

Trip Report
Richard Bowen, Cathy Chan-Halbrendt, Kent Fleming
July 21 – August 4, 2004

Contents:

pp. 1 - 8	Report on Venilale and Dili Workshops, Additional Activities, Lessons Learned, Potential Follow-Up Activities
pp. 9 – 24	Appendix I: Venilale Workshop Agenda and Evaluations
pp. 25 – 30	Appendix II: Dili Workshop Agenda and Evaluations
pp. 31 – 39	Appendix III: Timor Leste Black Rice Marketing, Dr. Kent Fleming
p. 40	Appendix IV: Proposed Extension Assistance for Coffee Industry

Wednesday, July 21 - Saturday, July 24: Workshop Preparation

Wednesday, July 21 - Saturday, July 24: Workshop Preparation

On July 22nd the UH project's Team of instructors (Alexander, Bowen, Chan-Halbrendt and Fleming) met with the project's local staff to discuss the translation arrangements and the logistics of running the workshop in Venilale. Four translators were expected and our plans were to split the translators into pairs: Nina Gomes and Franseca as one team and Flavia da Silva and the fourth translator as the second team. The fourth translator did not show up. Hence, the three translators were shared between the two teams of instructors. Bowen and Fleming paired up to form one team with translators Gomes and Franseca and Alexander and Chan-Halbrendt paired with Flavia as the translator. On July 23rd the Team met individually with the translators to go through the presentations and to do a "dry run" of the presentations to assess whether the delivery of translated dialog from English to Tetun/Bahasa Indonesian was optimal.

On July 24th the Team met to discuss the structure and content of Day 2 of the Workshop: Field trip. Dr. Hal McArthur joined the Team for discussions on the planning of Day 2. He offered, and the Team agreed, that he would make a presentation on how to collect information from the farmer's groups for the field trip activities. One of the outcomes of the July 24 discussions was to begin Day 2 by presenting the purpose of the field trip along with a list of expectations to be derived during the field trip. In particular the Team agreed that the participants should focus on recording farmers' objectives; gathering data on potential income generating activities and on their marketing plans. This information will then be used for activities on Day 3 of workshop on evaluation of new technologies and income generating activities.

Sunday, July 25 – Thursday, July 29: Venilale Workshop

We arrived at Venilale in the early afternoon and began setting up the large conference room to handle our instructional needs for the general sessions as well as the need for plenary and breakout sessions.

Participants began arriving in late afternoon. After dinner we had an evening session to get to know each other and to divide the participants into the 4 groups in which they would be working with for the duration of the workshop.

Forty (40) individuals from a number of organizations participated in the workshop in Venilale. They included the following number and organizations:

- 26 from MAFF (Dili – 5, Manatutu – 1, Baucau - 1, Viqueque – 2, Lautem – 1, Liquisa – 1, Ermera – 2, Bobonaro – 2, Aileu – 1, Same – 2, Oecusse – 2, Other – 6).
- 2 Agricultural Service Centers (Bobonaro (1) and Viqueque (1));
- 4 NGO's: HASATIL (2); ETADEP (2); CRS (3); Caritas, Dili (1)
- 2 agricultural schools: SPP Natarbora (2); Esc.Tec.de Ag (2).

The participants came from many parts of the country. They were mostly technical staff of organizations that work very closely with the farmers, farmer groups and communities. There were no female participants although two had signed up to attend. This observation was presented to the MAFF Director of Administration, Ms. Odete Guterrez. We asked her to encourage a greater participation of females in future workshops or activities organized by MAFF and UH. Female participants were represented in community workshops held by Bob Alexander and Andre du Toit in Baucau a few weeks earlier. In fact, a number of female and youths participated in those workshops.

Workbooks with exercises were prepared in Bahasa Indonesian and provided to each participant. The three local translators helped to simultaneously translate the oral presentations of the instructors into Tetun and Bahasa Indonesian.

The course schedule is attached as Appendix I. The Monday workshop opened with a brief overview of the “Hawaii project,” setting of ground rules, and a review of expectations of participants summarized from the registration forms. The rest of the day was devoted to covering key economic concepts related to improving farmer decision-making, and included a number of exercises done individually or in groups:

- framework for assessing adoption of new agricultural technologies and products (Fleming)
- prices and marketing plans (Chan-Halbrendt)
- lessons on diffusion and adoption from the Green Revolution (Bowen)
- food security and risks (Alexander)

Tuesday was devoted to preparation of the participants for field trips to villages with whom the UH project are working. Fernando Sousa and Andre du Toit discussed the maize and rice trials and the land use groups that had been established to create new

income generating activities. Guidelines for collecting information were presented and participants went into their groups to formulate plans to gather information. Visits to the villages went smoothly.

On Wednesday, participant groups reported what they had learned in the village visits within the 2 primary sessions of the day: (1) adoption of new technologies for staples, and (2) income generating activities and critique of the marketing plans of the village land use groups. The first session on adoption reviewed the goals and objectives of villagers that participants were asked to collect. Fleming taught participants how to use partial budgets to analyze farmer decisions. Preliminary results on corn trials were used to teach participants how to make recommendations to farmers relative to decisions on adoption of improved seeds and on the use of fertilizer.

The afternoon session was devoted to evaluating existing or proposed income-generating activities of the village farmer groups. Participants were taught a scoring and ranking methodology for evaluating income-generating activities. Each of the 4 participant groups also finished assessing the village marketing plans from Day 1.

The final session on Wednesday night was a brainstorming and priority setting exercise where participants were asked to identify “actions to improve the economic environment for agriculture.” Two of the participants who had shown exceptional leadership during the group exercises agreed to facilitate the session in Tetun and Bahasa Indonesian. The session was quite lively and well facilitated. Seven major categories of actions were identified and prioritized by all 4 participant groups. The major groups (farmer groups, private sector, MAFF District, MAFF National, NGO’s, University that should be involved were identified for each major category. Specific actions were then brainstormed. Finally, participants were given 10 stars each to place on the actions they felt were most important.

A closing ceremony was held to present certificates to those completing the workshop.

Evaluation:

There was an overall evaluation conducted for each day and for the specific sessions of each day. (See Appendix I.) Specifically, for Day 1 there were evaluations for each session (4) and an overall assessment for the day’s workshop. For Day 2 there was only one evaluation as the main focus was the field trip. On Day 3 there were evaluations for the four sessions (by instructors) and an overall assessment for the day.

Participants felt that the workshop was relevant to their future work. In most cases, the information presented was just the right amount. Activities such as group exercises and field trip were useful in learning the concepts. Having the workbook was extremely helpful. Participants in general got what they expected from the workshop. At times, the pace was too fast. The translation was not optimal particularly for the first day as there were many technical concepts but it got better for the remainder of the workshop.

Participants believed that the field trip to the communities was well organized. They would like to see some follow-up activities.

Friday, July 30 – Sunday, August 1: Dili Workshop Preparation

The Team returned to Dili on July 29th, 2004. On the 30th, Bowen, Chan-Halbrendt and Alexander attended the Conference on Agriculture and the Environment sponsored by the National University of Timor-Leste (UNTL). Alexander presented a report on food and income security that he also used in the training exercises in Venilale. McArthur and Fleming participated in a workshop on Planning Research Priorities held at the UNTL's Experiment Station in Hera. The morning session was focused on the University's (UNTL) research priorities and the afternoon's focus was on NGO's research priorities. Of particular interests were the CCT/NBCA's research priorities for coffee. Among the research priorities that were of interest to the UH team was a proposed assessment of the economic impact of the coffee industry if the Albizia trees that currently provide shade for the coffee crop slowly died due to disease infestation of those trees and if replanting does not occur quickly.

On July 31st, 2004, the Team met to discuss presentation plans for sessions on August 2-3, 2004 of the workshop in Dili. For Day 1 the team decided to place less emphasis on concepts and theories. Instead, they agreed to concentrate on the integrating exercises with field trip reports from the workshop just completed in Venilale. For presentations on Day 2, the Team had lengthy discussions as to how to bring the results of the last session in Venilale (roles various organizations play in enhancing the farmers/farm household decision making) into the Dili workshop. The Team agreed to have one of the participants from the workshop in Venilale to serve as a facilitator and to conduct this session in Tetun. In addition, the Team agreed for this session (who should play what roles and how) that the discussion should only focus on three topics: production, marketing and food and income security with the overarching themes of coordination, data collection and analysis and human capacity building.

In the afternoon of July 31, 2004, the Team spent the afternoon working with translators and incorporating the exercises from Venilale into our presentations. Cathy worked on the evaluations of the workshop with the translators on the same day. In the evening of July 31, 2004, the Team met with the UH project local staff to finalize the logistics of the workshop.

The Team decided to produce a workbook for the Dili workshop in English, so that participants could refer to them during the workshop as well as to have a reference document to for future use. A local printing company agreed to work with Bowen, Cathy and Nina Amaral on Sunday to print out and photocopy the 98-page workbook. The copies were available that evening.

August 2 – 3, 2004: Dili Workshop

There were 21 participants for the Dili workshop. Representations are as follows:

- MAFF (6 –DNPA, Research, Crops, Research and Extension, DPPP);
- 6 NGO's: CRS (1); World Vision (2); Caritas Australia (2), TIDS (1); HASATIL (1); ETADEP (1);
- UNTL (2); USAID (3- EG, NCBA); and Others (2).

There were three female participants. The workshop was held at Turismo Hotel in Dili.

The workshop opened with overviews of the Hawaii project and of the Venilale workshop. The rest of the first day was devoted to reviewing the key economic concepts of the workshop, including the results of the Venilale group exercises:

- lessons on diffusion and adoption from the Green Revolution (Bowen)
- framework for assessing adoption of new agricultural technologies and products (Fleming)
- prices and marketing plans (Chan-Halbrendt)
- food security and risks (Alexander)
- evaluating income-generating activities (Chan-Halbrendt and Alexander)

The Tuesday morning final session was devoted to participant feedback and discussion. We identified from the Venilale workshop 3 overarching concerns on future “activities to support improved farmer decision-making on production, marketing, and food and income security:”

- data needs
- coordination
- capacity-building.

The participants were put into 3 groups, with balanced representation from MAFF, University and NGO's. The groups identified specific actions that should be taken and presented them to the entire groups.

Within the data needs session, Fleming told the participants about the program of the U.S. National Agriculture Statistics Service (NASS) to assist developing countries with establishing national agricultural statistics programs. Each participant was given a copy of a recent Annual Statistics of Hawaiian Agriculture, produced by NASS and the Hawaii Department of Agriculture. Alexander summarized the data to be collected by MAFF.

The final 2 group reports on coordination and capacity building consisted of presentations by members of the participant breakout groups and discussion. The workshop concluded with a general discussion of follow-up actions. A closing ceremony was held to award certificates to those completing the workshop.

Evaluation

The participants found the instructors knowledgeable and were impressed with the audiovisuals and handouts. 36 percent found the pace of the workshop too fast, likely due to difficulties in English for some participants. Slightly over half of the participants thought that the amount of information given was just right and that the objectives of the workshop were met. For the agenda and evaluations by day and by session, see Appendix II.

August 2 – 4, Activities Additional to Workshops

Fleming worked on black rice export possibilities. He visited the GTZ rice mill in Manatuto to see about milling black rice and to obtain milling costs. The facility is impressive and is milling a substantial amount of white rice for local retail sales. However, all the bran is removed and the mill would not appear to be appropriate for an alternative to replace the current hand milled practices. He visited comparable Indonesian rice fields and mills and completed his black rice study and pricing model (see Appendix III) in Bali.

Bowen and Chan-Halbrendt met with Ego Lemos of HASATIL, an umbrella organization for NGO's working in sustainable agriculture. Ego is interested in sustainable agriculture, with specific interests and expertise in permaculture. Permaculture training for Peace Corps volunteers was being held at HASATIL headquarters during our visit. Ego showed us pictures of the types of activities in which he is engaged with farmers. Bowen showed a PowerPoint presentation of the Hawaii sustainable agriculture program, of which he is the coordinator. Ideas for future collaboration in capacity building were discussed.

Bowen and Chan-Halbrendt met with Yoshikazu Wada of the Japanese Embassy to learn about their grants program. The embassy has two grant programs: one for NGO's and the other for Grass-roots projects. The average grant size of the grass-roots projects is \$50,000.

Bowen, Chan-Halbrendt and Alexander met with Kim Jones and Angela for an hour just before departing for the airport. We reviewed the activities and some of the lessons learned and potential follow-up activities. Kim was most concerned about translation issues, follow-up activities, and the need for a Dili coordinator for the Hawaii project. While we agreed that we had problems with translation, of the workbook and in the workshop, we stated that the translation improved during the workshops and that the workshops were well received despite translation problems. We discussed several ways future workshops on economic issues might be handled. Several follow-up activities were mentioned but time did not allow for discussion of the full range of potential activities. Kim suggested that the presentations in Bahasa Indonesian be recorded on CD's for widespread distribution to potential users. Kim asked that we revise the Hawaii project to include priority follow-up activities. We listened to Kim's concerns about the need for a Dili project coordinator and said we would relay those concerns to the project leaders. We agreed to submit our final trip report by the end of the first week of September.

Lessons Learned:

We learned that translation in general and translation of economic terms and concepts is serious problem. There are several options for future workshops dealing with economic issues:

- hire an economist fluent in both English and in Tetun and Bahasa Indonesia (Portuguese in the near future) to deliver the lectures and facilitate discussion. Our role would be to develop the curriculum and train the economist to present the curriculum.
- use locally trained facilitators to lead large group activities, as we did with the final sessions of both the Venilale and Dili workshops. The facilitating skills of Egas _____, the training officer for MAFF, and Ego Lemos of HASATIL were excellent.
- use simultaneous translation services. We are told that the Hotel Timor has such facilities although they are likely to be expensive.
- Offer more in-depth follow-up training. Separate workshops should now be held for farm management and marketing, focused on those skills most needed by district-level professionals.
- integrate economic analysis into the agronomic workshops as appropriate.

Potential Follow-up Activities Within the Hawaii Project

1. Farm Management

The Venilale workshop participants requested follow-up training on farm management decision making. In order for this training to be more useful, it would be advisable to also train extension officers to work with farmers on improved record keeping. A 3-day workshop on farm management decision making will be followed by a 2-day workshop on record-keeping.

2. Data Collection training- NASS

The opportunity of the USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service, International Program to assist MAFF in developing a modern statistical service was presented at the Dili workshop. If MAFF is interest in pursuing this assistance, we can facilitate bringing the parties together.

3. Community Marketing Workshop and Follow up

Follow-up with the implementation of the marketing activities initiated by the project (earlier workshop by Bob Alexander and Carin DuToit).

This will entail:

- a. present the improved/revised marketing plans from the Venilale workshop to the community
- b. survey what has been done, what are the problems and constraints
- c. propose recommendations to overcome the issues

- d. conduct a 3 day workshop on entrepreneurship and business/management skills

4. Annual Conference on Agricultural Situation and Outlook

The objective of this conference is to update the agricultural development and outlook in East Timor and to provide professional development opportunity for agricultural practitioners. Planning of the conference would include important agricultural partners such as MAFF, UNTL, NGOs and large agricultural organizations (NCBA?). The workshop would have three components and would be for at least three days. Each component would be presented per day. For example, Day 1: Situation and Outlook: Commodity supply, demand and trade situation and outlook of important agricultural products; Day 2: field visits of new varieties, uses or products of agriculture; Day 3: professional training workshops for Extension and other professionals. The training themes could include grant writing, word processing, spreadsheet, surfing the internet for information and presentation, leadership skills, and skills building in agricultural production and marketing. Bowen, Fleming and Chan-Halbrendt have been active in planning Hawaii's annual state agricultural conferences and could help with planning a conference in East Timor.

5. National and International Visits and Exchanges

There was a strong desire by Extension professionals to visit interesting and innovative farms and rural enterprises outside their own district. An annual tour by Extension and NGO professionals, possibly in conjunction with an annual or biannual conference, would be an appropriate way to provide this type of activity. It is also important for professionals to observe innovative agricultural operations outside their own country. Occasional study tours, possibly a combination of professionals and farmers, to agricultural and marketing sites in places like Bali, Thailand, Philippines would spur the introduction of new crops, products, methods of production or marketing.

6. Economic Evaluation of the Coffee Industry and the Shade Tree Decline Scenario

Coffee is East Timor's primary export and it faces many problems. A comprehensive economic analysis of the whole industry could easily be justified. One serious problem that could cripple the industry is the serious decline of the shade trees, Albizia, from diseases. Replacement of the shade trees is an issue some in the coffee industry believe is not being taken seriously enough by the government. An economic study has been proposed to USDA Extension International Programs for funding (Appendix IV).

Appendix I: Venilale Workshop Schedule and Evaluations

District-level Agricultural Economic Analysis, Evaluation, & Decision-Making

Facilitators (University of Hawaii):

Bob Alexander – Economic Consultant (Rural Livelihood Risk Management)
Dr. Richard Bowen – Extension Economist (Sustainable Agriculture)
Dr. Cathy Chan-Halbrendt – Research Economist (Marketing & Economic Development)
Dr. Kent Fleming – Extension Economist (Farm Management)

Collaborators (University of Hawaii):

Dr. Andre DuToit – Agronomist;
Dr. Hal McArthur – Director of Research Relations

1. Schedule

Sunday, 25 July

12:00-19:00	Registration of participants
19:00-20:00	Dinner
20:00-21:00	Group formation exercise
21:00-21:30	Discussion of evaluation forms

Monday, 26 July

8:30-9:15	Introduction – Bob Alexander
9:15-10:30	Farm Management – Kent Fleming
10:30-10:45	Snack
10:45-12:15	Farm Management – Kent Fleming
12:30-13:30	Lunch/relax
13:30-15:00	Marketing – Cathy Chan-Halbrendt
15:00-15:30	Diffusion & Adoption - Bowen
15:30-15:45	Snack
15:45-16:30	Diffusion & Adoption – Richard Bowen
16:30-17:30	Risk Management – Bob Alexander
17:30-19:00	Relax
19:00-20:00	Dinner
20:00-21:00	Activity
21:00-21:30	Evaluation of the day

Tuesday, 27 July

8:30-10:00	Concepts for Information Gathering – All
10:00-10:30	Land-use groups – Andre DuToit
10:30-10:45	Snack
10:45-12:15	Information Gathering Techniques – Hal McArthur
12:30-13:00	Lunch
13:00-13:30	Transport to village sites
13:30-15:30	Field Information Gathering
15:30-15:45	Snack
15:45-17:30	Field Information Gathering
17:30-19:00	Relax

19:00-20:00	Dinner
20:00-21:00	Activity
21:00-21:30	Evaluation of the day

Wednesday, 28 July

8:30-10:30	Group Reports – Hal McArthur
10:30-10:45	Snack
10:45-12:15	Evaluate New Technology – Kent Fleming & Richard Bowen
12:30-13:30	Lunch/relax
13:30-15:30	Evaluate Income-Generating Activities – Cathy Chan-Halbrecht & Bob Alexander
15:30-15:45	Snack
15:45-17:30	Group Exercise Completion
17:30-18:00	Relax
18:00-19:00	Dinner

Wednesday, 28 July (originally schedule for Thursday morning)

19:00–21:30	Economic Decision Making Needs and Roles Prioritization – Richard Bowen (facilitated by Egas ____, MAFF and Egos Lemos, HASATIL
21:30-22:00	Presentation of Certificates

2. Evaluation

Monday 26/07/04 Overall evaluation for the Day							
1. How relevant was today's workshop to your future work?	Very relevant	13	38%	2. How do you rate the amount of information?	Too much	9	26%
	Relevant	21			62%	Just Right	
	Not relevant				Too little		
3. How was the pace of the workshop?	Too fast	10	31%	4. Activities (when used) were:	Very effective	11	33%
	Just right	21			65%	Neutral	
	Too slow	1	3%		Ineffective	4	12%
					Weren't used		
Structure							
5. How did audio/visuals contribute to your learning?	Enhanced	15	44%	6. Were the handouts useful?	Very useful	30	91%
	Neutral	19	56%		Neutral	3	9%
	Distracted				Distracting		
	None used				None used		
7. Based on the list of goals discussed at the start of this	Definitely	24	73%	8. Do you think that the workshop's objectives were met?	Fully met	31	94%
	Somewhat	9	27%		Partially met	2	6%
	No				Not met		

Strengths and Weaknesses

9. Please list what you consider to be three strengths of today

1. Improve knowledge
2. Direction for daily practice
3. Good presentations and relevant information
3. Great facilitation – very helpful
4. Event is appropriate and peaceful
5. All the presentations were well accomplished
6. Enjoyable and instructors were well prepared
7. Use of audio visual aid is very helpful
8. Very useful as direction for MAFF and related organizations
9. Protect farmers' necessities
10. Not left behind
11. Train agriculture managers to make decisions
12. Improve confidence in decision making
13. Practical information
14. Sharing new information
15. Real data collection
16. Most instructors are experts in their field
17. Improve skills of the participants in problems identification
18. Cooperation between NGOs and Government to join their perceptions
19. Sharing experience
20. Sufficient training materials
21. Good presentation methods
22. New experience in agriculture management

10. Please list what you consider to be three weaknesses of today

The interpretation was not satisfactory

Interpreter should familiar with the topics
 Interpreter is not competent
 The situation is too tense
 bad timing – tight schedule and finish until late at night
 Assessment techniques
 Session 4 presentation was not very successful due to technical problem
 Too brief
 Data is not relevant
 Lack of experiment in East Timor
 Language barrier
 A bit too general
 Too many technical terms
 Data collection methods were not covered
 Limited time for discussion
 Evaluation form should be provided at the end of each session
 No forum discussion
 Many participants were not very active
 Graphics were not very clear
 Interpreter's voice was not clear and not strong
 Trainers and participants did not get to know each other well enough
 Some theories were not very relevant
 No presentation in Indonesian
 Half of the terms used in the interpretation were not effective
 No 'brain storm' and 'ice breaker'

SESSION I Dr. Kent Fleming							
26/07/04							
1. Was the instructor knowledgeable?	Very	24	77%	2. Please rate the instructor in terms of: clarity of presentation	Very good	25	96%
	Somewhat	10	29%		Satisfactor y	1	4%
	No				Poor		
3. Was the instructor well organized?	Very organized	9	26%	4. Please rate the instructor in terms of answering questions and managing discussions:	Very good	3	9%
	Neutral	11	32%		Satisfactory	29	85%
	Organized	12	35%		Poor	2	6%
	disorganized	2	5%				
5. Please rate the usefulness of the group exercises	Very good	16	47%	6. Please rate the instructor in terms of use of training aids:	Very good	13	42%
	Satisfactory	17	50%		Satisfactory	21	68%
	Poor	1			Poor		
7. Any other comments about the workshop instructor?							
Instructor is very experienced Good presentation and good exercises Get a funny interpreter to keep the participants awake Too fast – difficult for the participants to absorb the information							

Well done
 Interpreter was not very helpful
 Timing should be improved
 Good presentation skills
 A lot of time was wasted because of language barrier
 In the future more time should be allocated for discussion
 Good jokes and relaxing
 Get an interpreter with agriculture background
 Economic analysis was not very clear which may lead to the continuing use of herbicide – this can affect farmers' economy as well as environment
 The content should be more detail
 If it is possible similar workshop should also be conducted in the western part of East Timor
 The instructor is very good at presenting and the information is very useful for farmers in East Timor
 Too tense, more jokes would be helpful
 Interpretation was not maximum

**SESSION II Dr. Catherine Chan-Halbrendt
 26/07/04**

1. Was the instructor knowledgeable?	Very	21	68%	2. Please rate the instructor in terms of: clarity of presentation	Very good	7	23%
	Somewhat	10	32%		Satisfactory	24	77%
	No				Poor		
3. Was the instructor well organized?	Very organized	10	33%	4. Please rate the instructor in terms of answering questions and managing discussions:	Very good	2	7%
	Neutral	11	37%		Satisfactory	27	90%
	Organized	9	30%		Poor	1	3%
	disorganized						
5. Please rate the usefulness of the group exercises	Very good	12	39%	6. Please rate the instructor in terms of use of training aids:	Very good	11	35%
	Satisfactory	19	61%		Satisfactory	20	65%
	Poor				Poor		

7. Any other comments about the workshop instructor?

Excellent job
 Presentation was very good but more exercise is required
 Clear and firm
 Sharing previous and current experience
 Lacking visual aid and other training materials
 It is better for the instructor and interpreter to sit together to better prepared – help participants' concentration
 Pretty systematic
 Very satisfactory
 Having Hawaii University assisting East Timor is great
 Entertainment required (intermezzo)
 Need to be slowly in presenting
 Good structure but communication is not very helpful
 More jokes for relaxing please!

More time would be better
 Not complicated – easy to be absorb
 More competent interpreter is required
 The interpretation was too complicated
 All good but if it is possible we would like to have a copy of your presentation in English for our reference
 For future, such presentation more time

SESSION III Dr. Richard Bowen							
26/07/04							
1. Was the instructor knowledgeable?	Very	21	68%	2. Please rate the instructor in terms of: clarity of presentation	Very good	4	13%
	Somewhat	10	32%		Satisfactory	27	87%
	No				Poor		
3. Was the instructor well organized?	Very organized	5	16%	4. Please rate the instructor in terms of answering questions and managing discussions:	Very good	1	3%
	Neutral	16	50%		Satisfactory	27	90%
	Organized	10	31%		Poor	2	7%
	disorganized	1	3%				
5. Please rate the usefulness of the group exercises	Very good	7	23%	6. Please rate the instructor in terms of use of training aids:	Very good	7	23%
	Satisfactory	23	74%		Satisfactory	24	77%
	Poor	1	3%		Poor		

7. Any other comments about the workshop instructor?

The speech is good enough but body movement is minimum
 More relaxing environment should be created in noontime when the participant feel fed up
 Language is a real problem for us to be able to fully understand the context of the presentation
 Instructor has been helpful
 The result is satisfactory
 Information shared is very useful for us to be able to assist farmers in rural areas
 There is a need for further clarification for better understanding of the subject matter
 All good – “I’m very satisfied with the presentation”
 Strong voice
 More time required for similar workshop in the future
 Some difficulties with the technical terms but good in general
 The message is not very clear. It seemed like the system of the green revolution is suggested to be retained
 Sufficient
 Need to be more detail (experiment)
 We had hoped that it was not too fast
 Jokes for intermezzo
 Entertainment between the session maybe a good idea
 Interpretation was complicated

It would be great if we could get a copy of your presentation in English for our reference

SESSION IV Bob Alexander							
26/07/04							
1. Was the instructor knowledgeable?	Very	17	71%	2. Please rate the instructor in terms of: clarity of presentation	Very good	5	26%
	Somewhat	7	29%		Satisfactory	14	74%
	No				Poor		
3. Was the instructor well organized?	Very organized	5	21%	4. Please rate the instructor in terms of answering questions and managing discussions:	Very good	2	8%
	Neutral	7	29%		Satisfactory	21	88%
	Organized	12	50%		Poor	1	4%
	disorganized						
5. Please rate the usefulness of the group exercises	Very good	8	33%	6. Please rate the instructor in terms of use of training aids:	Very good	4	17%
	Satisfactory	15	63%		Satisfactory	20	83%
	Poor	1	4%		Poor		
7. Any other comments about the workshop instructor?							
<p>Not too fast please! – interpreter would not be able to cover everything</p> <p>Sessions at night were not good idea</p> <p>Jokes in between would be nice</p> <p>Time was very limited</p> <p>I did not quite understand</p> <p>Such workshop should also be done in the western part of the country</p> <p>Data used in the presentation was unclear; it was not clear what method was used</p> <p>Relax and all good</p> <p>Very good presentation but bad timing</p> <p>Too fast – difficult to absorb</p> <p>Good, firm and clear</p> <p>It is a good idea to share some experience from Hawaii</p> <p>Well prepared</p>							

Contents	27/07/04			Overall Evaluation for the Day			
1. How relevant was today's workshop to your future work?	Very relevant	14	45%	2. How do you rate the amount of information?	Too much	5	16%
	Relevant	17	55%		Just Right	26	84%
	Not relevant				Too little		
3. How was the pace of the workshop?	Too fast	4	13%	4. Activities (when used) were:	Very effective	12	39%
	Just right	25	83%		Neutral	17	54%
	Too slow				Ineffective	2	6%
					Weren't used		

Structure							
5. How did audio/visuals contribute to your learning?	Enhanced	16	51%	6. Were the handouts useful?	Very useful	25	81%
	Neutral	15	48%		Neutral	6	19%
	Distracted				Distracting		
	None used				None used		
7. Based on the list of goals discussed at the start of this	Definitely	15	48%	8. Do you think that the workshop's objectives were met?	Fully met	3	10%
	Somewhat	16	51%		Partially met	27	87%
	No				Not met	1	3%

Strengths and Weaknesses

9. Please list what you consider to be three strengths of today

Improve science
 Improve thinking for the future
 Improve skills
 The farmers was ready for interview
 Enough time for practice
 The presentation is good to apply in the field
 Collect the right information from the farmer
 Sharing information between the participant and the farmer
 The presentation is helpful to know how to use the land
 This workshop is useful for the farmer in village
 Have the schedule in the workshop
 Help us to know the real situation of the farmer
 This workshop is useful for implementation activity
 This workshop is useful to make the economic analysis and good decision.
 Cooperation between E. Timor and Hawaii University, NGOs and MAFP
 The workbook is useful
 Good instructors
 Farmers groups were organized

10. Please list what you consider to be three weaknesses of today

Too short time
 Not enough time for the questions and answers
 The practice is not really support and not enough time
 Communication (language) is not so good with the farmer
 Human resources is not enough
 The concepts in presentation is not complete
 Farmer management was low
 Missing concepts in workbook
 Farmers did not give the true information about the experiments
 The participants are not ready to talk to the farmers
 Translation is not good and clear
 The presentation not really answer the question
 Difficult for the framer to sell the yield
 Technical assistance should be improved for the farmer in Fatulia
 Too fast in presentation and not clear
 There is no copy of Dr. Hal's presentation.

Contents	28/07/04			Overall Evaluation for the Day			
1. How relevant was today's workshop to your future work?	Very relevant	21	58%	2. How do you rate the amount of information?	Too much	15	44%
	Relevant	15	42%		Just Right	19	56%
	Not relevant				Too little		
3. How was the pace of the workshop?	Too fast	12	33%	4. Activities (when used) were:	Very effective	13	39%
	Just right	24	67%		Neutral	19	56%
	Too slow				Ineffective	1	5%
					Weren't used		
Structure							
5. How did audio/visuals contribute to your learning?	Enhanced	17	49%	6. Were the handouts useful?	Very useful	26	72%
	Neutral	18	51%		Neutral	10	28%
	Distracted				Distracting		
	None used				None used		
7. Based on the list of goals discussed at the start of this	Definitely	25	71%	8. Do you think that the workshop's objectives were met?	Fully met	9	25%
	Somewhat	10	29%		Partially met	27	75%
	No				Not met		

Strengths and Weaknesses

9. Please list what you consider to be three strengths of today

Findings can be discussed in groups
All participants may work in line with the plan/direction of the instructor
Sweet & smart interpreter raised the spirits of the participants
Improve knowledge on economic agriculture analysis
Basic knowledge for future workshop
Different topics were covered
Simple language is used
Good interpreter
Participants were very enthusiastic
Active in every discussion
Well accomplished
Participant were given chances to participate in the presentation
Good communication between participants
Sharing information
Improve working spirit and self confidence
Subject matters have been covered explicitly
Easy to be understood
Timing was good
Advisors were trained to provide useful recommendation to farmers
Very appropriate 2 be applied in rural areas
Exercises were very appropriate
Improve knowledge about planning and consolidation of agriculture analysis
Problems identification and prioritization
Collective decision making is effective

Useful information
 Most MAFF programs are related to this workshop
 Instructors are the experts and competent in their field
 Sufficient facilities
 Appropriate location
 Use of audio visual
 Actual information and knowledge was covered
 Practical knowledge

10. Please list what you consider to be three weaknesses of today

Bad timing
 Tiresome because it continues until late at night
 Interpreter is not familiar with the subject
 Limited time (too much to covered in a short time)
 Limited matters were covered
 Lack of printing materials
 Explanation was very brief
 Too much theory and less practice
 Presentations were not well organized
 Insufficient tools and methods
 Group discussion is complicated and time consuming
 Information was not well delivered

**SESSION I Dr. Kent Fleming
 28/07/04**

1. Was the instructor knowledgeable?	Very	20	77%	2. Please rate the instructor in terms of: clarity of presentation	Very good	11	30%
	Somewhat	6	23%		Satisfactory	26	70%
	No				Poor		
3. Was the instructor well organized?	Very organized	16	43%	4. Please rate the instructor in terms of answering questions and managing discussions:	Very good	9	24%
	Neutral	11	30%		Satisfactory	26	70%
	Organized	9	24%		Poor	2	5%
	disorganized	1	3%				
5. Please rate the usefulness of the group exercises	Very good	16	46%	6. Please rate the instructor in terms of use of training aids:	Very good	15	42%
	Satisfactory	19	54%		Satisfactory	21	58%
	Poor				Poor		

7. Any other comments about the workshop instructor?

The presentation is good, clear and systematic
 Easy to be understood
 Very good timing
 Very patience in delivering the materials
 I like Dr. Kent the most because the subject is relevant to my field of study
 The topic is very interesting and appropriate thus more time is required

This workshop is very satisfactory with good interpreter
 The information is very useful although very tight
 More workshop on this topic is required
 Although it is a bit too theoretical I've enjoyed it
 Less opportunity for discussion
 The instructor is very knowledgeable and experienced
 His is very good at teaching and his knowledge on social economic matters is extraordinary

**SESSION II Dr. Catherine Chan-Halbrendt
 28/07/04**

1. Was the instructor knowledgeable?	Very	28	80%	2. Please rate the instructor in terms of: clarity of presentation	Very good	14	40%
	Somewhat	7	20%		Satisfactory	21	60%
	No				Poor		
3. Was the instructor well organized?	Very organized	4	15%	4. Please rate the instructor in terms of answering questions and managing discussions:	Very good	11	31%
	Neutral	17	63%		Satisfactory	24	69%
	Organized	6	22%		Poor		0%
	disorganized		0%				
5. Please rate the usefulness of the group exercises	Very good	15	43%	6. Please rate the instructor in terms of use of training aids:	Very good	15	42%
	Satisfactory	20	57%		Satisfactory	21	58%
	Poor				Poor		

7. Any other comments about the workshop instructor?

Good and clear – systematic delivery
 Timing should be more effective
 Sweet and patience
 We love the topic
 Visual aid is needed
 Very interesting topic and good interpreter
 I'm very satisfied
 Although tired, the instructor was able to deliver an excellent presentation
 Too fast and less chance for discussion
 Information was very useful
 Knowledgeable but a with a little Tetum will be helpful
 Professional and experienced
 This instructor is very experienced in training provision
 The interpreter was not translating everything said by the instructor
 In the future, information in the workbook should be more detail and systematic
 Good but needs follow ups
 Patience, slower and sure

SESSION III Dr. Richard Bowen							
28/07/04							
1. Was the instructor knowledgeable?	Very	27	79%	2. Please rate the instructor in terms of: clarity of presentation	Very good	15	44%
	Somewhat	7	21%		Satisfactory	19	56%
	No				Poor		
3. Was the instructor well organized?	Very organized	13	38%	4. Please rate the instructor in terms of answering questions and managing discussions:	Very good	11	32%
	Neutral	13	38%		Satisfactory	22	65%
	Organized	8	24%		Poor	1	3%
	disorganized						
5. Please rate the usefulness of the group exercises	Very good	16	47%	6. Please rate the instructor in terms of use of training aids:	Very good	15	44%
	Satisfactory	18	53%		Satisfactory	19	56%
	Poor				Poor		

7. Any other comments about the workshop instructor?

Very experienced
 Very good presentation
 More time should be allocated to answer participants' questions
 More competent interpreter is needed
 Very interesting
 Easy to be understood
 With authority, firm, simple, solid, and clear
 Discussion session was very useful to share knowledge – more discussion is suggested
 Good discussion but unorganized
 More of such training is needed in the future with better interpreter
 More relaxing situation is preferable

SESSION IV Catherine Chan-Halbrecht and Bob Alexander							
28/07/04							
1. Was the instructor knowledgeable?	Very	25	81%	2. Please rate the instructor in terms of: clarity of presentation	Very good	14	45%
	Somewhat	6	19%		Satisfactory	17	55%
	No				Poor		
3. Was the instructor well organized?	Very organized	14	45%	4. Please rate the instructor in terms of answering questions and managing discussions:	Very good	12	39%
	Neutral	13	42%		Satisfactory	19	61%
	Organized	4	13%		Poor		

	disorganized						
5. Please rate the usefulness of the group exercises	Very good	14	45%	6. Please rate the instructor in terms of use of training aids:	Very good	12	39%
	Satisfactory	17	55%		Satisfactory	19	61%
	Poor				Poor		

7. Any other comments about the workshop instructor?

No clear feedback to the participants discussion
Clear - easy to be understood
Very good presentation – clear and systematic
Get closer to the groups when explaining something in group exercises
Every participant was enthusiastic
Presentation is very relevant to situation in East Timor
With authority, firm, brief, solid and clear
Practical skills should be improved
This session is very useful not only for us but also farmers
Keep the good work

Appendix II. Dili Workshop Agenda and Evaluations

Central-level Agricultural Economic Analysis, Evaluation, & Decision-Making

Hotel Turismo
2-3 August, 2004

Facilitators:

Bob Alexander	Economic Consultant (Rural Livelihood Risk Management)
Dr. Richard Bowen	Extension Economist (Sustainable Agriculture)
Dr. Cathy Chan-Halbrendt	Research Economist (Marketing & Economic Development)
Dr. Kent Fleming	Extension Economist (Farm Management)

Collaborator:

Dr. Andre DuToit	Agronomist
------------------	------------

Schedule:

• **Monday, 2 August**

9:00- 9:15	Registration of Participants
9:15- 9:45	Introduction – Bob Alexander & Andre DuToit
9:45-10:30	Diffusion & Adoption – Richard Bowen
10:30-10:45	Snack
10:45-12:00	Farm Management & Evaluation of New Practices – - Kent Fleming
12:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-14:45	Ag Prices and Marketing – Cathy Chan-Halbrendt
14:45-15:30	Technological Change, Product Change, and Risks – - Bob Alexander
15:30-15:45	Snack
15:45-16:30	Evaluation of New Products – Cathy Chan-Halbrendt & - Bob Alexander
16:30-16:45	Evaluation of the Day's Activities
16:45-17:00	Questions & Discussion

• **Tuesday, 3 August**

9:00- 9:30	Questions & Discussion
9:30-10:00	Data Needs Discussion
10:00-10:30	Roles Framework
10:30-10:45	Snack
10:45-12:00	Summary Discussion: Roles, Analysis, & Evaluation
12:00-14:00	Lunch, Evaluation of Day's Activities, & Completion

Overall Workshop Evaluation

Contents	03/08/04						
1. How relevant was today's workshop to your future work?	Very relevant	10	91%	2. How do you rate the amount of information?	Too much	5	45%
	Relevant	1	9%		Just Right	6	55%
	Not relevant				Too little		
3. How was the pace of the workshop?	Too fast	4	36%	4. Activities (when used) were:	Very effective	5	45%
	Just right	7	64%		Neutral	5	45%
	Too slow				Ineffective	1	10%
					Weren't used		
Structure							
5. How did audio/visuals contribute to your learning?	Enhanced	9	82%	6. Were the handouts useful?	Very useful	9	82%
	Neutral	2	18%		Neutral	2	18%
	Distracted				Distracting		
	None used				None used		
7. Based on the list of goals discussed at the start of this workshop did you	Definitely	6	55%	8. Do you think that the workshop's objectives were met?	Fully met	6	55%
	Somewhat	5	45%		Partially met	5	45%
	No				Not met		

Strengths and Weaknesses

9. Please list what you consider to be three strengths of today	<p>Community analysis of food security</p> <p>Identifying 'lack of skills & information' as main reasons for not adopting an intervention – this is solvable</p> <p>Marketing session was good</p> <p>The workshop was well organized</p> <p>The subjects are link to our program (agriculture)</p> <p>The subjects are very useful information to improve farmers economy for agriculture</p> <p>Gain useful information</p> <p>Gain experience</p> <p>Assist in planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation</p> <p>Relevant and useful information</p> <p>Practical methods</p> <p>Good facilitation</p>
10. Please list what you consider to be three weaknesses of today	<p>Language barrier</p> <p>A little unorganized</p> <p>Time is too limited</p> <p>Not dynamic</p> <p>There was no discussion within the groups</p> <p>The presentation is conducted in high standard of English and too fast</p> <p>The workshop is conducted only presentation and not participative</p> <p>Pace of the Dr. Kent's economic analysis session</p> <p>Not yet have quantifying results of chromolaena, Andre's trial – this will be good</p>
11. Suggestions for follow-up activities	

The matrix – need further discussion
 If there is report to be prepared for submission (to local government), all findings of the workshop need to be clarified first.
 There should be consideration of the suggestions of the participants
 The explanation should be simple and clear
 The workshop should be participative
 Dr. Bowen's Graph on "growth rate" should include actual production figure over green revolution

SESSION I Dr. Richard Bowen 08/02/04							
1. Was the instructor knowledgeable?	Very	11	100%	2. Please rate the instructor in terms of: clarity of presentation	Very good	7	64%
	Somewhat				Satisfactory	4	36%
	No				Poor		
3. Was the instructor well organized?	Very organized	7	64%	4. Please rate the instructor in terms of answering questions and managing discussions:	Very good	5	45%
	Neutral	3	27%		Satisfactory	6	55%
	Organized	1	9%		Poor		
	disorganized						
5. Please rate the usefulness of the group exercises	Very good	4	36%	6. Please rate the instructor in terms of use of training aids:	Very good	5	45%
	Satisfactory	5	45%		Satisfactory	6	55%
	Poor	2	18%		Poor		

SESSION II Dr. Kent Fleming 08/02/04							
1. Was the instructor knowledgeable?	Very	10	100%	2. Please rate the instructor in terms of: clarity of presentation	Very good	7	70%
	Somewhat				Satisfactory	3	30%
	No				Poor		
3. Was the instructor well organized?	Very organized	6	60%	4. Please rate the instructor in terms of answering questions and managing discussions:	Very good	5	50%
	Neutral	3	30%		Satisfactory	5	50%
	Organized	1	10%		Poor		
	disorganized						
5. Please rate the usefulness of the	Very good	4	40%	6. Please rate the instructor in terms of	Very good	4	44%

group exercises				use of training aids:			
	Satisfactory	5	50%		Satisfactory	5	56%
	Poor	1	10%		Poor		

SESSION III Dr. Catherine Chan-Halbrecht 08/02/04							
1. Was the instructor knowledgeable?	Very	9	100%	2. Please rate the instructor in terms of: clarity of presentation	Very good	8	89%
	Somewhat				Satisfactory	1	11%
	No				Poor		
3. Was the instructor well organized?	Very organized	5	56%	4. Please rate the instructor in terms of answering questions and managing discussions:	Very good	5	56%
	Neutral	3	33%		Satisfactory	4	44%
	Organized	1	11%		Poor		
	disorganized						
5. Please rate the usefulness of the group exercises	Very good	3	38%	6. Please rate the instructor in terms of use of training aids:	Very good	4	50%
	Satisfactory	4	50%		Satisfactory	4	50%
	Poor	1	12%		Poor		

SESSION IV Bob Alexander 08/02/04							
1. Was the instructor knowledgeable?	Very	7	78%	2. Please rate the instructor in terms of: clarity of presentation	Very good	8	89%
	Somewhat	2	22%		Satisfactory	1	11%
	No				Poor		
3. Was the instructor well organized?	Very organized	5	56%	4. Please rate the instructor in terms of answering questions and managing discussions:	Very good	5	56%
	Neutral	3	33%		Satisfactory	4	44%
	Organized	1	11%		Poor		
	disorganized						
5. Please rate the usefulness of the group exercises	Very good	3	38%	6. Please rate the instructor in terms of use of training aids:	Very good	4	50%
	Satisfactory	4	50%		Satisfactory	4	50%
	Poor	1	12%		Poor		

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

SESSION V Catherine Chan-Halbrendt and Bob Alexander							
08/02/04							
1. Was the instructor knowledgeable?	Very	9	100%	2. Please rate the instructor in terms of: clarity of presentation	Very good	9	100%
	Somewhat				Satisfactory		
	No				Poor		
3. Was the instructor well organized?	Very organized	7	78%	4. Please rate the instructor in terms of answering questions and managing discussions:	Very good	5	56%
	Neutral	2	22%		Satisfactory	4	44%
	Organized				Poor		
5. Please rate the usefulness of the group exercises	disorganized			6. Please rate the instructor in terms of use of training aids:	Very good	4	50%
	Very good	3	38%		Satisfactory	4	50%
	Satisfactory	4	50%		Poor		
	Poor	1	12%				

SESSION VI – VII Roles to improve the economy environment for agriculture							
28/07/04							
1. Were the facilitator (s) effective?	Very	10	83%	2. Was the session well organized?	Very organized	5	42%
	Somewhat	2	17%		Neutral	5	42%
	No				Organized	1	8%
					disorganized	1	8%
3. Were the facilitator (s) effective?	Very good	6	50%	4. Was the input from the Venilale workshop useful?	Very good	5	42%
	Satisfactory	6	50%		Satisfactory	5	42%
	Poor				Poor	2	16%
5. Please rate the usefulness of the group discussion	Very good	4	33%	6. Please rate the session in terms of use of training aids:	Very good	4	33%
	Satisfactory	6	50%		Satisfactory	8	67%
	Poor	2	17%		Poor		
7. Any other comments about the workshop session?							

There was no clarification or concluding comment on what was the use of the discussions
Follow up workshop might be needed to further address issues raised in this workshop
Flip card and markers should be provided for the group presentation
All sessions explanation this morning is very useful for us
This is an important workshop, therefore two days is not enough to cover this area (topic)
Good. Hope that more time is allocated for discussion so that more issue is raised
Please provide more training on market analysis and agriculture statistics

Appendix III.
Timor Leste Black Rice Marketing
Dr. Kent Fleming

Currently Timor Leste imports a considerable amount of rice to meet its rice consumption demand. A few have argued that Timor Leste should enter the rice export market. However, the quality and cost of Timor Leste rice production do not make it internationally competitive with rice exporting countries such as Indonesia and Vietnam. Timor Leste's overall strategy at this time should be rice import substitution.

While it is premature for Timor Leste to consider competing in the international rice commodity markets, there may be small international niche markets for some Timorese rice. This possibility needs to be explored seriously. It is likely that such markets will need to be created. If these market development efforts are successful, there is the danger that other rice producing countries will then come in to exploit it. In spite of potential failure, one must undertake the possibly futile effort because Timor Leste has no other options for international rice trade.

Niche market candidate:

Baucau's long stemmed, traditional black rice appears potentially to be of international interest. It is a unique product that has gastronomic appeal. It is grown in extremely small amounts and is used domestically primarily for special social occasions. While it costs the same to grow as other rice varieties, it's yield is only about 10% of the modern commercial varieties. To be treated equitably growers would need to be paid proportionately more for black paddy or milled rice than for white. The actual price difference is a function of the relative white rice yields and the current market price for paddy and milled white rice. (The following analysis shows the procedure for calculating the equitable price of black rice but the data needs to be refined. For example, the market would prefer *organic* black rice so the appropriate price and yields need to be based on organic white rice price and yields. Shipping costs also need to be determined.)

Price Calculations for Baucau Black Rice

A. Growing & harvesting costs:

	Units	White rice	Baucau Black
1 Yield of paddy (using same growing conditions)	(kg/ha)	3000	300
2 Mkt. price of paddy (@ 14% moisture content)	(\$/kg.)	\$0.11	\$1.10
3 Quality premium	(\$/kg.)	\$0.00	\$0.15
4 Gross field value (to farmer) of 1 kg. of paddy	(\$/kg.)	\$0.11	\$1.25
5 Gross field value (to farmer) of 1 hectare of paddy	(\$/ha.)	\$330.00	\$375.00

B. Processing costs:

Milling recovery rate	60.0%	kgs.	1800	180
Number of 10 kg. bags of rice/ hectare		bags	180.0	18.0
1 Milling price		(\$/kg.)	\$0.19	\$0.19
2 Cost to mill paddy from 1 hectare		(\$/ha.)	\$570.00	\$57.00
3 Total cost of milled rice from 1 hectare		(\$/ha.)	\$900.00	\$432.00
4 Wholesale price of milled rice per kg.		(\$/kg.)	\$0.30	\$1.44
Note: Price per can at farm, when kg. per can =	0.96	(\$/can)	\$0.31	\$1.50

C. Packaging costs:

5 Bagging cost per 10 kg. bag		(\$/bag)	\$2.00	\$2.00
6 Wholesale price of bagged milled rice per kg.		(\$/kg.)	\$0.50	\$1.64
7 Wholesale price of 10 kg. bag		(\$/10 kg.)	\$5.00	\$16.40

D. Shipping costs:

1 Shipping rate*		(\$/kg.)	\$1.00	\$1.00
2 Cost to ship 10 kilogram bag of rice		(\$/bag)	\$10.00	\$10.00
Note: Delivered price for a hectare of production		(\$/ha.)	\$2,700.00	\$475.20
3 Delivered price per kilogram		(\$/kg.)	\$1.50	\$2.64
4 Delivered price per bag		(\$/bag)	\$15.00	\$26.40

E. Distribution cost:

1 Handler's profit margin**			33%	33%
2 Retail sales price per kg.		(\$/kg.)	\$2.00	\$3.51
Note: this translates into a retail sales price per lb. of		(\$/lb.)	\$0.91	\$1.60
3 Retail sales price per bag		(\$/bag)	\$19.95	\$35.11

* At this time this is an excess baggage charge

** At this time this is a contingency (risk) factor



Fleming met with the farmer who grew the black rice (far right), and three other neighboring farmers. The rice to the far left is unmilled black rice; the other is milled black rice.



Milled rice in the background, unmilled in the foreground.



On the farm rice is sold by volume rather than weight (by the can rather than by the kilo). The person in the foreground, José, is from Venilale (in the Baucau region) and graduated from UH this past spring. He has returned to his home works for our UH/USAID economic development project and would be a good contact⁵ for collecting rice for export to Hawaii.



Wife of the farmer who grew the rice, with friend pouring un-milled black rice into the mortar for her.



Milling the black rice



Winnowing the black rice



The farmhouse of the black rice grower in Venilale (in the Baucau region) where we purchased the black rice.

Our joint effort in developing a niche market for this rice will have a significant economic impact for this farmer's livelihood. Paying an amount equitable in relation to white rice will encourage others to grow more black rice next season. If we can continue to expand the market, as small as it is, this effort can have a significant economic impact for this farming community. At this point black rice is rare, and some effort was required to obtain the 20 kgs. being imported into Hawaii. The Baucau farmer we located was the only farmer who had enough beyond his family's ceremonial consumption needs and his need for seed for planting the following crop.

The Timorese use it, both as warm rice with a meal and as a coconut milk pudding, both warm and cold. This rice has considerable potential for use by Hawaii's better chefs (e.g., Chef Merriman), although probably as it is traditionally prepared. Merriman is more likely to use it as a high impact item on a plate with grilled ahi or prepared and chilled for use in a water cress salad with a coconut vinaigrette dressing. The hand-crafted aspect of Baucau black rice may be part of its attractiveness (certainly it will be for the Slow Food group when we are ready to introduce it to them). However, it is worthwhile to consider milling it mechanically if we can locate a miller who can mill it without stripping off the nutritious and flavor-contributing outer layer (bran).

Appendix IV. Proposed Extension Assistance in Coffee Industry

30 July 2004

To: USDA Cooperative Extension Service, International Programs
Via: Angela Rodrigues,
Project Management Specialist – Economic Growth Program, USAID-Timor Leste
Subject: Formal Request for Extension Assistance
Requested by: Prof. Filipe T. Dias Ximenes,
Head of SOSEK, National University of Timor Leste (UNTL)

Evaluation of and Education on the Economics of East Timor Coffee Production, Processing and Marketing

At the Conference on “Priority Areas for Future Agricultural Research & Extension” (July 29, 2004, UNTL, Dili, Timor Leste), the relevant UNTL faculty and NGO representatives outlined priority areas for future agricultural research and extension. One of the priority needs identified by the Department of Social Economics was an analysis of the economics of coffee production and marketing, with particular reference to the Ermira region. This results of the proposed research would serve a wide range of purposes for the coffee industry (especially its marketing efforts), the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (MAFF) (especially in making policy recommendations and prioritizing its extension efforts) and UNTL (especially in meeting its educational responsibilities). However, the immediate use would be to determine if all parties in the coffee chain of production, processing, and marketing, especially the coffee farmers, are receiving a “fair” return for their various activities. The research results will contribute to the on-going effort to increase the efficiency, equitability and global competitiveness of the Timor Leste coffee industry.

In designing the Timor Leste (TL) research and extension efforts consideration should be given to previous successful programs. An initial task will be to collect the relevant economic data and to organize it into information useful for economic decision-making. UNTL will largely have to collect new data. (CCT is an NCBA project with substantial funding by USAID.) CCT will have some relevant coffee data that it may be prepared to share. UNTL agribusiness students also need to be trained in the methodologies involved in this area of production economics.

Dr. Kent Fleming, University of Hawaii (UH) Extension Economist and team member of the USAID/UH economic development project in TL participated in the Research Priorities Conference. He has been working closely with the Kona coffee industry for 15 years (as well as with coffee producers in the Dominican Republic, Mexico and Guatemala), and he suggested UNTL draw upon the extensive experience UH has in developing the well-known Kona coffee industry. The UH experience might provide UNTL with a good model to accomplish its task effectively. Dr. Fleming, who has been working in Timor Leste at various times over the past year, has been in communication with David Boyce of the Coffee Cooperative of Timor (CCT). Fleming would want to continue working with Mr. Boyce, hopefully to involve him in the UNTL effort. In regards to UNTL’s educational needs, Dr. Fleming teaches the UH undergraduate agribusiness management course. Fleming appears to be a good candidate to help initiate the UNTL coffee economics project. UNTL is therefore requesting the International Program of USDA/CES to support his participation in accomplishing the UNTL research and extension priority.