

Workshop Proceeding on

Experience Sharing and Research Validation Workshop on Development Agents' (DAs') Effectiveness on Technology Dissemination#



26 Sep, 2011

Hawasa, Ethiopia



Food Security Forum Experience Sharing and Research Validation Workshop on Development Agents' (DA's) Effectiveness on Technology Dissemination

Date: 26 September, 2011

Venue: - Central Hotel, Hawassa, Ethiopia

Participants: -List attached

Time started: - 8:30 A.M

After the registration of the participants of the workshop, Ato Dawit Belete, the organizer of the program from CCRDA, ActionAid's local partner, welcomed the participants and announced the program.

By the facilitation of Ato Dawit, Ato Aynadis Zeru the representative from Early Warning Response and Food Security Work Process made a short speech on the importance of the workshop and he officially opened it.



Pic.1. Ato Aynadis Zeru opening the workshop.



Then Dr.Yibrah Beyene, Dean of Hawassa College of Agriculture, thanked all the participants and allowed them to introduce themselves. And the introduction of the participants proceeded with presentations.



Pic.2. Dr.Yibrah Beyene introducing participants each other.

Presentation on:-

Effectiveness of DA's Performance in Agricultural Technology Dissemination: the case of Southern Nation Nationalities and Peoples Regional State (SNNPRS), Ethiopia

**By: - Ato Kinfe Asayehegn,
Ato Gebrehiwot W/Gebriel and
Ato Deribe Kaske**



Pic.3. The researcher presenting the Paper.

The presenter has started his presentation by briefing about Ethiopia saying that Ethiopia is the second most populous country in Sub-Saharan Africa with a population of 73.92 million.

He also said that Ethiopia is an agrarian country where around 95 % of the country's agricultural output is produced by smallholder farmers.

So the country is highly dependent on agriculture to address food and nutritional insecurity, poverty and to stimulate and sustain national economic growth and development.

The study attempted to investigate the constraints that impede the ability of agricultural extension workers to effectively perform their roles.

The study also indicated that DAs especially those at kebele levels are not properly discharging their responsibilities and have limited acquaintance to many of the concepts related to their duties and responsibilities at the kebele level.

The general objective of the study was to identify the overall effectiveness of performance of DAs in agricultural technology disseminating and



contribution to the enhancement of the livelihood of the rural community by increasing farmers' access to improved agricultural knowledge, technology and information.

The research also specifically aimed at:-

- ❖ Identifying the causes and effects of existing challenges of DAs in technology dissemination process
- ❖ Identifying key areas of engagements of DAs that would have greater multiplier effect on the existing extension system of the region.
- ❖ Promoting dialogue among all the concerned stakeholders and take part towards enhancing the effectiveness of technology transfer to the rural community.

The study was conducted in 12 selected wordas and 36 kebeles of the Southern Nations, Nationalities and People's Regional State, and data was collected from primary and secondary sources and used both quantitative and qualitative.

The Primary data was gathered from 108 DAs and 108 farmers. There was also informal discussion with key informants.

The data collected from document reviews, key informants interview, questionnaire and focus group discussions was analyzed using SPSS, version 17 software.

From the total sample of DAs 66.7% were male and 33.3% of them were female: the ration between male to female is twice. With few female extension workers it is very challenging to give agricultural extension service equally



both to the female and male at the same time. 62% of the sample DAs are single and 38% of them are married. DAs who got married are most stable to work in their residence closely with the community.

The majority 104 (96.3%) of DAs have no other source of income and the rest few 4(3.7%) gain income from livestock production, crop production poultry beside to their mean annual income salary.

With this difficult situation and high cost of living, it is challenging for development agents to serve the community effectively and efficiently.

Beside to their regular work, DAS are also engaged in:-

- ❖ Identifying specific farmers problem and referring them to subject matter specialty
- ❖ Facilitating credit and credit repayment issues
- ❖ Working as transformer between GOS, NGOS, research and other private sectors for the improvement of farmers' livelihood.
- ❖ Collecting government tax and
- ❖ Some of them run their won private business.

This shows that DAs were overloaded to undertake these and other policy objectives of the government.

Major problems of development agent of the region:

- Difficulties in defining the priority goals and objectives
- Determining the option of implementation
- Identifying the source needed for implementation
- Identification of the right person for the right activities
- Planning

- Determent out comes
- Deciding how to measure activities
- Summarizing the final work plan and
- Reporting the activities.

According to the study it was revealed that, out of the total sample DAs the response of 65.7% respondents were highly users of farmers training in technology dissemination, but it was theoretical based training. The research and extension linkage in the study area was also very poor.

The presenter indicated that if DAs are motivated at the workplace they will be able to do their job effectively and increase their job satisfaction. As a result they serve the community as well as the country as a whole by dissemination the technology in full potential.



Pic.4. The other researcher helping his colleague in the presentation.



It was also briefly indicated that because of lack of adequate incentive DAs have poor performance in dissemination new technology to the farmers. This condition led them to resign their job.

Education is assumed to increase the ability of farmers to use agriculture related information in a better way.

According to the study 21.3% of the sample respondents were illiterates. Age of the farmer's also plays a key role in house hold decision on the use of different types of technologies.

Farmers require different information on agricultural technologies more than the technology itself. It was revealed that development agents are the major and the first most frequently used source of information for the farmers. Neighbors or friends serve as the second most frequently used information source.

Types of extension service obtained from DAs:

Farmers were mostly getting extension services such as technical support, theoretical support, input supply and experience from development agents.

According to the survey most of the farmers (91.7%) had no language problem to communicate with DAs. Only 8.3% of them had the problem.

The study also indicated that 33.3% of the respondents farmers have a problem of interpreting or putting the information received from DAs into



action. It is because DAs lack practical skills, commitment, input, resources and they don't have enough time.

Utilization of credit may enable farmers to purchase inputs or acquire physical capital. Credit use is expected to influence effectiveness of DAs positively.

The availability of extension agents in the rural areas is very important to farmers, but farmers were unable to get the expected advice from them.

The average number of contact or visit among respondents within a year was only 4 days.

According to the research analysis, of the technologies accessed to the farmers by DAs only 95.6% and 68.5% of the sample farmers were highly receiver of improved maize variety, chemical fertilizer, professional advice and improved poultry respectively while the rest new agricultural technologies were received by very few farmers.

The findings of the study suggested that those farmers selected by DAs and take part in PADETES adopt technologies within a given package.

The major constraints of farmers in adopting new agricultural technologies were:-

- ✓ High price inputs
- ✓ Shortage of working capitals
- ✓ Resistance of farmers to adopt new technology
- ✓ Incidence of pests and diseases
- ✓ Lack of continuous follow up by DAs



- ✓ Shortage of time to teach all farmers properly by DAs, and
- ✓ timely Unavailability of inputs

In addition to this, unavailability of farm implements, transpiration, unsuitability of some agricultural technologies with farmers' real situation, lack of practical skill of DAs and other undefined constraints affected the adoption rate of new technologies by the farmer.

Finally, the following points were set as recommendations.

- It is essential to carry out on- job training for development agents
- The government should have to give top priority and work to the development of rural infrastructure facilities.
- Institutional barriers have to be improved by strengthen supportive organizations like credit, marketing and cooperative associations.
- DAs have to access the farmers training needs assessment and conduct farmers training based on the gap gained from the results of the need assessment.

After tea break

Discussion on the presentation

1. Ato Zenebe from Hawassa University has forwarded his opinion as follows:-
 - I. This kind of work is done for the first time in our region. What has been presented is an outcome of the study. It reveals the general overview. It is a systematic enquiry through a systematic way. Therefore, it should be review workshop. Validation is not convenient as a title. We are not here to endorse it. If we were there to validate it should have been by a systematic enquiry based on scientific way.

II. Farmers training centers have to be functional. It should be given emphasis. As far as I know health extension is advanced in customer satisfaction and giving service. Development Agents' have to be committed to localize their knowledge and also to live in the area with the society.



Pic.5. Ato Zenebe expressing his opinion.

Comments on the paper were given as follow

1. There are some things to be improved through time. That are:-
 - i. The topic talks about effectiveness of DAs but there are other things inside. If we focus on other things in addition to DAs, we have to expand the work. Otherwise, if we focus only on DAs, we have to see their performance, competency etc. we have to see it from these point of view.



- ii. The development agents also have to be the right people for the work.
- iii. 2.8% up graded but are they really working as development agents? Or did they go any where else? I don't think they are all training the farmers.
- iv. The sample of 108 DAs may be enough for the study but is it really enough number to bring policy change (development)?

2. The recommendation says the government should do this, but it should not be like that. There are specific bureaus. So we have to locate specifically the concerned bureau, other wise, it may not be effective. The recommendations are broad. They have to be from the detail of the study. Other wise we appreciate the work because we planned to do things like this together.

3. The specific objective is smaller, so add more on it since you have much data. In the part of data analysis, the focus group discussion is not clear. Who are involved in the discussion? Female or male? Who are the key informants? How many are they? It has to be clearer for the reader of the research. It also says there are 17 or 19 Females only. Why is it? Why the number is so low? If you have same number of male and female your research would be good.

On page 26, table 9 it is depicted that 40.74% of extension workers face difficulties in defining the priority goals and objectives. But in the recommendation nothing is explained; may be these people need training. Again on page 34, for the last one year it says there was no communication so it is a big gap you have to give recommendation on this to fill the gap. I thank the researchers and the network of this workshop is appreciable so I am happy.



4. What are we going to do next? It should not be only to document it, but we need to put it into practice. The development agents are very important. But there is a skill gap. They may need to go to college and universities otherwise if the training should be on-job training it is also good. There is significant difference between zones. The data shows this difference. Why is that? If we know the reason it will help us for intervention.

The adoption rate shows that if DAs are good, the farmers will be good. Actually it is my perception. I can't say it is the reality whether the adoption is good or bad we have to work on it. We have a plan to bring the country to a middle level income country. If there are ways to improve this, show us the direction. The document shows many things but the recommendations should be seen carefully to know who will be responsible for it.

5. How is the competency of the DAs evaluated? There are affecting factors. These factors have to be prioritized and tackle to solve the problems we have. When we think of such projects we have to know where the gap is. DAs, extension workers and farmers have linkage. They work together. It should be seen that way when adoption rate is high technology will be disseminated. Technological gaps had to be emphasized in this study.

6. It was better if people were invited from agricultural extension because they know more about this issue. I have also seen it in my experience. DAs collect agricultural taxes so sometimes farmers run away from them. Therefore, these DAs are not working properly. We have to see this issue. DAs are given incentives to make them motivated. If there is another way it is better to show us. It would be better if international NGOs have link with these DAs.



7. The points discussed in this study are key problems. They are crucial. This study plays an important role. But one said the people from agriculture are important. Actually the agricultural research gives trainings, but remained on the woredas. The government removed the problem of money but DAs work when they are given orders from top officials.

If there is also any pressure or obstacle from top officials it has to be put in the study. There is a gap between agricultural extension, the farmers and DAs. To develop the performance we have to strengthen the network as long as the performance is the point.

Responses on the comments and question raised by the participants

1. Our main things are the DAs. We made informal discussion with them. The key informants from woredas were only 17 because female are small in number in the kebeles. We take them proportionally from the kebeles. There were small numbers of females.

2. On Page 26 there are problems but not in the recommendation part. Giving on-job training is one of the recommendations.

3. Among zones, of course, there are gaps. The main reasons for the difference are the type service they give, level of education and distance (some are in the remote areas).

4. If the title does not cover study we accept the suggestion. The DAs don't want to continue in this field of work. They want to do other job because it doesn't help them to upgrade academic status.

5. For the study 108 samples were enough, but we take it as a comment. It helps us to see it again.



6. It is not only giving incentives only for few selected DAs once per year that matters but it is also better to be fair because some are working even at the weekends. We have seen what we didn't see so thank you.

7. It should not be Validation. It is a good comment so we will see it again. Some of the comments have answers there in the document.

8. Adoption is may be right but this study can't give answer for every thing because of its scope. It is a big question by itself when we say the adoption rate is high. What is the capacity of DAs? We can only see some things. All things can't be answered only by us. This study is conducted based on other studies from these studies we took data.

9. DAs have to be out from the tax collection work but they still do. In short it good and it will help us to improve it further in the future. There may also be communication gap so they may miss the right information. We have accepted the comments since we brought the study and give support to our work in general.

10. We had to involve stake holder in the study but we thought it was enough. But for the future we are thinking of giving trainings. But some things are beyond the research scope, for example, the problem of the effectiveness of the DAS. Is it from the university, the government or what? It is not answered because it is beyond the scope of the research. There is also capacity problem. So by looking supporters or donors or anything else we have to improve the work in the future.

11. There are people to be acknowledged. This research was thought in 2008 by Action Aid. After the data had been collected it was there for 3 years. After 3 years in 2011 that data was not useful. Therefore, using the remaining money these people from Hawassa University have collected new data and conducted this research in their free time. This work is funded by EU and Action Aid Ethiopia based on the agreement with CRDA.

Lunch break

Presentation on Good Practices

By: - Meret project

The presenter has demonstrated good practices on integrated watershed development.



Pic.6. Presentation on good practices.

Meret plus means, managing environmental resources to enable transition to more sustainable livelihood and partnership, land use solidarity.

The project has its own organizational structure. The presenter said that the causes of food shortage are:-

1. shortage of farm land



2. degradation and
3. high population

It focuses on sustainable development. It has also vision, mission and goal. The objective of the project is to improve the livelihood and food security opportunities for the most vulnerable and in particular women headed households through the sustainable use of the natural resource base.

It uses reserve based management. It has planning tools. It works by identifying the society's problems. It also has quality control mechanism. By interviewing the society and by conducting observation they evaluate the action done; don't use quantitative method.

Meret project is playing exemplary role in:-

- ✓ Road maintenance and construction
- ✓ Land rehabilitation
- ✓ Productivity improvement
- ✓ Income generation
- ✓ Demonstrating water as base for development
- ✓ Contributed access for market improvement

The project has brought significant changes in:-

1. Agro-ecosystem
2. Livelihoods of beneficiaries
3. Addressing the millennium goals

Result of this work is changing environment into productivity.

How can we scale up this? And thank you.

Presentation on



Historical Background and Status of Food Security Network in SNNPRS

By: - Ato Hagos



Pic.6. Ato Hagos on presentation.

Ato Hagos indicated that the network helps to put all the scattered hands together and the establishment of this network was initiated by Agricultural and Rural Development Bureau, AAE and CCRDA.

The first consultation workshop was organized in 2006. 43 participants were found and food security related papers and experiences of NGOs were presented. 5 organizations were elected to be core managing group of the network.

The second and third meetings were held in 2007 and 2010 respectively.

The main objective of the 2010 meeting was to vitalize the food security network.



The net work has the following critical challenges:

1. Lack of commitment of member organizations
2. High staff turnover from member organizations
3. Lack of proper handover of tasks and documents.
4. Absence of meetings
5. Tight schedule of member organizations
6. Lack of clear action plan.

The following questions were raised on the presentations

Q1. To what extent we are careful when we do our work?

Q2. How could Meret project become this much successful? Is that because of resource or any other means?

Q3. Target area has high population in relation to land size. They use small portion of land. Is that enough to them? or Do you have any kind of relationship with the government to solve this problem?

Q4. There are other organizations which are working on the same thing but this has a big difference. What is the reason? To what extent do you monitor resource distribution?

Q5. What mechanisms do you use to give priority to kebele? How do you target the beneficiaries?

Q6. On the water harvesting work wasn't there any problem?

Q7. We are told that the project works on 12 woredas.

Even when we work on 2 woredas there are a lot of challenge in terms of



resource how much is the budget for this 12 wordas?

Q8. There 12 wordas and components. Is it possible to see the works of the project in detail from the beginning to the end to visualize the presentation?

Q9. This work involved the farmers. As we call other stakeholder for meeting, what if we call farmers also to share experience?

Q10. This work is amazing work. Meret project does not work forever. What can be done to sustain this good practice?

Q11. What percent is the significant change you brought?

Q12. Wolayta, Alaba, Hadia have been changed but is there any change in other places like in Sodo Gurage? If there is no change what is the reason?

Q13. Is it only the result of your effort or do you have other organizations working together with you in bringing this change?

Answers were given as follows.

1. This project has long years experience in other places and through time it has improved a lot. It is under agricultural bureaus. I am myself agricultural bureau worker. So it works with the government office. It is the result of agricultural bureau and other NGOs. It doesn't work alone.

2. Konso terrace system is exemplary work. We got a great deal of experience from Konso. To reduce environmental degradation there is an area fenced around and allowed to grow grass on it. We take care of it. It needs collaboration. It is all about Konso.



3. It is not because of the resource we planted those trees. We came to development work like apple plantation, grass, seed etc. We reduced expenditure when there was resource there was loss before.
 - ✓ It is a matter of coordination.
 - ✓ By giving incentives and new technology development rather than giving aid we did the work.
4. By changing the style of ploughing in that small land we helped them produce better. We work on the land of the areas where there is shortage of food.
5. We had also challenges. In 1995 the project started with 15 model farmers but now we have 9500 farmers after long years. Change resistance was the other challenge. In the office there is quality standardization issue. It had to be 90 or 100% successful, but still there are problems.
6. We work together with the government and other organizations in the regular program to scale up these activities.
7. We give direct support for pregnant women, children, HIV victims and elderly people. 17% direct support and 83% work for those who are able to work.
8. Women participation should be high. Form 9500 farmers most of them are female. They do the main job. There is good result. Women are leaders. They manage their houses. So there are such women.
9. Some organizations involved in many different activities but it is a mistake to do different activities but now it is being improved. Thank you.



Comments

1. We have 30 years experience so we have learned while we were working. It is participatory work. Before time we order the people to do things so farmers were not willing to approach us. Therefore, we have learned how to do it. Farmers need immediate response. Slowly the farmers understood that the work is much helpful for them so they became active participants. We also have learned so many things from the farmers.

Before time UNESCO recorded only New York but now New York and the worda together registered. Now they do the fishery by taking care of the water. We are almost to leave the place and we are to stop the support.

Thank you.

2. We need to share experience with you since you have good practices.

It is good to continue this program but it is also good to consider the ecological aspect together with the economic change. It is good if there Scale up strategy by linking to TVT Colleges and universities. Do we have this link? What is the guarantee of this land not to have degradation again?

It is good that you get tired to improve the condition but how can we preserve the works? It is not a question it is a comment.

3. I have worked for 33 years in the project. We started it in a small land.

The degradations increasing, and the agricultural bureau focuses on only input, but what about the degradation? It is not really development.



4. All forum member organizations in the next meeting should present its own practices to share experiences.

Comments and questions on the second presentation

Q. 1. To be clear with I'd like know if this forum legally registered, and who is executing it?

Comment

1. There are many supportive bodies in the region but they work separately. It is good if we work in collaboration. The network is very important. It should not continue like this. So the network should be strengthened. My additional suggest is that membership should be obligatory. So we should push every one to be member. Every institution commitment is not the same. At institution leader level this issue should be accepted and signed among. And chairman and secretary are necessary. If they activate it the network will work. I don't know to what extent the agricultural bureau is concerned.

2 .This forum is important no question but from 2006 up to now it is not functional. It had no good establishment so it couldn't be as such functional. In addition to organizations who work on food security, research institutes and universities have to be members to have good results.

3. As it is said before it is very important and no question so, it must be obligatory according to this atmosphere. Food security is national as well as international issue but the commitment we have is a bit lesser. So how do we



bring the commitment? We said the DAS are not committed but we may also not be commented.

Institutional leaders should give attention it. We can conclude it on this and proceed to the way forward. We have to be benefited out of it. So let's focus on what to do next when we meet again. I think it is good to see it that way.

Ato Dawit Belete gave feedback on the questions and comments.

There is a difference between network and forum. If it is network we need a process to be legal. But if it is forum we can establish such kind of forum and it can be permanent. So as to me it has to be food security forum. We can continue with the forum without the need of registration and any other process.

To establish this forum we discussed with food security bureau and the bureau also delegated a representative. Our today's meeting is the first meeting and we are going to decide together how to work on food security.





Pic.7. Ato Dawit Belete giving feedback.

We who work on food security, university and agricultural bureau can bring the expected change by working together. We have to see how to strengthen the linkage? It is better to settle this.

Comment

1. We have it in the action plan in the food security bureaus. It is not something that was functional before and dead now; it is still in our action plan.

2. The steering committee should strengthen it and rather than the agricultural bureaus, the food security should coordinate and work together.

3. We have seen the past experience and now we have to establish active forum. It is not only food security office but also we have to work on the developed.

I don't think there is any problem whether we call it network or forum though it seems that it needs legal bases since it is going to be done also by the government together with us.

Even if there is time constraint, let's establish it and do it in collaboration. It should not be only for the sake of establishing it. We must be committed. It is a very good idea, but we have to be stronger.

4. In addition to what is said now before it was not strengthened. If it was by government representatives it was good as long as the government is more responsible in the developmental activities. So the leader should be elected from the government bureau.



5. The issue of network and forum must be concluded now. If it is forum, no problem, but if it is network we need to have legal bases.

If we only raise the development issue it is going to be very broad. If it is forum we come for a meeting when only we are called. There should be a way to execute the issue. It must be a legal network. We have to establish a body which can call for meeting at least once or twice a year.

In addition to this, it is also better to wing other universities that have a good knowledge and experience on this, but the food security office is much more important than anyone of us.

6. Agricultural bureau is the formal bureau which can handle this issue. If it is so other institutions like education, environment and land administration etc. are also concerned. So the agricultural bureau is the right bureau to handle this.

7. The head should be the agricultural bureau and the food security office can serve as secretary. Universities that are found in the region also have to be involved in this issue.

Feedback

Universities can be involved in this as well. It is a good idea. The main thing here is to be committed even if it is under the agricultural bureau. There will be a report to the agricultural bureau. Let it be led by the agricultural bureau and the bureau will assign a leader.



What shall we do to put this into practice? Who is going to take the responsibility? Before CCRDA and agricultural bureau and others together were doing it. What if they themselves do it?

Q.1. How effective was the previous committee? Were we supposed to raise a question then if that committee was strong?

Answer:

I think it has to be a different one. That was not strong. We have to establish a new committee by selecting individuals from different institutions. Strong members from Hawasa University and people who are in Hawassa should be selected.

Food security will take the responsibility and in the next meeting the steering committee will be selected. The committee in its meeting will decide the exact day of the next meeting to be in two months time.

Ato Yilma Muluken from Action Aid Ethiopia expressed his gratitude to the participants and also indicated that such kinds of works are good to bring about change at the grassroots level. He said it is a good opportunity to us share ideas that can bring change at the grassroots level. It's good to be together. We can start from the region and we can do it up to the country level.



Pic.8. Ato Yilma Muluken making closing speech.

Following his short speech the workshop was officially closed.



E ffectiveness of Development Agents’ Performance in Agricultural Technology Dissemination: The Case of SNNPRS, E thiopia.

By

Kinfe Asayehegn (MSc)
Gebrehiwot Weldegebrial (MSc)
Deribe Kaske (MSc)

September 26, 2011
Hawassa

1

**Food Security Forum Revitalization and Research Validation
Workshop Participants List September 26/2011**

S/n	Participants Name	Organisation	Place of Work	Tel- Adress
1	Masresha Kibret	JeCCDO	Hawassa	916823075
2	Nigat Chekule	Tilla	Hawassa	916826286
3	Kibret Bezaweletaw	Research Center	Hawassa	922462577
4	Daniel Dauro	SARI	Hawassa	926307308
5	Tesfaye Oyida	World vision	Hawassa	911855775
6	Antehun Degu	SARI	Hawassa	911759913
7	Molalish Petros	SARI	Hawassa	911994548
8	Tefera Chemera	SARI	Hawassa	916067368
9	Teketel Dechasa	ACF	Hawassa	912025860
10	Fekedu Mulugeta		Hawassa	911742053
11	Eden Abera		Hawassa	916056475
12	Efrem Aytenfsu	MCDP	Chencha	920442408
13	Erkeno Wossoro	WFP	Hawassa	916823872
14	Zenebe Worku	Hawasa Universty	Hawassa	916823421
15	Diribe Kaske	Hawasa Universty	Hawassa	911936200
16	Ezra Tefera	EWRFS/ENCO	Hawassa	916824777
17	G/Hiwot W/Gabriel	Hawasa Universty	Hawassa	913406572
18	Edom Mengistu (Dr)	Hawasa Universty	Hawassa	916828235
19	Ararso Geremew	Affini. Dev` t. Int.	Hawassa	913181046
20	Girima Degu	C.C.C	Soddo	911180236
21	Aynaddis Zeru	BoA, FS dept	Hawassa	911821620
22	Leulseged Begashaw	Plan Int. Eth	Hawassa	912059042
23	Adane Diniku	BoA, MERET	Hawassa	916106670
24	Birihanu Adane	IRC	Hawassa	912750218
25	Frew Beriso	MKC-RDA	Boricha	911358306
26	Yilma Muluken	Actionaid	Addis Ababa	911339524
27	Chala Legesse	People in Need	Halaba	910770993
28	Nadew Tumicha	DA	Chukuwuya	910133018
29	Tilahun Defersa (Dr)	EECMY/SCES	Hawassa	916823853
30	Zewudie Asfaw	BoFED	Hawassa	916823853
31	Taddese Boda	Concern Eth.	Wolayta	911066554
32	Taddese Kassa	DA	Southern Omo (jinka)	911005276
33	Kinfe Asayehugn	Hawasa Universty	Hawassa	913413063
34	Berhanu Nega	Hawasa Universty	Hawassa	916825065
35	Yibrah Beyene	Hawasa Universty	Hawassa	916823687
36	Samuel Gebre	Catholic Church	Hawassa	911751157
37	Meseret Kidane	Cheshire	Hawassa	916824582
38	Bihanu Abie	Gowrnmen	Dara	911092454
39	Seif	Actionaid	Addis Ababa	