IPM strategies

The paper generated a number of discussion issues as follows:

1. What is the role of FFS in IPM?
   (A) FFS is one of the tools in IPM. FFS offers basket of options on pest control methods to farmers so they make informed decisions. Moreover, FFS could go beyond IPM as discussed in earlier sessions.

2. What is being done on Wooly whitefly in citrus?
   (B) In response to the presenter indicated that a Bvumbwe research team is working on biological control measures. There is this project but the funding is inadequate to sort out the problem completely.
   (C) It may become necessary to look for external funding finishes when the current project comes to an end. Policy makers, donors and the private sector need to start working towards a more sustainable solution to this problem. Efforts should be made to request funds by involving policy makers and from other donors and/or private companies.

9. Experiences of a Salima ToT graduate: FFS in Karonga District by Kamwendo

The presentation on the role of FFS in IPM was followed by a presentation on experiences by a Salima Training of Trainers (ToT) graduate in Karonga District. This paper was presented by Mrs. N.D. Kamwendo. The paper raised
a number of issues as follows:

1. The background to FFS in Karonga has started after a ToT which was conducted in Salima from August to November in 2003. Salima ToT was facilitated by M.H.L. Sande (Department of Crop Production), A.M. Kamwela (DAES) and J. Phiri (Mrs, DAES). The approach is now widely used across the district.

2. FFS activities are sponsored through cost sharing basis whereby the government provides start-up inputs and stationery, while the ToT funding was covered by FAO and Special Programme for Food Security (SPFS) under International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD).

3. The objectives of the FFS are to equip farmers with knowledge and skills to observe field conditions, take active participation as well as to empower them on relevant decision-making.

4. Crops studied include: Maize, cassava, rice, groundnuts and tomatoes.

5. Special Topics covered are in the FFS include effective group management, leadership skills, conflict management, gross margin analysis and gender and HIV/AIDS mainstreaming.

6. A total of 24 schools have been conducted with 467 graduates (261 women and 206 men) and three farmer facilitators have established their FFSs.

7. Lessons learnt include a high adoption as compared to on-farm demonstrations (OFDs). FFS result in confidence building in farmers and also that farmers are likely to understand the technologies fully. FFSs approach tend to reduce workload on the extension staff. FFS also tends to challenge recommended technologies thereby resulting on more improvements on relevance of such messages.

8. The major challenges to FFS include high dropouts due to failure to adhere to norms and higher expectations to FFS, inadequate support in terms of transport and inputs

9. The presenter also indicated that planned studies for the future are summer tomato production and livestock production.

Discussions after the presentation of the paper generated a number of issues as follows:

1. Workshop participants wanted to know whether any follow-ups have been made on the Salima ToT graduates.

   (A) In response, it was revealed that Salima ToT was financed by FAO under SPFS. After it phased out, MoAFS was constrained on its funding resources to do follow-up & backstopping.
(B) The follow-up and support were very limited or came late if at all, though varied between ADDs. Resources were dependent on donor support which is usually on project basis which was difficult to predict.

(C) It was also revealed that MoAFS had sent out a questionnaire in 2006 to do a general survey on FFS in all ADDs.

2. Workshop participants also wanted to know what the average dropout rate in Karonga has been.

(A) In response, the presenter revealed that it was around ten percent to date.

3. Another question that participants wanted to know was what farmers say about FFS in Karonga.

(A) In response, the presenter said that the farmers appreciated the value of FFS and they observed and make decisions of their own. The difference between demonstration and FFS was clearly recognised.

(B) Farmers became more knowledgeable and proactive. In fact, some post-FFS groups have been sustained by farmers.

4. Participants also wanted to know why is FFS not commonly implemented on the ground in other places: why it is not spreading fast in Malawi.

(A) In response, it was revealed that it was when the concept of FFS was introduced in Malawi, the extension policy was still top-down rather than participatory, hence FFS (being participatory) was not in line with policy at that time.

(B) It was also revealed that in Karonga, when recognised that funding was not coming through, DADO agreed to assist and provide budget for ToT graduates to establish FFS.

(C) It was revealed that in Mzimba, some of FFSs were abandoned because farmers did not understand objectives. Objectives of FFS were not well stated by staff to farmers. Some farmers who started FFS did not continue because FFS involved too much workload.

(D) The participants observed that it has been ten years since FFS approach was introduced in Malawi. They recognised the advantage of FFS but still it was not on the ground. Pilot projects tended to have short life cycles and after a while they were forgotten. The participants noted that there was need to understand what the actual weaknesses are during the group discussions and come up with the way forward. They noted that people should not assume that any good approach would spread automatically without any support to move it forward (wheel bird).
The participants also felt that there was need for policy shift from block or top-down to participatory. We need advocacy document on FFS to guide its implementation in Malawi. They offered to work together with the government on drafting the policy guideline.

10. Experiences of an NGO: Concern Universal by Chizimba
The presentation of a Salima ToT graduate’s experiences in Karonga was followed by another presentation on experiences of an NGO taking the case of Concern Universal (CU) which was presented by Mr. L. Chizimba. In the beginning, the outline of Concern Universal and Dedza Food Security Improvement Project was given. The major issues raised in the presentation were that:

1. FFS was adopted because of low adoption regarding promoted practices, promotion of farmer-led research, exit strategy, while building capacity and empowering farmers, farmer to farmer extension, as a strategy for the collective problem identification, analysis and solving.
2. The initiation of the FFS took place through briefing session to project staff on the FFS concept. A week-long training was conducted for CU and MoAFS staff and the trainer was Mrs. Kamwendo.
3. Up to the time of the workshop, three FFS had been established for the summer season of 2005/06 season, and five schools were running, with a total membership of 111 females and 58 males.
4. The types of studies / trials included plant population, varietal trials (maize), nutrient management trails and maize and beans’ interplanting.
5. The AESA is conducted on a weekly basis and field days as well as radio programs are organised.
6. The presenter indicated that the lessons learnt included that FFS is a strong approach for farmer training and empowerment as well as increased adoption, increased farmers’ confidence especially of farmer facilitators. The approach has a large impact on competence of extension staff and has shown importance of group cohesiveness; It has shown to have impact on group sustainability to solve farming
and other community level problems. The paper also revealed the need for extension workers to clarify the FFS approach to the farmers to avoid raising unrealistic expectations and the need to spell out utilisation of the produce constitution with the farmers;

7. The paper revealed that the major challenges were expensive training of staff, burden on farmers in terms of resources and inputs, misunderstandings amongst farmers on material cost and benefit (inputs) for the FFS and sharing of outputs (produce) from the FFS. There was also high dropout rates mainly due to migration.

8. The presenter indicated that the way forward was to continue supporting field-level FFS activities and to share lessons learnt with other CU programs and stakeholders, as well as to expand FFS to other areas like fish farming, and support training of GoM staff in FFS.

11. Experiences of a Donor Agency: Junior Farmer Field & Life Skills by Kachale

The paper on the experiences of an NGO was followed by a presentation on the experiences of a Donor Agency: Junior Farmer Field and Life Skills (JFFLS) which was presented by Mr. C. Kachale. The paper revealed the following issues:

1. The initiative was developed by FAO in order to help children affected by HIV/AIDS, and that it aimed at improving the children’s agriculture and life skills. It was introduced into Malawi because of the problem of HIV/AIDS.

2. A technical working group was established comprising three UN agencies (FAO, UNICEF, WFP and government ministries (Ministry of Education as the lead ministry, Ministries of Health, Agriculture and Gender), with Bunda College as an observer. The working group provides technical backstopping.

3. JFFLS focuses on children both in and out-of school. Pilot JFFLS were established at primary schools in Ntcheu and Mangochi, with four in each district. The primary schools had set up committees and identified plots. The committees selected team of facilitators.

4. Facilitators for each school included an agricultural extension worker, a teacher, a child protection worker and two community members, who were trained on the implementation skills and they selected the children (vulnerable children in the
community) to participate: twenty boys and twenty girls were in each school.

5. The curricula from other countries were adapted to suit Malawian context. Observatory Learning (OL: substituted for AESA in JFFLS) is conducted.

6. The presenter made a number of observations and problems in implementation.
   (A) Failure to identify personnel from health sector (health surveillance) in JFFLS.
   (B) Conflict of ownership between facilitators and school committees.
   (C) Food is not given to single orphan children due to the policy of WFP.
   (D) Learning is done in the afternoon without any snack. Children learn on empty stomach creating a negative impact on attendance and participation.
   (E) Low attendance during peak agricultural periods due to agricultural activities.
   (F) More girls leave JFFLS because of early marriages.
   (G) Chichewa was agreed as a mode of communication taking into account the composition of the facilitation team.
   (H) Conflicts on what to learn on medicinal plants (some communities want to include some plants which Ministry of Education does not approve).
   (I) Equalising the number of boys and girls pose a challenge where there are more vulnerable girls than boys and vice versa.

7. The presenter also isolated a number of lessons learnt as follows:
   (A) Issues to deal with changes in attitude and mindset of communities, such as gender or children’s rights.
   (B) Avoiding words which can imply discrimination and stigma (orphans, poor).
   (C) Aspiration of children should not be confined to agriculture.
   (D) Create balance between exercising children’s rights and adoption by communities.

12. Experiences of Private Sector: Smallholder Coffee Farmers Trust by Kaunda
The paper on experiences of a Donor Agency was followed by another paper on experiences from the private sector, the case of Smallholder Coffee Farmers Trust, which was presented by Mr. B.B. Kaunda. The presenter raised a number of issues in his presentation as follows:

1. The Smallholder Coffee Farmers Trust (SCFT) is a farmer-managed and controlled organisation dealing with coffee and honey production, processing and marketing. Extension is vital for this
2. The FFS approach was introduced under Coffee White Stem Borer Management Project financed by Common Fund for Commodity (CFC), GoM and Department for International Development (DFID). Grant recipient: International Coffee Organisation, with executing agency of CABI (Kenya and UK). Implementing agencies were MoAFS, Lunyangwa Research Station. Beneficiaries are SCFT and estates in Malawi.

3. The key issues of project components are: new control methods, farmer participatory framework, IPM, environmentally friendly control and cost studies.

4. The reason for selecting FFS was to take advantage of experiential learning cycle.

5. The FFS by SCFT is a school without walls and the coffee field is the primary learning material while the coffee tree is the teacher.

6. The FFSs started in 2004 and by the time of the workshop, they were still ongoing while others had been concluded. The project was for four years and the FFSs were still continuing after the project life.

7. Facilitators were the SCFT and government extension workers, trained through ToT for 5 days, ran by Martin Kimani of CABI, Stephen Nyirenda and Chimmings Chanika of Lunyangwa. The contents of ToT included Coffee agronomy and pest and diseases identification and their control methods.

8. In total 32 schools had been conducted with 400 male and 157 female participants totalling to 557.

9. Farmers were saying that FFS should continue even after project. They understood identification of diseases and pests and their control methods, and proper and informed decisions to spray were made based on scout results.

10. The result of FFS showed farmers’ internalisation of the processes, farmers’ knowledge which was untapped (due to assumption that they know nothing and had to be trained). Farmer involvement in decision-making was found to be very important, farmers get closer to the crop and tend to have better understanding of the agronomic practices.

11. Ten new Field Schools had been started in the year. Farmers agreed that FFS was a good concept and should continue even after the project.

Discussions at the end of the presentation generated a number of issues as follows:

1. The participants felt strongly that the issues of funding need to be looked at during the implementation of FFS.

2. The participants wanted to know why they had to have restrictions on certain
medicinal plants in JFFLS. Why didn’t the implementing agencies include other medicinal plants following community’s interest/wish?

(A) In response, the presenter indicated that they had to follow guidelines from ministry of education on recommended list of medicinal plants to be used in JFFLS. This was because most of the medicinal plants had not been scientifically proven and could possibly be poisonous to the children.

3. The workshop participants wanted to know where the knowledge for JFFLS come from. This was in consideration to the fact that farmers knowledge and skills are being lost, or not being adopted as part of programme. This was more so in the case of traditional medicinal plants.

(A) The presenter responded by saying that on medicinal plant in JFFLS, Ministry of Education was particularly concerned about the impact on the children so it was rather sensitive. On other crops the project was more flexible.

4. The workshop participants wanted to know how the project dealt with discrimination/stigma issues when targeting OVCs in JFFLS?

(A) The presenter responded that discrimination did indeed exist, but the children and community were aware and understood the criteria which was used to select participating children (i.e. vulnerability). This way they felt that they could minimise stigmatisation. This was shown by the fact that other children wanted to join JFFLS as well.

5. Some participants wanted to know what the lifespan of JFFLS was.

(A) The presenter responded by saying that in other countries, JFFLS project run for more than one year. The Malawi project had one-year funding on pilot basis with possible extension & scaling-up.

6. The age range of JFFLS participants

(A) In response, the presenter indicated that the age range for the participants was roughly between 13-19 years.

13. Experiences from East & Southern Africa by Kimani

The paper on the experiences from the private sector was followed by a presentation on experiences from East and Southern Africa by Mr. M. Kimani. The presenter raised a number of issues as follows:
1. FFS is a participatory approach where farmers are given an opportunity to learn and adapt production and pest management practices using participatory discovery learning methods through observations, analysis, discussions and collective decision-making. Even though FFS tend to be treated as extension in Malawi, it is important to note that FFS is different from extension in its strict sense.

2. FFS has been implemented in various parts of the world.

3. It came to Kenya in 1997/8 on pilot basis as part of global IPM Facility of FAO. The objectives were to experiment the methodology and to reduce the amount of pesticides. FFS also started in Tanzania, Uganda, Ethiopia, DR Congo, Cameroon and Cote d’Ivoire. Malawi and Zimbabwe on Coffee Stemborer. Livestock-based FFS is being implemented in Kenya and Uganda.

4. FFS gives everyone chance to practice skills which normal extension may not be able to provide.

5. FFS can be applied in the following areas: Integrated Pest Management, Participatory Action Research, Integrated Production and Pest Management, Seed production and multiplication, Commodities, Soil fertility management, Livestock production, Conservation and sustainable use of agro biodiversity, Conservation of indigenous natural enemies, Market access and many more.

6. FFS was adopted by CABI because of its relevance to its development themes - Knowledge for Development and Commodities

7. The East African Sub-regional Pilot (Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania & Mozambique) Project. objectives include increasing competence of extension systems to provide farmer education that responds effectively to local resources and conditions, to establish a networking capacity for exchange of FFS experiences within and between countries, and to contribute information on the replicability and effectiveness of FFS as an alternative and sustainable extension vehicle.


9. A number of alumni FFS groups have been established between 1999-2002 in the three countries, and most of them are still functional and some evolved to other groups.

10. There are different adaptations of FFS (different models of expansion): Zigzag ToT model, FFS foci model (focusing on selected areas), Farmer facilitated FFS, FFS commercial plots alongside study plots, Self financing FFS, FFS organisational networks up to national level.

11. Self-financing of FFS has become popular in East Africa. Funding has always been problematic everywhere. FFS group opens and keeps a bank account then submits
a grant proposal for running of FFS to donors like IFAD. Extension workers as facilitators will be experts and paid by the grant from farmers. If the facilitators don’t do a satisfactory job, the farmers can either not pay them or even dismiss them.

13. After graduation: farmers often engage in FFS networks, and some of the FFS networks are evolving into business units such as FFS commodity associations e.g. 5 in Uganda—citrus, honey, root crops and oil crops. FFS networks in Kenya and Uganda have a market information service and joint e-mail addresses.

14. Lessons learnt: FFS is an effective method of encouraging communities to validate and adapt technologies to local conditions, improve rural food security and income generation and empower farmers to find solutions to their problems; FFS networks are an effective way of organizing and empowering smallholder farmers with common interests and increase their access to markets.

15. The future of FFS networks is likely to be more for market access for various commodities and commodity chains. FFS will no longer be dependent on donors and organisations but it is community-based enterprise.

Discussions following presentation on the paper brought up a number of issues including:

1. Participants wanted to know how problems of illiteracy among farmers are dealt with in FFS,
   (A) In response, the presenter indicated that FFS uses adult non-formal education principles, which emphasise practical and hands-on experiences. Use of local language and real-life examples should be encouraged. Illiteracy should not be an impediment. Crosscutting issues such as adult literacy, HIV/AIDS, and marketing have been integrated into FFS in Kenya.

2. Participants wanted to know what could be done in Malawi to promote self-financing of FFS?
   (A) The presenter responded by saying that a strategy needs to be developed through brainstorming in the workshop in the way forward session tomorrow.

3. The participants wanted to know what is normally grown in commercial FFS plots.
   (A) The response was that people usually grow what they have learned in the previous FFS sessions.

4. The participants wanted to know how youths are invited to participate in FFS in East Africa.
   (A) The response was that most of FFSs which were running in Kenya and other parts of East Africa were linked to ICT networks which were attracting youths to
access innovative technologies.

(B) He also added that different clusters of people sharing common interest were also willing to join.

5. The presenter also indicated that CABI could help on the following activities:
   (A) Organising study tours
   (B) Writing joint proposals with stakeholders in Malawi
   (C) Curriculum development for educational institutions
   (D) Establishing national networks
   (E) Production of dissemination materials
   (F) Preparation of policy briefs

14. GROUP DISCUSSIONS

The first half of the morning on the second day (25 April 2007) was spent on group work. Following the presentations on the first day, the groups discussed the following issues:

1. Funding issues
2. Documentation of process and policy implications
3. Issues around implementation/ e.g.literacy
4. Sustainability of impact and process of FFS
5. Exit strategy, what happens after graduation
6. Planning on technical content in technology transfer (FFS as not its vehicle) vs facilitation skills in participatory approach
7. Training of trainers and facilitators in relevant skills
8. Group cohesiveness (team building)
9. Stakeholder processes and linkages- networking
10. FFS impact assessment (monitoring and evaluation)
The participants were broken into two groups and conducted SWOT analysis discussed way forward as shown in annexes 3 & 4 for details.

15. GENERAL PLENARY

The groups made presentations in the general plenary and the issues agreed upon were:

1. The workshop decided to establish a steering committee. The Department of Extension Services (DAES) in the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security should be the lead institution. CABI will backstop this national steering committee. The workshop participants recommended that other members to the committee should be:
   (A) Academia: Bunda College & Natural Resources College
   (B) NGOs: (Concern Universal, WorldVision, Plan International, CADECOM, Oxfam, Coffee trust, ActionAid, NASFAM, CISANET), non-governmental individuals (NGIs)
   (C) Private sector
   (D) Farmer representatives. Farmers union of Malawi, etc.
   (E) Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Extension, Crop Production & Agricultural research to appoint relevant research stations)
   (F) International research institutions (CGIAR; CIAT, ICRISAT, IITA/SARRNET, etc)
   (G) Donor community (EU, USAID, FAO, WFP, etc) through the chair of donor coordinating committee.

2. The workshop recommended that the Terms of References for the steering committee be:
   (A) Develop/ draft policy framework;
(B) Development and updating of manual (implementation guideline outlining the pillars FFS in Malawi as 'living document') and curriculum on FFS;
(C) Conduct briefings on FFS at all levels;
(D) Capacity building (training);
(E) Resource mobilisation, proposal development, advocacy work to interested donors;
(F) Enhance collaboration among members & stakeholders;
(G) Establish national network & be part of regional bodies;
(H) Organise annual meetings on progress of action plans;
(I) Conduct follow-up workshops in the future (every 2-3 years) on general progress on FFS related activities.
(J) Provide FFS resource mapping (where to find trained personnel, funding possibilities etc) for stakeholders to access resources on FFS.

3. As a way forward, the workshop organising committee was requested to:
   (A) Meet the Principal Secretary for the Ministry of Agriculture to brief him on the decisions and recommendations followed by the workshop.
   (B) Set-up e-mail network among the participants to continue working together, by which the feedback of meeting with PS will be circulated. Although internet access can be a challenge, it was still considered to be the least expensive means of communication for many participants.

4. Another workshop similar to this one should be held again one year after this workshop.

5. The points listed above have been agreed unanimously by all the participants.

16. CLOSING REMARKS
Closing remarks were made by three people including Mr. E. Mwendo-Phiri representing NGOs, Mr. M.L. Mlotha representing the Department of Agricultural Extension Services, and Dr. C. Masangano on behalf of the main organising committee.

1. Mr. E. Mwendo-Phiri, World Vision Malawi
   
   The achievement of this workshop is to have improved understanding and consensus on FFS in Malawi. Its success is attributed to Mr. Kimani as well as all the participants.

2. Mr. M.L. Mlotha, Department of Extension Services

   It is appreciated that this workshop has helped us recognise FFS as a powerful tool to empower farmers. The key for this approach to succeed in Malawi is collaboration among different sectors and relevant stakeholders through steering committee to be established.

3. Dr. C.M. Masangano, Bunda College, University of Malawi

   Pleased to note that the workshop has been very successful especially thanks to Mr. Kimani and also presenters. We have drawn lots of lessons from what have been presented and the workshop was well attended, which shall be later reported to the PS and will be used in teaching students at the college. Interested and looking forward to follow-up activities by steering committee such as development of manual and policy documents. Will keep on sharing proceedings and outcomes as a steering committee and continue working together as a team.
Annex 1.
Timetable for Workshop: Sharing Farmer Field Schools (FFS) Experiences in Malawi

Venue: Malawi Institute of Management
Dates: April 24 & 25 2007
Facilitators: Dr. C.M. Masangano, Bunda College, Dr. G.K.C. Nyirenda, Bunda College, Mr. M.H.L. Sande, MoA, Mr. Mlotha, DAES, MoA, Mr. Mwendo-Phiri, WorldVision
Moderators: Mr. Martin Kimani, CAB International Africa

Day 1: April 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsible person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>Arrival and registration of participants</td>
<td>Master of ceremony: Dr. Masangano/ Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Brief introductory notes</td>
<td>Prof Kanyama-Phiri, Principal, Bunda College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45</td>
<td>Welcome remarks</td>
<td>Mr. P.H. Kabambe, Principal Secretary, MoAFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:55</td>
<td>Opening speech</td>
<td>Dr. C. M. Masangano, Bunda College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:10</td>
<td>Group photograph &amp; tea/coffee break</td>
<td>Dr. G. Malindi, DAES, MoA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:25</td>
<td>Workshop objectives/ expectations (involving participants)</td>
<td>Mr. E.N. Kayuwe, Mchinji District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:40</td>
<td>Policy framework for FFS</td>
<td>Mr. E.M. Kanyimbo, Karonga District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:10</td>
<td>Overview of FFS in Malawi: opportunities &amp; challenges</td>
<td>Dr. G.K.C. Nyirenda, Bunda College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:25</td>
<td>Basic principles of FFS</td>
<td>Mr. E.N. Kayuwe, Mchinji District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:55</td>
<td>Role of FFS in IPM</td>
<td>Mr. E.M. Kanyimbo, Karonga District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:10</td>
<td>Experiences: Salima ToT graduates</td>
<td>Dr. G. Malindi, DAES, MoA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:35</td>
<td>Experiences: Donor Agencies</td>
<td>Mr. L. Chizimba, Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Lunch break</td>
<td>Mr. B. B. Kaunda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>Experiences: NGOs</td>
<td>Mr. Caesar Kachale: FAO/ WFP/ UNICEF/ UNFPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>Concern Universal Dedza</td>
<td>Mr. L. Chizimba, Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:55</td>
<td>Coffee Farmers Trust</td>
<td>Mr. Caesar Kachale: FAO/ WFP/ UNICEF/ UNFPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:20</td>
<td>Experiences from abroad</td>
<td>Mr. B. B. Kaunda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:50</td>
<td>Experiences from East &amp; Southern Africa</td>
<td>Mr. Caesar Kachale: FAO/ WFP/ UNICEF/ UNFPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30</td>
<td>Tea/coffee break</td>
<td>Mr. Martin Kimani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:45</td>
<td>Group discussion</td>
<td>Moderator: Martin Kimani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:15</td>
<td>Group presentations</td>
<td>Martin Kimani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>Plenary</td>
<td>Martin Kimani and facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:15</td>
<td>Briefing for the programme for the second day</td>
<td>Dr. C. M. Masangano, Bunda College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Responsible person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Re-cap of first day</td>
<td>Mr. Kayuwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Introduction to way forward</td>
<td>Moderators: Mr. Kimani, Dr. Masangano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Discussions on way forward, recommendations &amp; strategies for</td>
<td>Facilitators: Kimani, Masangano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>different perspectives/stakeholders:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>Tea/coffee break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45</td>
<td>Way forward (continued)</td>
<td>Facilitators: Kimani, Masangano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15</td>
<td>Closing remarks</td>
<td>Masangano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>Departure of the participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<td><a href="mailto:kavukuku@yahoo.co.uk">kavukuku@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Patricia Kasenda</td>
<td>AEDO</td>
<td>Thyolo RDP</td>
<td>P.O. Box 22, Thyolo</td>
<td>08 703 230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>M.J. Machera</td>
<td>Videographer</td>
<td>Agriculture Communication Branch</td>
<td>P.O. Box 294, Lilongwe</td>
<td>09 432 767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I.C. Tangwena (Mrs)</td>
<td>AEDO</td>
<td>Thyolo RDP</td>
<td>P.O. Box 22, Thyolo</td>
<td>08 359 120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>M.A. Kasomekera</td>
<td>Training Officer</td>
<td>Ntcheu DAO</td>
<td>P.O. Box 19, Ntcheu</td>
<td>09 310 375/09 816 089</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>J.D.L. Ngwaya</td>
<td>AEDO</td>
<td>Manjawira EPA</td>
<td>P.O. Box 7, Manjawira</td>
<td>09 230 874</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>N.H. Yobe</td>
<td>AEDO</td>
<td>Manjawira EPA</td>
<td>P.O. Box 7, Manjawira</td>
<td>09 380 762</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>B.K. Gondwe</td>
<td>AEDO</td>
<td>Thyolo RDP</td>
<td>P.O. Box 22, Thyolo</td>
<td>09 380 762</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>K. Kamchacha</td>
<td>AEDO</td>
<td>Mvera EPA</td>
<td>P.O. Box 42, Mvera</td>
<td>09 178 044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>J.P. Kawonga</td>
<td>AEDO</td>
<td>Mvera EPA</td>
<td>P.O. Box 42, Mvera</td>
<td>09 497 732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>O.J.S. Kumwenda</td>
<td>Principal Extension Methodology Officer</td>
<td>Mzuzu ADD</td>
<td>P.O. Box 131, Mzuzu</td>
<td>09 409 606</td>
<td>01 332 067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>A.L.F. Benati</td>
<td>CAEO</td>
<td>Shire Valley ADD</td>
<td>P/Bag 1, Ngabu</td>
<td>01 427 253/08 515 009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>L. Ndala</td>
<td>AEDO</td>
<td>Chingale EPA</td>
<td>P.O. Box 287, Zomba</td>
<td>08 560 643</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>S.A. Nkhongoza</td>
<td>Acting AEDC</td>
<td>Chingale EPA</td>
<td>P.O. Box 287, Zomba</td>
<td>09 380 239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Fydess Khundi</td>
<td>Agribusiness Officer</td>
<td>Zomba DADO</td>
<td>P.O. Box 287, Zomba</td>
<td>08 725 792/01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Phone Numbers</td>
<td>Contact Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>S.P.M. Nyirenda</td>
<td>Principal Agricultural Research Scientist</td>
<td>Lunyangwa Research Station</td>
<td>P.O. Box 59, Mzuzu</td>
<td>09 930 322 687 223/01 01 332 961/01 334 017</td>
<td><a href="mailto:snyirenda@yahoo.co.uk">snyirenda@yahoo.co.uk</a>; <a href="mailto:njadada@sdnp.org.mw">njadada@sdnp.org.mw</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>N.E. Cronwell</td>
<td>AEDC</td>
<td>Emfeni EPA,</td>
<td>P.O. Box 63, Mabulabo, Mzimba</td>
<td>08 757 793</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>C.T. Gondwe</td>
<td>AEDO</td>
<td>Emfeni EPA,</td>
<td>P.O. Box 63, Mabulabo, Mzimba</td>
<td>08 607 523</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>K.D. Manda</td>
<td>AEDO</td>
<td>Emfeni EPA,</td>
<td>P.O. Box 63, Mabulabo, Mzimba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>J.J. Mgamba</td>
<td>AEDC</td>
<td>Njuyu EPA,</td>
<td>P.O. Box 70, Kafukule, Mzimba</td>
<td>08 724 672</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>John Nyirenda</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
<td>OXFAM</td>
<td>P.O. Box 182, Mulanje</td>
<td>08 207 879 812 722/08 01 320 902</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jnyirenda@oxfam.org.uk">jnyirenda@oxfam.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>B.B. Kaunda</td>
<td>Operations Director</td>
<td>SCFI, Luwinga</td>
<td>P.O. Box 20133, Luwinga, Mzuzu</td>
<td>01 320 664</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Y. Mkwinda</td>
<td>Project Officer</td>
<td>Emmanuel International</td>
<td>P.O. Box 514, Mangochi</td>
<td>01 594/08 346 213</td>
<td><a href="mailto:liwondee@sdnp.org.mw">liwondee@sdnp.org.mw</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>L. Chizimba</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Concern Universal</td>
<td>P.O. Box 217, Dedza</td>
<td>01 223 025/048 01 223 157</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lovely.chizimba@concern-universal.org">lovely.chizimba@concern-universal.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Norias Kayira (Mrs.)</td>
<td>Senior Agricultural Project Officer</td>
<td>Catholic Relief Services</td>
<td>P/Bag B319, Lilongwe</td>
<td>0 964 479</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nkayira@crsmalawi.org">nkayira@crsmalawi.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>C. Kachale</td>
<td>Project Officer</td>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>P.O. Box 30750, Lilongwe 3</td>
<td>01 773 887 255/08 01 773 263</td>
<td><a href="mailto:caesar.kachale@fao.org">caesar.kachale@fao.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>D. Ndlovu</td>
<td>Programme Assistant, Food Security</td>
<td>World Food Programme</td>
<td>P.O. Box 30571, Lilongwe 3</td>
<td>01 774 306 260 666/08 01 773 785</td>
<td><a href="mailto:duncan.ndlovu@wfp.org">duncan.ndlovu@wfp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>R.V. Mbamba (Mrs.)</td>
<td>Food Security and Sustainable Livelihood Advisor</td>
<td>Plan International Malawi</td>
<td>P.O. Box 2053, Lilongwe</td>
<td>01 770 939 837 699/09</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rosebell.mbamba@plan_international.org">rosebell.mbamba@plan_international.org</a>; <a href="mailto:roseamba2002@yahoo.com">roseamba2002@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Augustine K. Phiri</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>IDEAA Malawi</td>
<td>P.O. Box 40563, Kanengo, Lilongwe 4</td>
<td>09 280 903/08 858 144</td>
<td>01 759 536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Christopher Chibwana</td>
<td>Programmes Coordinator</td>
<td>Trustees of Agricultural Promotion Programme</td>
<td>P/Bag A21, Lilongwe</td>
<td>01 755 553/09 304 663</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chrischibwana@yahoo.co.uk">chrischibwana@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Moses Jemitale</td>
<td>Agriculture Coordinator</td>
<td>World Relief Malawi</td>
<td>P.O. Box 30717, Lilongwe</td>
<td>01 794 166</td>
<td>01 794 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Dr. D. Kambewa</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Bunda College</td>
<td>P.O. Box 219, Lilongwe</td>
<td>08 830 860</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kambewa@sdnp.org.mw">kambewa@sdnp.org.mw</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>C. Chonde (Mrs)</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Bunda College</td>
<td>P.O. Box 219, Lilongwe</td>
<td>09 205 755</td>
<td>01 277 364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 3. Group 1 discussion

**Strengths**

1. Availability of staff
   - Trained or exposed
   - Potential ones
2. High adoption & adaptation rates
3. Farmers are willing to implement FFS
4. Favourable policy environment which accommodates FFS
5. Involvement of public, private sector, civil society and learning institutions
6. Malawi is a member of CABI. We can easily tap expertise/ we can learn from
7. There are structures that are entry points. E.g. model village, irrigation schemes.

#### Way forward/ action plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues/ strengths</th>
<th>What can be done</th>
<th>How</th>
<th>Who (needs revision)</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability of staff</td>
<td>Facilitate establishment of FFS</td>
<td>Site identification</td>
<td>Community &amp; AEDOs??</td>
<td>By June 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained or exposed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposal writing to donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential ones</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporation of FFS into annual work plans and budgets</td>
<td>DADO</td>
<td>By May 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Build capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Training remaining staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide FFS guidelines</td>
<td>DAES</td>
<td>By September 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High adoption &amp; adaptation rates</td>
<td>Increase number of sites</td>
<td>Conduct sensitisation campaigns</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Throughout July 2007 to June 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Field days</td>
<td>AEDO</td>
<td>At all developmental/growth stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use existing structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct sensitisation meetings</td>
<td>AEDO</td>
<td>Throughout July 2007 to June 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Empower communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Train on group development &amp; management</td>
<td>AEDC</td>
<td>Throughout July 2007 to June 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers are willing to implement FFS</td>
<td>Mobilisation</td>
<td>Form groups</td>
<td>AEDO</td>
<td>Throughout July 2007 to June 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favourable policy environment which accommodates FFS</td>
<td>Involvement &amp; commitment of higher-level authorities, senior officers</td>
<td>Joint planning, implementation &amp; evaluation</td>
<td>DAES</td>
<td>Throughout July 2007 to June 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Linking policy to implementation of FFS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of public, private sector, civil society and learning institutions</td>
<td>Strengthen collaboration</td>
<td>Joint planning, implementation &amp; evaluation</td>
<td>Learning institutions</td>
<td>Throughout July 2007 to June 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi is a member of CABI</td>
<td>We can easily tap expertise/ we can learn from</td>
<td>Through regular meetings</td>
<td>DAES</td>
<td>Throughout July 2007 to June 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 4. Group 2 discussion

Weaknesses of FFS implementation in Malawi
1. Inadequate number of well trained staff.
2. Lack of technical backup.
3. Season-long training is not appropriate for some stakeholders.
4. No clear guidelines after graduation in implementation of FFS.
5. No policy guidelines on FFS implementation.
6. Lack of commitment to fund FFS.
7. Lack of funds.
8. Inadequate documentation.
9. No monitoring and evaluation
10. Lack of commitment of facilitators and participants attending FFS and networking

Way forward
1. More staff to be trained in all districts by DAES, NGOs, by June 2008.
2. A national steering committee to be set up to look at implementation of FFS. By DAES August 2007.
3. Explore other options on the facilitators training by Steering Committee by December 2007.
5. A National Steering Committee should formulate policy guidelines by December 2007.
6. FFS activities should be included in the budget.
7. Provide a framework on FFS documentation by Steering Committee by December 2007.
9. A strong commitment by facilitation and participants is required in FFS implementation to introduce incentives.
10. Initiate coordination and networking amongst stakeholders at all levels. By Steering Committee by December 2007.
Annex 5. Presented papers & materials

◆ Opening speech, Mr. P.H. Kabambe, Principal Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MoAFS)

◆ Policy framework for Farmer Field Schools,
  ▪ Paper: C.M. Kanyenda, Department of Agricultural Extension Services (DAES), MoAFS
  ▪ Presentation: Dr. G. Malindi and C.M. Kanyenda, DAES, MoAFS

◆ Overview of Farmer Field Schools (FFS) in Malawi,
  ▪ Paper: A.M. Kamwela, Farm Income Diversification Programme Chitipa and M.H.L. Sande, Crop Production Department, MoAFS
  ▪ Presentation: E.M. Kanyimbo, Karonga District and E.N. Kayuwe, Mchinji District

◆ Basic principles of Farmer Field Schools (FFS)
  ▪ Paper: A.M. Kamwela and M.H.L. Sande
  ▪ Presentation: E.M. Kanyimbo

◆ The Role of Farmer Field Schools (FFS) in the practice and adoption of Integrated Pest Management (IPM) by smallholder farmers in Malawi
  ▪ Paper and presentation: Dr. G.K.C. Nyirenda, Bunda College

◆ Farmer Field Schools: ToT Graduate’s Experience
  ▪ Paper and presentation: N.D. Kamwendo, Hara Water Users Association/Vinthukutu EPA, Karonga District Agricultural Development Office

◆ Farmer Field Schools: a case study for Dedza food security Improvement Project (DFSIP)
  ▪ Presentation: L. Chizimba, Project Manager, Concern Universal Dedza

◆ Junior Farmer Field & Life Skills (JFFLS) in Malawi: Enhancing Food and Nutrition Security for the Most Vulnerable Communities in Malawi through Agriculture and Livelihood Diversification
  ▪ Paper and presentation: C. Kachale, Project Officer, FAO Malawi

◆ Experiences of Farmer Field Schools under Smallholder Coffee Subsector in Malawi
  ▪ Paper: B. B. Kaunda, Smallholder Coffee Farmers Trust (SCFT)
  ▪ Presentation: B. B. Kaunda, SCFT. Chimmings Chanika, Stephen Nyirenda, Lunyangwa Research Station. Martin Kimani, CABI Africa (Nairobi)

◆ Farmer Field Schools in East and Southern Africa
  ▪ Presentation: Martin Kimani, CABI Africa (Nairobi)