



Workshop on Promoting Farmer-led Innovation for Climate-resilient Agriculture in Myanmar's Dry Zone

10-11 December 2015

Mandalay, Myanmar

Workshop Report



Funded by:



Livelihoods and Food Security Trust Fund



Acknowledgements

We thank the European Union and governments of Australia, Denmark, France, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, the United States of America for their kind contributions to improving the livelihoods and food security of rural people in Myanmar. We would also like to thank the Mitsubishi Corporation, as a private sector donor.

Disclaimer

This document is supported with financial assistance from Australia, Denmark, the European Union, France, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, and the Mitsubishi Corporation. The views expressed herein are not to be taken to reflect the official opinion of any of the LIFT donors or the Secretariat of the United Nations.

This report has been issued without formal editing.

Workshop on Promoting Farmer-led Innovation for Climate-resilient Agriculture in Myanmar's Dry Zone

Table of Contents

Topic	Page no.
Executive summary	4
Introduction	5
Workshop objectives and programme	5
Participants and resource persons	6
Discussions and key learning outcomes	6
Conclusion	7
Annexes:	
<i>Annex I: Workshop Programme</i>	8
<i>Annex II: List of Participants</i>	11
<i>Annex III: Workshop Evaluation Summary</i>	13
<i>Annex IV: Workshop Evaluation Form</i>	18

Executive Summary

CAPSA in partnership with the Network Activities Group (a national NGO) and the Department of Rural Development of the Ministry of Livestock, Fisheries and Rural Development of Myanmar (DRD-MLFRD) organized a **'Workshop on Promoting Farmer-led Innovation for Climate-resilient Agriculture'** in Mandalay, Myanmar from 10-11 December 2015. The workshop was part of the capacity building component of the project titled *'An Integrated Rural Economic and Social Development Programme for Livelihoods Improvement in the Dry Zone of Myanmar'* which is funded by the Livelihoods and Food Security Trust Fund (LIFT - <http://www.lift-fund.org>) and aims to support livelihoods improvement and food security in the country's Dry Zone that suffers from a high incidence of poverty.

The objectives of the workshop were to:

- (i) Enable a better understanding of agricultural innovation processes and the importance of farmers' innovation;
- (ii) Provide an understanding of the concept and key approaches for farmer-led innovation for climate resilient agriculture (CRA) in context of the Dry Zone (including gender dimension);
- (iii) Discuss policy priorities and institutional mechanisms for promoting farmer-led innovation for CRA as they relate to the Dry Zone;
- (iv) Share experiences and successful cases on farmer-led innovation for CRA from within Myanmar as well as from the Asia-Pacific region.

Twenty three participants (48% women) attended the event representing technical staff as well as community leaders from a broad cross-section of stakeholders including the Department of Agriculture, Department of Agricultural Research, Department of Agricultural Planning, DRD-MLFRD, Yezin Agricultural University, farmers associations from Mandalay, Magway and Sagaing regions, a seed merchants' chamber, LIFT development partners (NGOs) and the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS).

The workshop was led by qualified International and national experts and was conducted in interactive mode with a significant amount of group exercises which saw active engagement of the participants. To enable knowledge sharing, some participants also presented their own cases and experiences with farmer innovations. Another interesting element of the workshop was a farm visit where participants interacted with farming families and got hands-on exposure to approaches for identifying farmer innovations.

Feedback received from participants in the wrap up session was positive. Ninety five percent of the participants perceived the meeting as excellent (14%) or good (81%), and more than half of them (52.4%) felt that they would be able to use all or most of the knowledge gained through the workshop. Overall, the workshop helped to strengthen the capacities of participants to promote sustainable agriculture and rural development in order to meet the challenges posed by climate change.

Workshop on Promoting Farmer-led Innovation for Climate-resilient Agriculture in Myanmar's Dry Zone

10-11 December, 2015

Workshop Report

I. Introduction

The Dry Zone of Myanmar covers about 13% of the country with a population of approximately 14.5 million people¹. It suffers from high levels of poverty and food insecurity. Agriculture is an important source of livelihood and the key crops include rice (both irrigated and rainfed), pulses (pigeon pea, chickpea) and oil crops (sesame, groundnut, sunflower)². Climate change is among the key threats to the agricultural sector in the Dry Zone. The sector is being increasingly impacted by unfavourable climatic conditions, particularly a combination of periods of low precipitation and unpredictable monsoon rains. The most severely affected are the poor, rural families whose livelihoods and welfare are primarily dependent upon agriculture which is leading to income instability. Climate change is also aggravating the adverse effects of severe land and environmental degradation which implies that farmers have to conduct farming on inherently poor and fragile soils while constrained by low affordability of inputs and limited knowledge of coping strategies. In this context, building the climate resilience of agriculture in the Dry Zone is of critical significance.

For the success of policy and programme interventions to promote climate resilient agriculture, it is important to recognize that farming communities including smallholders embody a vast amount of knowledge and skills. Farmers must be regarded as drivers and active participants in the innovation process instead of as passive recipients of the results of scientific research or technology transfer. Farmer-led innovation - referred to by Prolinnova and the World Bank as the “dynamics of indigenous knowledge i.e., knowledge that grows within a social group, incorporating learning from own experience over generations, but also external knowledge internalized within the local ways of thinking and doing”³ – is key to realizing and scaling-up climate resilient agriculture.

CAPSA in partnership with the Network Activities Group (a national NGO) and the Department of Rural Development of the Ministry of Livestock, Fisheries and Rural Development of Myanmar (DRD-MLFRD) organized a ‘**Workshop on Promoting Farmer-led Innovation for Climate-resilient Agriculture**’ in Mandalay, Myanmar from 10-11 December 2015. The workshop was part of the capacity building component of the project titled ‘*An Integrated Rural Economic and Social Development Programme for Livelihoods Improvement in the Dry Zone of Myanmar*’ which is funded by the Livelihoods and Food Security Trust Fund (LIFT -<http://www.lift-fund.org>) and aims to support livelihoods improvement and food security in the Dry Zone.

II. Workshop objectives and programme

The objectives of the workshop were to:

- i. Enable a better understanding of agricultural innovation processes and the importance of farmers’ innovation;
- ii. Provide an understanding of the concept and key approaches for farmer-led innovation for climate resilient agriculture (CRA) in context of the Dry Zone (including gender dimension);

¹<http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/ena/wfp234780.pdf?iframe>

²http://www.lift-fund.org/sites/lift-fund.org/files/uploads/Dry_Zone/MercyCorps%20DZ%20of%20Myanmar.pdf

³http://wikieducator.org/Farmer_Led_Innovations

- iii. Discuss policy priorities and institutional mechanisms for promoting farmer-led innovation for CRA as they relate to the Dry Zone;
- iv. Share experiences and successful cases on farmer-led innovation for CRA from within Myanmar as well as from the Asia-Pacific region.

The programme comprised of presentations, discussions, a farm visit and group work (the detailed programme is enclosed as **Annex I**). As part of the analytical work of the project, CAPSA is developing a case study on 'Policies, Institutions and Processes to support farmer-led innovation for climate resilient and sustainable agriculture in the Dry Zone of Myanmar' through engagement of a local expert. The results of this case study were also presented during the workshop to complement the learning.

English-Myanmar language translation services were provided during the event. This was a time consuming process which reduced the time available for discussions, but was nonetheless necessary for conduct of the workshop.

III. Participants and resource persons

Twenty three participants attended the event representing technical staff as well as community leaders from a broad cross-section of stakeholders including the Department of Agriculture, Department of Agricultural Research, Department of Agricultural Planning, DRD-MLFRD, Yezin Agricultural University, farmers associations from Mandalay, Magway and Sagaing regions, a seed merchants' chamber, LIFT development partners (NGOs) and the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS). Forty eight percent of the participants (11) were women.

The workshop was led by qualified International and national resource persons as follows:

- (1) Ms. Cheshakala Wettasinha, PROLINNOVA International Secretariat and Advisor, Royal Tropical Institute, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
- (2) Mr. Myo Chit, National consultant for CAPSA for Policies, Institutions and Processes (PIP) case study on Farmer-led Innovation, Yangon, Myanmar.

The list of participants is enclosed as **Annex II**.

IV. Discussions and key learning outcomes

Introduction and project background: The workshop was inaugurated by a representative of DRD-MLFRD. A NAG representative provided an overview of the socio-economic and agricultural context of the Dry Zone, while the CAPSA representative made a presentation about the LIFT-funded project, how the current workshop was contributing to the project, and the objectives of the workshop.

Farmer/local innovation: The concept of farmer/local innovation and its different types were discussed and illustrated through examples from the Asia-Pacific region. The distinction between innovation (as a process) and innovations (as products of the process) was also explained. An overview of the tools for identifying local innovation was provided.

Farmer-led innovation development (Participatory Innovation Development or PID) for climate-resilient agriculture: The distinction between farmer' own research and farmer-led joint research was clarified and the role of multi-stakeholder partnerships was discussed. The iterative cycle of PID was outlined while emphasizing the importance of giving attention to gender in PID. Examples of farmer innovations for climate change adaptation from other countries were also presented along with suggestions on ways to strengthen adaptive capacity.

Key features of Participatory Innovation Development: Three participants from (i) Farmer Association, Magway region, (ii) Adventist Development and Relief Agency or ADRA (an NGO and LIFT Implementing Partner), and (iii) Department of Agricultural Research, made presentations on cases and experiences of farmer innovation from their work. These presentations along with accompanying discussions/Q&A helped the participants to share knowledge amongst themselves and also better relate the concepts being discussed to their own context.

Farm visit: On day 2 of the workshop, a half-day farm visit to Ingel village in Patheingyi Township was organized for the participants. Participants were divided into four groups and each group visited a farm family to obtain information on local research and innovations. The exercise provided hands-on exposure to the participants in identifying farmer innovations.

Supporting farmer-led innovation for climate resilient agriculture: At the end of the farm visit, each group made a presentation to the plenary on their interaction with farm families and the innovations they had identified. Each group received comments and feedback from the other groups as well as the resource persons on their presentation.

Outcomes of case study: The outcomes of the case study on 'Policies, Institutions and Processes to support farmer-led innovation for climate resilient and sustainable agriculture in the Dry Zone of Myanmar' were presented to provide a broader context to the workshop topic. Relevant policies, institutions and processes were identified and analysed along with an assessment of their strengths and weaknesses.

Summary: As part of a free flowing discussion in the Summary session, participants expressed their thoughts on the workshop. The feedback indicated that the workshop was well received. As suggestions for improvement, the participants felt the workshop duration should be longer and that more farmers should be invited to attend.

V. Conclusion

Overall, the workshop emphasized farmer-led innovation as a multi-stakeholder process, with farmers at the centre of that process. It highlighted the need for all stakeholders to work together to achieve desired outcomes and to keep farmer-led innovation in mind in during both the planning as well as execution stages of a project.

The workshop was conducted in interactive mode with a significant amount of group exercises which saw active engagement of the participants. Feedback received from participants in the wrap up session was quite positive. They indicated they had found the workshop useful and received many good ideas (detailed results of the workshop evaluation are enclosed in **Annex III**). Overall, the workshop made a key contribution towards strengthening the capacities of participants to promote sustainable agriculture and rural development in order to meet the challenges posed by climate change.

Annex I: Workshop Programme

Day 1: Thursday, 10 December 2015

TIME	SESSION TITLE	SESSION DESCRIPTION
8.30 – 9.00 am	Registration	- Registration of participants
9.00 – 10.00 am	Session 1: Inaugural session and project background	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inaugural speech, Mr. Myo Naing Aung, Director, Mandalay Region, DRD-MLFRD - Introduction to Dry Zone situation, Dr. Myo Ma Ma Than, Program Officer, NAG - Dry Zone livelihoods project overview and meeting objectives, Mr. Anshuman Varma, Knowledge Management Coordinator, CAPSA-ESCAP - Self-introduction, participant expectations and Ice breaking exercise - Group photo
10.00– 10.20 am	Coffee break	
10.20 am – 12.00 pm	Session 2: Farmer/local innovation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What is farmer/local innovation? What is traditional knowledge? What is the difference? - Farmer innovation: process and products - Types of innovation - Why recognize farmer/local innovation, especially in the context of climate (and other) change - Discussion <p><i>Resource person: Ms. Chesha Wettasinha, Advisor, Royal Tropical Institute, Netherlands, and member, Prolinnova network</i></p>
12.00 – 1.00 pm	Lunch	
1.00 – 2.30 pm	Session 3: Farmer-led innovation development (Participatory Innovation Development) for climate-resilient agriculture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participatory Innovation Development (PID) - Multi-stakeholder partnerships – farmers, extensionists, researchers and other stakeholders working and co-developing innovation - Selecting farmer innovations for further development through PID - Discussion <p><i>Resource person: Ms. Chesha Wettasinha</i></p>
2.30 – 2.50 pm	Coffee break	
2.50 – 5.00 pm	Session 4: Key features of Participatory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation by selected participants on cases/experiences with PID - Discussion

TIME	SESSION TITLE	SESSION DESCRIPTION
	Innovation Development	<p><i>Moderators: Ms. Chesha Wettasinha and Mr. Myo Chit, national expert</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Key features of PID - Joint experimentation based on farmer innovation - Differences between farmers' and researchers' experiments - Design improvements in farmers' experiments - Discussion <p><i>Resource person: Ms. Chesha Wettasinha</i></p>
5.00 – 5.15 pm	Session 5: Wrap up of the Day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Key learning points of the day <p><i>Moderators: CAPSA representative and Ms. Chesha Wettasinha</i></p>

Day 2: Friday, 11 December 2015

TIME	SESSION TITLE	SESSION DESCRIPTION
7.00 am – 12.30 pm	Session 6: Farm visit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Travel to farm site - On-site activities and discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Interacting with farming families o Identifying farmer innovation and short documentation of innovations - Return from farm site
12.30 – 1.30 pm	Lunch	
1.30 – 3.00 pm	Session 7: Supporting farmer-led innovation for climate resilient agriculture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation by participants of examples identified during farm visit - Concrete ways in which these innovations could be supported through PID - Giving attention to gender in identification and development of farmer innovation - Discussion <p><i>Moderator: Ms. Chesha Wettasinha</i></p>
3.00 – 3.20 pm	Coffee break	
3.20 – 4.50 pm	Session 8: Outcomes of study on policies, institutions and processes for farmer-led innovation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Results of study on 'Policies, Institutions and Processes (PIPs) to support farmer-led innovation for climate resilient and sustainable agriculture in the Dry Zone of Myanmar' - Discussion

TIME	SESSION TITLE	SESSION DESCRIPTION
		<i>Resource person: Mr. Myo Chit</i>
4.50 –5.15 pm	Session 9: Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Moderated discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Summary of workshop outcomes o Follow up actions <p><i>Moderators: Mr. Anshuman Varma, Dr. Chesha Wettasinha, Mr. Myo Chit, Dr. Myo Ma Ma Than</i></p>
5.15 – 5.25 pm	Session 10: Closing remarks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Closing remarks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Mr. Anshuman Varma, CAPSA-ESCAP o Mr. Myo Naing Aung, DRD-MLFRD o Mr. Than Tun, UNOPS o Dr. Myo Ma Ma Than, NAG
5.25 – 5.30 pm	Evaluation	- Meeting Evaluation

Annex II: List of Participants

National Participants:

- (1) Mr. Myo; Deputy Director; Department of Rural Development, Mandalay Region, Ministry of Livestock, Fisheries and Rural Development; Mandalay;
- (2) Ms. Khin Thandar Kyaw; Deputy Staff Officer; Department of Rural Development, Mandalay Region, Ministry of Livestock, Fisheries and Rural Development; Mandalay; Tel: 09-444033278.
- (3) Ms. Than Than Htay; Deputy Director, Department of Agriculture, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation; Nay Pyi Taw; Tel: 095 67 410297 / 410522/ 09 250527704 / 09 8302462; Fax: 095 67 410146; Email: than2htay.mas@gmail.com.
- (4) Mr. Kyaw Maung Maung; Staff Officer, Department of Agriculture, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation; Sagaing; Tel: 072-21622, 09-2020106; Fax: 072-21622; Email: kyawmngmg54@gmail.com.
- (5) Dr. (Ms.) Moe Swe Yee; Deputy Staff Officer, Department of Agriculture, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation; Mandalay; Tel: 095278656, 0978950680; Fax: +95277815; Email: moesweyee2007@gmail.com
- (6) Mr. Thein Lwin; District Staff Officer, Magway Region, Department of Agriculture, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation; Magway; Tel: 09 2221128; Fax: 063-26577; Email: theinlwin64@gmail.com.
- (7) Ms. Thida Aung; Township Staff Officer; Department of Agriculture, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation; Patheingyi Township, Mandalay; [Tel:09797203045](tel:09797203045).
- (8) Ms. Aye Aye Thu; Department of Agriculture, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation; Patheingyi Township, Mandalay.
- (9) Ms. Myat Nwe Nwe; Research Officer, Department of Agricultural Research, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation; Nay Pyi Taw; Tel: 09450455189; Fax: 067416554; Email: myatnwenwe62@gmail.com.
- (10) Ms. Hla Hla Win; Research officer, Oilseed Research Farm, Magway, Department of Agricultural Research, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation; Magway; Tel: 09-31965879, 09-797679397.
- (11) Mr. Myint Soe; Farm Manager (Deputy Director), Zaloke Research Farm, Department of Agricultural Research, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation; Monywa, Sagaing Division; Tel: 0943018120, 09787874049; Fax: 07122801; Email: myintsoe53@gmail.com, kyawhtweaung@gmail.com.
- (12) Ms. Khin Mar Oo; Deputy Director, Department of Planning, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation; Nay Pyi Taw; Tel: 067410405 (office), 0933013392 (mobile); Fax: 067410405; Email: Khinmaroo2007@gmail.com.
- (13) Dr. (Mr.) Than Myint Htun; Lecturer, Department of Plant Breeding, Physiology and Ecology, Yezin Agricultural University; Naypyitaw; Tel: +95 09254424460; Email: than12htun@gmail.com.
- (14) Mr. Soe Win Maung; Consultant, Myanmar Pulses, Beans and Sesame Seeds Merchants Association; Lanmadaw, Yangon; Tel: 01-214828/ 09430 15578; Fax: 01-214836; Email: soewmg@gmail.com.
- (15) Ms. Khin Myint Myint; Secretary, Mandalay Farmers Association; Mandalay; Tel: 09-797581676.
- (16) Mr. Aung Soe; Farmer and Village Tract Administer; Myingyan District; Tel: 09-796526557.
- (17) Mr. Myint Shwe; Deputy Chairman, Regional Farmer Development Association, Magway Region; Magway Township; Tel: 09259925101, 09796030539.
- (18) Mr. Sein Than Kyaw; Chairperson, Nathamyay Farmer Association; Ayartaw Township; Sagaing Region; Tel: 09256621795, 09780919896.
- (19) Mr. Aung Bo Bo Htay; Project Manager (SGRIP, Dryzone), ADRA Myanmar; Pakokku; Tel: 09-420320637; Email: aungbobohtay.adra.myanmar@gmail.com.
- (20) Ms. Khin Thuzar Htun; Senior Agronomist; Golden Plain Livelihood Development Services Co-op Ltd.; Insein Township, Yangon; Tel: 09-421043668; Email: admin@gpmyanmar.org.
- (21) Ms. Zin Mar Tun; Project Assistant, CESVI; Yeneyaung; Tel: 09261596414/ 09976981876 /06021254; Email: payncesvi@gmail.com.
- (22) Mr. Win Shwe Maung; Coordinator, ActionAid Myanmar; Bahan Township, Yangon; Tel: 09449250645, 09796278843; Email: Winshwe.Maung@actionaid.org.

United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) staff:

- (23) Mr. Than Tun; Focal officer for UNOPS livestock and agriculture projects; United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS); Yangon; Myanmar; Tel: +95-1-657-657278, 657280~7, 657703~ 4; Email: ThanT@unops.org.

Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) staff:

- (24) Mr. Anshuman Varma; Knowledge Management Coordinator; Centre for Alleviation of Poverty through Sustainable Agriculture (CAPSA), United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP); Bogor; Indonesia; Tel: +62-251-8343277, +62-251-8356813; Email: a.varma@uncapsa.org.

Experts and Consultants:

- (25) Ms. Cheshakala Wettasinha; PROLINNOVA International Secretariat, and Advisor, Royal Tropical Institute; Amsterdam; The Netherlands; Tel: +31205688205; Email: C.Wettasinha@kit.nl.
- (26) Mr. Myo Chit; National consultant for CAPSA for Policies, Institutions and Processes (PIP) case study on Farmer-led Innovation; Yangon; Myanmar; Tel: +9595197919; Email: myo.myo.c@gmail.com.

Network Activities Group (NAG) staff:

- (27) Ms. Myo Ma Ma Than; Program Officer; NAG; Yangon; Myanmar; Tel: +95 18010751, 09254913560; Email: myomamathan3@gmail.com.
- (28) Ms. Khin La Pyaye Win; Knowledge Management and M&E Officer; NAG; Yangon; Myanmar; Tel: 09971402057; Email: lapyaye@gmail.com.
- (29) Ms. Thet Linn Wai; Program Assistant; NAG; Yangon; Myanmar; Tel: 09425290754; Email: thetlinnwai@gmail.com.

Annex III: Workshop Evaluation Summary

Introduction

The workshop was aimed at enabling a better understanding of agricultural innovation processes and the importance of farmers' innovation as well as the concept and key approaches for farmer-led innovation for climate resilient agriculture. Twenty three participants took part in the event, out of which 48% (11) were women. Twenty two participants filled out the workshop evaluation form. They included 8 representatives from government ministries or departments, 4 from international NGOs, 5 from local NGOs, 3 from university/research institutes, and the rest from other organizations. Nine participants (41% of respondents) represented LIFT Implementing Partner organizations.

The workshop evaluation form used for obtaining feedback from participants is enclosed as Annex IV.

Understanding the training content and content coverage

All of the participants (100%) who responded to the corresponding question in the survey confirmed that they had understood all of the workshop content. Furthermore, 85% of the participants felt that the workshop had covered all the areas that they expected to learn about.

Usefulness of the content

Participants were invited to rank the usefulness of the training content and quality of processes and logistics from 'excellent' to 'poor'. Scores were given for each evaluation criteria: poor – 1, fair – 2, good – 3, and excellent – 4. The table below presents the results. In terms of content, participants evaluated each key session. The two sessions which received the highest number of excellent or good ratings were **session 6** - Farm visit on identifying farmer innovation (77%), and **session 2** - Farmer/local innovation (73%). Other sessions which were rated as excellent or good by over half the participants were **session 3** - Farmer-led innovation development (Participatory Innovation Development) for climate-resilient agriculture (64%) and **session 4** - Key features of Participatory Innovation Development (54%). The sessions that received the lowest number of excellent or good ratings were **session 8** - Policies, institutions and processes for farmer-led innovation in Myanmar (45%) and **session 7** - Supporting farmer-led innovation for climate resilient agriculture (47%). The average score for all content was calculated as 2.66 (4 – the highest).

In terms of processes, more than 96% of the participants rated the agenda and flow as excellent or good. For facilitation and feedback, 86% of the participants considered them to be excellent or good. The average score for processes was calculated as 3.2 (4 – the highest).

In terms of logistics, more than 50% of the participants considered them good and more than 20% rated them excellent in all categories except meeting facilities, where only 4% considered it excellent and 60% as good. One participant (4.5% of respondents) rated administrative assistance during the meeting as poor. The average score for logistics was calculated as 3.0 (4 – the highest).

		Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Average Score
Content	Farmer/local innovation (Session 2)	18%	55%	27%	-	2.9
	Farmer-led innovation development (Participatory Innovation Development) for climate-resilient agriculture (Session 3)	14%	50%	36%	-	2.8
	Key features of Participatory Innovation	9%	45%	36%	9%	2.5

Development (Session 4)					
Identifying farmer innovation (Session 6: Farm visit)	23%	54%	9%	14%	2.9
Supporting farmer-led innovation for climate resilient agriculture (Session 7)	14%	33%	43%	10%	2.5
Policies, institutions and processes for farmer-led innovation in Myanmar (Session 8)	5%	40%	45%	10%	2.4

Relevance of new knowledge and ability to use it

All the participants (100%) who responded to the corresponding question felt that the workshop had equipped them with the right knowledge to improve the way they work. In addition, more than half of the participants (52.4%) felt that they would be able to use all (9.5%) or most (42.9%) of the knowledge gained though the workshop.

All (5)	Most of it (4)	About half (3)	A little (2)	Nothing (1)
9.5%	42.9%	47.6%	-	-

The workshop evaluation form asked the participants that rated “all”, “most of it”, or “about half” to list key learnings they obtained the workshop. Some of the learnings mentioned by the participants were:

- Meaning and importance of farmer-led innovation.
- Participatory approach for crop diversity, variety and non-farm income.
- Incorporating the aspect of farmer-led innovation during training on sustainable agriculture.
- Innovation, types of innovation, and the innovation process.
- Importance of collaboration and knowledge sharing between different stakeholders.
- Climate-resilient technique for Agriculture including traditional systems.
- Role of gender.

Changes/improvements to be made as a result of the workshop

Some changes or improvements that participants pointed out they are planning to make in their work as a result of the workshop were:

- “We should adopt the change from traditional to innovative agriculture.”
- “To find out ways to fulfil what farmers need and promote their innovative ideas. We should consider this fact in conducting research as well.”
- Different approaches between traditional and innovative themes for farmer-led research
- To make sure to promote farmer-led innovation activities in project proposals, and to be aware of farmer innovation while implementing projects.
- “Sharing farmer-led innovation with students in Yezin Agricultural University, sharing with other farmers in farmer meetings / orientation.”
- “To work harder to be able to distribute extension services to smallholders as it is very important.”
- To emphasize on agriculture which is compatible with climate change resilience.
- “I would work for promoting climate resilient agriculture in Central Dry Zone.”
- “I would keep learning about farmer-led innovation and share what I learned here with other extension colleague staff.”
- “I would take a supportive role relating to farmer-led innovation as much as I can.”

Whether planning to act as a Trainer

When asked whether participants planned to act as a trainer to train others, 75% of those who responded answered 'Yes' and 25% answered 'No'.

Some of the groups that participants planned to train included:

- Local farmers
- Farmer co-operators and on-farm researchers
- Colleagues
- Local extension staff
- Agricultural staff (eg. those of Department of Fisheries (DoF) and Central Agriculture Research and Training Center (CARTC))
- Agricultural Field Planners
- Youth of Village Development Committees
- University students

Some of the focus areas for the planned training were:

- Farmer-led innovation and farmer's innovation development
- Participatory approaches
- Climate-resilient agriculture
- Making adjustments in agricultural production techniques vis-a-vis natural environmental changes.
- Training of Trainers

Below are some of the comments provided by participants in the workshop evaluation forms:

- "In training for agricultural staff held by DoF eg CARTC, we would apply farmer-led innovation and participatory approach as one of the training contents. And would share this with extension staff as well."
- "I would share training materials and ideas I gained from this workshop with other colleagues."
- "Training to initiate and encourage farmer-led innovation for farmers or farmer organizations."
- "Training on Innovation and cooperation for local farmers."
- "Sharing traditional and innovative farmer-led innovation with youth of Village Development Committee."

Quality of processes and logistics

Participants were invited to rank the quality of processes and logistics from 'excellent' to 'poor'. Scores were given for each evaluation criteria: poor – 1, fair – 2, good – 3, and excellent – 4. The table below presents the results.

In terms of processes, more than 96% of the participants rated the agenda and flow as excellent or good. For facilitation and feedback, 86% of the participants considered them to be excellent or good. The average score for processes was calculated as 3.2 (4 – the highest).

In terms of logistics, more than 50% of the participants considered them good and more than 20% rated them excellent in all categories except meeting facilities, where only 4% considered it excellent and 60% as good. One participant (4.5% of respondents) rated administrative assistance during the meeting as poor. The average score for logistics was calculated as 3.0 (4 – the highest).

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Average
	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Score

Process	Agenda and flow	32%	64%	4%	-	3.3
	Facilitation and feedback	24%	62%	14%	-	3.1
Logistics	Pre-meeting communication	23%	50%	27%	-	3.0
	Meeting facilities	4%	60%	36%	-	2.7
	Accommodation	21%	63%	16%	-	3.1
	Food	23%	63%	14%	-	3.1
	Administrative assistance during the meeting	23%	68%	4.5%	4.5%	3.1

Meeting expectations

For 77% of the participants, the meeting met their expectations to a very large (5%) or large extent (72%). For 23% of the participants, the meeting met their expectations to a moderate extent.

Very large (4)	Large (3)	Moderate (2)	Small (1)
5%	72%	23%	-

Meeting overall

From the workshop evaluation forms received, 95% of the participants perceived the meeting as excellent (14%) or good (81%), while 5% perceived it as fair. Nobody perceived it to be poor.

Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)
14%	81%	5%	-

Aspects to be improved in the future

This section indicates the key areas that can be taken into consideration in the organization of similar events in the future. These areas are based on the suggestions that participants expressed during the evaluation.

Invitations – Eight participants provided suggestions on inviting more participants. In particular they suggested inviting more farmers (particularly farmers who depend on rain-fed agriculture and who grow peanuts, sesame and bean varieties). Some participants also suggested inviting agricultural experts, Union level staff, and more local government representatives.

Duration of the Workshop – Seven participants felt that the duration of the workshop was not long enough, and should be increased.

Content – In terms of content, one participant felt that a greater element of field study would be good for the workshop. Another participant suggested that more group work and games would be effective, while one participant pointed out the need to address new and relevant technologies and ideas for the local agricultural context.

Logistics and Transportation – Some participants felt that logistic arrangements could be done better and improvements were needed. Three participants pointed out issues related to the support provided by organizers for their transportation and accommodation. One participant also identified requirements for preparation by participants as an area of improvement.

Other comments

- "This is a workshop with fantastic purposes and training approach."
- "This workshop ideas are relevant to today's agricultural needs."
- "Great! It is a workshop of participants from different townships."
- "I like this workshop so much because it focused on alleviating poor life of farmers in rural areas."
- "Better than average".
- "Workshop room should be bigger."
- "Other Dry Zone cities or townships should be selected for workshop venue."

Annex IV: Workshop Evaluation Form

Workshop on Promoting Farmer-led Innovation for Climate-resilient Agriculture in Myanmar's Dry Zone

10–11 December 2015, Mandalay, Myanmar

Evaluation Form

1. **Name (optional):** _____

2. **Gender:** Male Female

3. **Organization Type (tick one):**

<input type="checkbox"/>	Government ministry or Department
<input type="checkbox"/>	Non-governmental organization (international)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Non-governmental organization/civil society (local)
<input type="checkbox"/>	University/research institute
<input type="checkbox"/>	International or bilateral organization
<input type="checkbox"/>	Private sector
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (please specify) _____

4. **Is your organization a LIFT Implementing Partner?** Yes No

5. **In which region of Myanmar do you work?** -----

6. **Did you fully understand all workshop content?** Yes No

If not, please specify what elements you did not understand:

7. **After the workshop, how would you rate your knowledge and understanding of:**

	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Average (2)	Weak (1)
Farmer/local innovation (Session 2)				
Farmer-led innovation development (Participatory Innovation Development) for climate-resilient agriculture (Session 3)				
Key features of Participatory Innovation Development (Session 4)				
Identifying farmer innovation (Session 6: Farm visit)				
Supporting farmer-led innovation for climate resilient agriculture (Session 7)				
Policies, institutions and processes for farmer-led innovation in Myanmar (Session 8)				

8. **Has the workshop equipped you with the right knowledge to improve the way you work?**

Yes No

If 'not', why not?

9. Is there an area that you expected to learn about but the workshop did not cover?

Yes No

If 'yes', please specify what area:

10. How much of what you learned (knowledge and skills) will you be able to use in your work?

All (5)	Most of it (4)	About half (3)	A little (2)	Nothing (1)

If you answer "A little" or "Nothing", please give the reasons why:

11. If you answer 'All' or 'Most of it' or 'About Half', please list maximum of THREE learnings.

12. a. What are you going to adopt or change in your daily work and long term work plan as a result of this workshop? If nothing, please respond to question 12b.

12. b. If you are not going to adopt or change anything in your daily work and long term work plan as a result of this workshop, please provide a brief reason:

13. Are you planning to act as a trainer to train others in using any of the new knowledge and skills? Yes

No

If 'yes', please specify who (what target group) you are likely to train and what content (knowledge, skills and practices) you will probably include in the training.

If 'not', why not?

14. How would you rate the usefulness and quality of the meeting in terms of processes and logistics?

		Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)
Process	Agenda and flow				
	Facilitation and feedback				
Logistics	Pre-meeting communication				
	Meeting facilities				
	Accommodation				
	Food				
	Administrative assistance during the meeting				

15. To what extent did the meeting meet your expectations? (*tick box*)

<i>Very large (4)</i>	<i>Large (3)</i>	<i>Moderate (2)</i>	<i>Small (1)</i>

16. How do you rate the meeting overall? (*tick box*)

Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)

17. What aspects of the meeting could be improved in the future?

18. Do you have additional comments on the overall meeting, on what you liked or disliked?

Thank you for your inputs!