

## Volunteer Report

### 1.1 Assignment information

- a) Clay Sneller
- b) Host Organization: Kulumsa Agricultural Research Center (KARC) and Holetta Agricultural Research Center (HARC) a unit of the Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural research (EIAR)
- c) October 26<sup>th</sup> 2015 to November 5<sup>th</sup> 2015 (excluding travel dates)
- d) 9 days

#### 1.2.1 Objective 1 in my SOW

Work with Yewubdar Shewaye as she prepares for her MS defense. She practiced her presentation for me and I reviewed her thesis. I offered her some suggestions and asked her questions her thesis advisors might ask.

- a) Completed
- b) She would pass, and she did
- c) No recommendations

#### 1.2.2 Objective 2 in my SOW

Deliver a 3-day workshop on the basics of plant breeding and some applications of emerging molecular breeding strategies

- a) Completed
- b) I expect that the participants will gain some new perspectives on plant breeding, how to evaluate their current efficiency, and learn some new breeding technologies. The impact of this is that participants can alter their breeding strategies and improve their efficiency with the resources that they have.
- c) It is easy to attend a workshop, the hard part is later when participants decide to incorporate their new knowledge into actions. I recommend that local supervisors follow up by soliciting ideas and discussions generated from the workshop and develop action plans to implement the best/most feasible ideas.

#### 1.2.3 Objective 3 in my SOW

Participate in a one week workshop on wheat and barley breeding for scientists with the EIAR

- a) Completed. I was able to attend only three days
- b) I delivered talks on the use of molecular plant breeding and many discussions on many aspects of crop improvement. I learned a great deal about plant breeding in the EIAR system and made some recommendation. The results seemed quite positive as I got the impression that many participants were thinking about new ideas and viewing what they do in a different light.

- c) As in 1.2.2, it is easy to attend a workshop, but thinking about the new knowledge gained and how to implement it is much more difficult. I recommend that local supervisors follow up by soliciting ideas and discussions generated from the workshop and develop action plans to implement the best/most feasible ideas.

### 1.3 Action Plan

Recommendation	Specific Action	Responsible Person	By When
<b>Change timing of visit by CRS volunteer</b>	A visit of this nature would be best about 3-4 weeks prior to harvest. I visited at harvest time and people are busy with harvesting. In addition an earlier visit would facilitate post-workshop discussions while ideas are fresh.	CRS and local hosts	
<b>Shorter class sessions</b>	Due to scheduling and harvest, class basically lasted 3 hours which is too long for effective teaching.	Local hosts	
<b>Generate actions plan to revise breeding programs based on new knowledge</b>	Local supervisors should arrange for input from all participants via group discussions etc and as a unit to 1) identify strengths and weaknesses, 2) decide how they may wish to alter their breeding plans to improve efficiency	Zerihun Tadesse Berhane Lakea	
<b>Assess current breeding programs</b>	The breeding programs should assess their current efficiencies and probabilities of success, particularly as to why they do not seem to get many new varieties from their local crossing program	Zerihun Tadesse Berhane Lakea	
<b>Assess what new technologies may be most useful</b>	KARC, HARC, and EIAR are building biotechnology infrastructure. This alone does little for breeding. Breeders need to work with the biotechnologist from the beginning to be sure these resources will be directed to technologies that have the greatest potential to benefit them. Much biotech uncovers information that is nice to know, but has little impact on plant breeding (short term, and even long term). EIAR cannot afford to allow their biotech investment to be siphoned off to such projects	Zerihun Tadesse Berhane Lakea	

### 1.4 Number of people attending

- a) Formal Training: 38  
 b) Through direct technical contact: 38 (same 38 as above)  
 c) Number of host staff: 38 (same 38 as above)  
 d) Training assistance by field: 23 ( a subset of the 38 mentioned above)

Category	Total	Males	Females
----------	-------	-------	---------

<b>Members</b>	0	0	0
<b>Employees</b>	38	34	4
<b>Clients</b>	0	0	0
<b>Family</b>	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	38	0	0

### 1.5 Gender

Gender roles: There were far females in the technical and science staff that I served than what we see in the US and Europe. Many females were relegated to field work.

What can CRS do: This is an EIAR issue so I don't see what CRS can do

### 1.6 Value of volunteer contribution in \$

- a) Hours spent preparing for assignment: ~40 hours prior to leaving for Ethiopia
- b) Value of contribution: 30 hrs prior to leaving + 48 hours traveling + 72 hours in country = 150 hours. This is a value of \$8798 based on my university salary

### 1.7 Value of hosts contribution

- a) Meals: Tea = 4 teas x \$ \_\_\_\_ = \$ \_\_\_\_\_
- b) Transportation: to/From KARC/Asella = 4 round trips x \$ \_\_\_\_ = \$ \_\_\_\_\_. KARC to HARC = \$ \_\_\_\_\_. HARC to Addis = 4 trips x \$ \_\_\_\_ = \$ \_\_\_\_\_
- c) Lodging \$0
- d) Translation \$0
- e) Other

### 1.8 Host Profile Data

No

### 1.9 Recommendation to CRS:

There could have been stronger coordination between CRS and KARC and EIAR to maximize the value of my visit. I sense that given more lead time that a more comprehensive plan could have been devised. I do realize that may not have been possible given the fluidity of plans and my availability for travel. Still I have to say that both parties (CRS, KARC) did a very good job with arranging times, getting attendance, making arrangements, and being flexible in a fluid situation. I think we all did very well with getting the most of what was possible given the time frame for preparing and visiting. It all worked out very well

### 1.10 Press Release.

