

**Strategic planning for the horticultural  
sector in Kosovo**  
(MAFRD/ SPHP-K)

**Second support mission**

Gerrit Holtland

21 – 30 November 2007

**CTRT**  
Heyendaal 3  
Ede  
The Netherlands

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1 Aim and program f the mission .....	5
1.2 Set up of the report .....	5
<b>2 THE SEQUENCE OF ACTIVITIES DURING THE MISSION .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3 PROGRESS IN THE WORKING GROUPS .....</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1 Grapes and vine.....	8
3.2 Vegetables .....	9
3.3 Ornamental crops.....	10
3.4 Fruit trees.....	11
3.5 Statistics .....	12
3.6 Plant Protection.....	12
3.7 General conclusions on the Working Groups.....	13
<b>4 THE PLANNING .....</b>	<b>15</b>
4.1 Working Groups.....	15
4.2 Coordination/ Facilitation .....	16
<b>5 CONCLUSIONS AND THE WAY FORWARD .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>ANNEX I: TOR MISSION .....</b>	<b>18</b>



## SUMMARY

From 21- 30 November a mission was fielded to give a follow up to the horticultural strategic planning process by MAFRD-SPHP-K initiated in March 2007. The progress since March has been limited as both parties did not give it sufficient priority and as the planned coordinators was not recruited.

On request of the partners the mission provided a two-day training on Value Chain Analysis and Development. After that separate discussions were held with each of the six Working Groups. Based on the outcomes of these discussions the mission drafted a proposal on how to adjust the strategic planning process. This was subsequently approved in a one-day workshop with all actors. In this workshop also the way of working for the next three months was agreed upon.

The main outcomes of the mission are:

1. The four WGs will concentrate on describing and analysing the primary actors (and their interactions) of the main value chains in their sub-sector.
2. The mission will provide them a structure for the Table of Contents for their reports. This will combine the basic structure of a sub-sector strategy and the ten steps of a Value Chain Analysis. The WGs that focus on specific technologies or element of the chain (e.g. greenhouses; nurseries), they will have to modify the Table of Contents accordingly.
3. The WGs will combine their description and analysis of the environment (commercial, non-commercial and institutional). The coordinator will play a key-role by organising one day seminars on topics like fiscal policies, trade agreements, extension system, credit systems etc.
4. The WG will collect the data needed to select the most competitive crops. This concerns:
  - a. area, yield,
  - b. price, Gross Margin, production costs (in absolute numbers and as % of most competitive country), profitability, man-days/ha,
  - c. quantity, value and sources of imports and the quantity, value and destination of export,
  - d. yield gap (potential yield minus actual yield), best yield in Kosovo, best practice (why was this yield is so high)
  - e. constraints for average farmers to get such good yields.

The WG on statistics will assist the WG on collecting these data.

5. Once this has been done this for the most important crops in all sub-sector, the 8-12 priority crops for Kosovo can be selected. These will be promoted by MAFRD in all their strategies (e.g. on research and extension, on subsidies or cheap loans, on export promotion, on collecting statistical data etc.)
6. Two supporting WGs were formed on statistics and plant protection. They will support other WGs but they will not develop a full fledged strategy on their own. Next to strategic issues they will deal with more short issues as well; if needed SPHP-K and MAFRD will sign separate MoUs about this.
7. Efforts must be undertaken to include more people in the process; e.g. IBK or university staff. This could be on a temporary basis as well.
8. A simple system of planning and reporting in the WG has been agreed upon. Their first step should be to divide the responsibilities for each paragraph in the proposed Tables of Contents.
9. The tasks and responsibilities of the newly recruited coordinator (who will start in January 2008) have been specified and agreed upon.

Lastly the mission wants to stress that the development of a horticultural strategy is a project on its own, with its own objectives, procedures and expected results. Both partners must make the necessary time and energy available to make it a success. This means that all people concerned will include the work for the WG in their Yearly Plan of Operations. In case this is not accepted by superiors the steering committee can provide support.

All stakeholders must keep in mind that the work on strategy development can sometimes run parallel with other forms of cooperation between MAFRD and SPHP-K; yet these processes should not be intermingled.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Aim and program of the mission

The main aim of the mission was to follow up on the results of the first mission in March. As the progress since March has been limited, the mission was asked to provide some further training on Value Chain Development to the Working Groups. So this was done. Next the mission met with each WG to understand the state of affairs and to agree on what they will do next. Based on this a program was made for a one-day workshop with all WGs. There the main conclusions of the mission on the progress in .

The ToR for the mission can be found in Annex I. The next table shows the actual itinerary:

<b>Date</b>	<b>Program</b>
Wednesday and Thursday 21/22	Travel (delay due to fog on airport; adjust training program from 3 to 2 days)
Friday 23	Training on Value Chain Analysis
Saturday 24	Training on Value Chain Development
Sunday 25	Rest and reporting/preparations
Monday 26	Workshops with the Working Groups on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 08.30 Grape and vine production</li> <li>• 10.30 Vegetables/ greenhouses</li> <li>• 14.00 Flowers</li> </ul> Meeting with Association expert if SPHP-K
Tuesday 27	Workshops with the Working Groups on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 08.30 Statistics</li> <li>• 10.30 Plant protection</li> <li>• 13.00 Fruit Trees</li> </ul> Meeting with the newly appointed coordinator
Wednesday 28	Reporting and preparing the last workshop
Thursday 29	Common Work Shops with all Working groups: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conclusions from the WG meetings</li> <li>• Planning, reporting</li> </ul>
Friday 30	Debriefing Departure

### 1.2 Set up of the report

Chapter two explains what the logic and of the sequence of activities during the mission. In chapter three the main findings on each of the Working Groups are presented. Chapter four gives an overview of what has been agreed on how the WG will operate in the coming period. Chapter five summarises the conclusions. In the Annexes one finds the details.

## 2 THE SEQUENCE OF ACTIVITIES DURING THE MISSION

First of all the mission provided a two-day training course on value chain development. The programme and the presentation can be found in Annex II. The value chain approach is based on a similar perspective as the strategic planning exercise of the first mission, yet it focuses more on the primary producers and the markets they serve. Focusing on one product, it is more concrete and brings commercial and technical aspects to the fore.

The mission was very satisfied that all the invited participants turned up, even on their free Saturday and that they participated actively in the program. The training started with an explanation of the steps to be taken in a value chain analysis:

- Step 1: mapping.
- Step 2: benchmarking
- Step 3: structure of added value
- Step 4: vertical links in the chain
- Step 5: chain coordination
- Step 6: performance of individual enterprises
- Step 7: horizontal coordination
- Step 8: commercial support system
- Step 9: non-commercial support system
- Step 10: policy environment

After the presentation the Working Groups discussed the steps and applied them to their own sub-sector. While doing so they were asked to make a clear distinction between what they already knew and what they did not yet know but wanted to find out. In the latter case they had to decide *whom* they could ask this information and *what* exactly they wanted to ask.

The next day the results of the discussions in the WG on the ten steps were discussed step by step. This highlighted both the content of what WGs thought important as well as the methodological problems they experienced in applying the ten steps.

After the training the mission had a meeting with each of the Working Groups. The objectives were to:

- share the progress
- identify the gaps so far
- agree on what the next steps will be.

The general program of the meetings was:

1. Overview of what has been done and feedback/questions from the mission.
2. What needs to be done?
  - Stakeholder analysis
  - Value Chain Analysis
3. Written agreement on the next steps
  - Who will do what and when?
  - What will be the concrete outcomes

The meetings were very interesting but too short to cover all aspects. In future missions more time must be planned for this.

Lastly a general planning workshop with all WGs was organised. The agenda was:

1. Feedback from the WG-discussions
2. Cross Cutting Themes
3. Planning/ reporting/ monitoring

4. Role and tasks of coordinator
5. Plan the first three months of 2008
6. Timing next mission / first Steering Committee
7. Make table of contents of WG report

The issues discussed under the first point (feedback from the WG-discussions) can be found in the next chapter. In chapter four the other issues are elaborated.



### 3 PROGRESS IN THE WORKING GROUPS

The general progress has been limited over the past half year. The main reason seems that both MAFRD and SPHP-K give little priority to the process. Staff is constantly occupied with other assignments. SPHP-K did not manage to attract a facilitator. Just prior to the mission both parties met and re-confirmed their commitment to the process. As mentioned in chapter 2, the mission found people well motivated to join the training and workshop.

The mission discussed the progress in separate meetings with each WG and then tried to link these discussions to both the Value Chain concepts and to the general progress in all WG during the general planning workshop.

#### 3.1 Grapes and vine

The institutional landscape in the sub-sector changed considerably with the creation of the Institute for Grapes and Wines in Rahovec. Its director, Nesim Morina, is the active spokesman of the WG. He is joined by Ylber Kuji, Shaban Ajdini and Fahredin Krasniqi. The previous members Bashkim Koronica and Ymer Berisha are no longer active.

The WG had prepared a rather extensive document. They explored the internet to get data on international markets. They also used data from a 2004 survey (MAFRD) of all vineyards. They have a database with 3000 farmers; they want to refresh these data and connect it to cadastral data within the context of an upcoming GTZ project. So in 2008 a full inventory will be done.

The mission provided some feedback on some data and details the report which was well appreciated and understood. The general discussion was on the state of affairs in the sub-sector. The key issues, in the understanding of the mission, proved to be:

- Seedlings are imported as there is no quality local production
- Farm management data show an income of 2.500-3.000 Euro/ha. In July-Nov. 2008 farm management data will be collected (by Krasniqi and others from EVV)
- Labour costs represent 70% of all costs
- Table grapes are most profitable. The yield is 12-15 MT and grapes are sold at road sides for 5 Euro/8 kg (so ca. 0.5 Euro/kg). Wine grapes yield 8-12 MT/ha and are sold for 0.15 - 0.2 - 0.35 - 0.53 Euro/kg; depending on the quality.
- The demand for table grapes exceeds the supply; so wine grapes are sold for fresh
- The sub-sector is dominated by two large scale farms (of 600 ha) with a very low productivity (3.5 MT/ha!)
- In processing 2 wineries dominate; they have 50% of the market. They undertake large investments in new lines, new labels, foreign TA etc. The other half is shared by some 10 others who all operate at only 15-20% of their capacities
- One reason why (international) markets were lost is the prolonged privatisation process, leaving some wineries non-operational for years. So now grapes are sold to Montenegro and the wine they produce is imported (with nice labels, good PR etc.)
- There is export to Germany of low quality wine. It is sold under the cost-price. These are reserves of previous years. In Germany it is sold in supermarkets for 2.99 Euro per litre. The label says it is from Kosovo.
- The quality wine can not compete on the international market and is sold locally. Yet, many Kosovars believe that imported wine is better; so they fetch a premium price.

Strategic concerns:

- How to create a (socially, economically) healthy balance between large farms and wineries and small family farms? Are cooperatives an option, out-growers schemes?
- How to ensure that farmers plant the most suitable varieties in terms of marketability (taste) and in terms of agro-ecological zoning? An old map of suitable zones of different varieties exists, but this needs updating.
- How can farmers be trained on cultivation techniques that enhance both productivity and quality?
- In table grapes: how to ensure an even spreading of production (early/ medium and late varieties). Again agro-ecological consideration should be taken into account.
- How to educate all actors on how to produce, to process and to consume quality wine? How to convince the (national) consumers that Kosovo can produce high quality wines? Maybe a (public) taste-contest can help.
- How to increase investments in vineyards? Some neighbouring countries managed to increase production (e.g. Albania). How did they do it? Role of credit and of training? Link favourable credit to following technological advice (var./fertilisation/pruning) or to a contract with a processor?

In general grape and wine production is a labour and knowledge intensive industry. There is no doubt that grapes are the most important crop in Kosovo. The creation of EVV is a major step forwards in creating a critical mass of knowledge and skills on grapes. This knowledge should be connected and extended to (agric.) schools, extension system and University.

### 3.2 Vegetables

This WG consists of Dukagjin Zeka, Ishmet Babai and Skender Kaciu. The WG started to describe the sub-sector, which is still very dynamic. Greenhouses and tunnels get increasingly important. They used a study of Mr. Agthoven to indicate the yield potential of a large number of vegetable crops. It would be interesting to update to this report from 2004: what happened since then and what needs to be done to close the yield gap? This WG knows very well how it wants to collect more information.

It has commissioned studies on the Value Chains of two main field vegetables: peppers and cabbage (Skender Kaciu, University). This should be used as a benchmark for the future and it should lead to some concrete recommendation for improvements. The study on peppers will be ready in March and the one on cabbage in June. The results will be shared first in the WG and then a validation will be done via stakeholder meetings. The outcomes should be clear recommendations that can be included in the WG-strategy.

IC invited Prof. Balliu from Albania to assess the potential for greenhouses and tunnels in Kosovo. The WG should develop the ToR. The aim is to assess which types of greenhouse technology is most suitable for Kosovo in the next 5 years. To the mission the key aspects seem to be:

- the type of construction and the optimal materials to be used
- an appropriate climate regulation system
- a proper fertilization system and approach (timing and type of fertilizers)
- proper plant protection measures
- proper seedling production systems (timing; size and types of cubes, type of soil etc.)

Probably this differs per agro-ecological zone. The mission advises not to include economic and marketing issues in the ToR as there would be a considerable risk to over-ask the consultant; leading to insufficient time to address the key issues. It seems better to use some time for a seminar with farmers and university students. The advice of Prof. Balliu has to be presented in the WG and in a stakeholder meeting and the results have to be fed into the strategic

plan of the WG. The WG should prepare the mission very well; proving the consultant with all available data (e.g. meteorological data).

The WG is considering making an inventory of the greenhouses/tunnels in Kosovo. They would have to hire some 20 students for this. The WG should develop the questionnaire and analyse the results. The WG was not very clear whether this should be limited to simple statistical facts (like surface; type of greenhouse) or also the technology farmers apply (fertilization etc.). The mission proposes to be very careful with the latter. Farmers tend not to disclose their technology to strangers and surely not to students who might not fully understand the issues at stake. The mission proposes to take the issue up with the WG on statistics to see how the data can fit into existing data collection system. One question is: if we pay students to do this; why should we not pay the statistical officers in the municipalities who have to collect such data, but who do that very poorly. Maybe; if we pay them once, they might be better motivated to update their data in the future.

Lastly Ishmet Babaj explained that IC will organise a round table in its office on 5 December on the potential for horticulture in Kosovo. Special attention will be given to the latest im- and export data. Unfortunately not all WG members were aware of this event.

These are all very good initiatives and the mission feels that good progress is made; at the same time it notes that in these initiatives focus on the primary actors in the system and that there is very limited attention for the commercial and non-commercial support system and the policy environment. There are some general statements like: the inputs are of low quality, there is no capital/credit.

So some strategic concerns remain:

- How to increase investment in greenhouses and tunnels?
- How to provide sustainable extension services to farmers? How can farmers learn from one another?
- What will be the long term situation: on which products can Kosovo compete?
- How to handle the marketing; is there a need for farmers to cooperate?

### 3.3 Ornamental crops

This WG consist of Habil Zeqiri, Faton Nagavci, Nora Gola and Sehnata Haradinaj of MAFRD who joined recently. The WG met with two main stakeholders (Rexhep Limani and Emrush Dervish) in this relatively small sub-sector.

The key element is that although the quality of local production is low there is still a good market. Imports exceed local production, both for annual and perennial plants. The WG proposes to have an import tax on mature plants (not on seedlings) to protect and to increase local production. The mission feels that such a conclusion is premature: local producers are making good profits so, why should this be even increased? It is quite well possible that the local production is limited by the lack of skills and knowledge or the lack of greenhouses; so an import tax would only increase the price for the consumer. Governments do not easily agree with this and also WTO rules (to which Kosovo does not have to adhere, but that it would like to apply as much as possible) do not allow it. Thirdly other countries could easily retaliate, but then with more important crops. In principle import taxes can only be used to 'neutralise' unfair competition of other countries (e.g. if they give export subsidies).

For the annual plants there is a substantial lack of Petunia's in the market. For perennial crops the demand for certain varieties of Thuja is very high; this means that the traditional Thuja variety has to be changed. In Febr./March the WG will do a survey among nursery men to see the composition of their production. They will also make a more detailed analysis of the

profitability of different species and varieties. In order to make a better assessment of the competitiveness of Kosovar producers, the WG want to visit some countries in the region to make a SWOT analysis of that country vis-à-vis Kosovo. So ultimately the WG will be able to conclude in which species and varieties Kosovo is most competitive.

Before going abroad the WG will ask some farmers/expert what the key-success factors are in producing high quality plants. This needs to be compared with technologies observed abroad and it can be the base for spreading the technology to other farmers. As mentioned in the beginning one of the strategic constraints could very well be that the sub-sector lacks critical mass because very few people have the necessary skills and knowledge. A critical mass is needed to be able to compete with import (and in the long run to export; if that will be feasible), to create a drive for innovation etc.

### 3.4 Fruit trees

The WG on fruit trees consists of Valdeta Avdiu and Maxhun Shehaj; they would like to have an expert of IBK or University as well. They discussed with key-stakeholders from MAFRD and donors/investors. They wrote a paper with an extensive introduction on fruit production and consumption in Kosovo in the last decades. This shows that many orchards were destroyed in the war; and after privatisation their productivity was very low. So in many ways this sub-sector has to start from scratch again. The efforts to rehabilitate apples orchards proved futile; with walnuts and hazelnuts it did work out well.

In their presentation the WG comes with a number of conclusions/ recommendations. We will discuss several here as they illustrate some more general points the mission likes to stress. One conclusion was that 'farmers need access to credit'. Yet, IC has organised a special credit line (with Raifeissenbank) for semi-intensive apple orchards. Despite the rather favourable conditions (3-years grace period; 14% interest) farmers were afraid to apply. This is an example of 'jumping into conclusions'. If we want to be practical we should explore why farmers hesitate to use this credit. What else can be done? Organise subsidised credit? If so, what pre-conditions can or should we attach to that? Possible examples: farmers must grow varieties demanded on the (export) market; a var. which is resistant to the crucial diseases, he must buy high quality seedlings; he must have an advisory contract with an expert, etc.

A second main constraint they see is the lack of good quality seeds. Imported seedlings (some 300.000) are cheap but of very poor quality (infected). The WG thinks that a nursery association is the key to a better fruit tree sub-sector. The central task of such an association should be to ensure that only quality seedlings reach the market. The idea has been discussed several times with potentially interested nursery owners. In doing so, the staff promotes the use of EPPO standards<sup>1</sup>. Basically this is about hygiene and record keeping (see [http://archives.eppo.org/EPPOStandards/PM4\\_CERT/pm4-07-e.doc](http://archives.eppo.org/EPPOStandards/PM4_CERT/pm4-07-e.doc)). Sometimes the nurserymen say they like the idea, sometimes they are less enthusiast. The mission thinks that they are not stable in their opinion because they are unsure about legal issues and how this will affect their markets. One source of insecurity are the many small nurseries. They do not apply proper standards and sell poor quality seedlings. To oust these from the market will be difficult, politically and technically. Interestingly these small producers are sometimes excluded from legal standards and legal requirements; e.g. in the plant protection law 'small producers do not need to register themselves (art. 25)' and they do not need plant passports for seedlings during local transport (art. 39). But what are 'small producers who sell on the local market'?

---

<sup>1</sup> EPPO is an international organisation of 48 countries covering all Europe (incl. Russia) except Serbia and Montenegro. Until the status of Kosovo is resolved it can not become member of EPPO.

To the mission strategic thinking should lead us away from the direct need of having an association to control the quality of seedling to a number of questions on the context:

- How can we make the nursery owners feel more secure on their legal position? Obviously the exemptions in the law for small producers make people worry.
- How can certifying nursery owners be sure that the competition on price and quality with small producers remains fair? The law could quantify what 'small' and 'local' means (e.g. less than 1000 seedlings; not to be transported beyond 10 km).
- How can we limit the costs of certification?
- How can farmers influence the decision making? Can they make a list of reasonable and practical criteria, derived from the EPPO standard?
- How can we ensure that both nursery owners and the certifying body have the necessary skills to implement and control the EPPO standards?

Maybe such issues could serve a questions in a ToR for a proposed to visit Italy to study the implementation of EPPO there.

### 3.5 Statistics

The WG on statistics was formed after the first mission. They reported many problems in collecting reliable data from production as municipality staff are not well motivated. Export data from customs are poor due to poor coding.

The WG is convinced that combining data can give much better insights in the actual situation in both production and im- and export. In that sense contradictions in data can be seen as an entry point for inquiries with the respective organs responsible for data collection. The WG visited some municipalities to improve the data collection.

At farm level MAFRD had started to collect detailed farm management data from 161 farms, (in the so called FADN; Farm Accounting Data Network) but, unfortunately, these can not be used as nobody knows how to operate the software.

The WG is very much willing to assist other WGs in collecting data; especially in the data needed to select the most important crops. Actually, from the beginning they want to give priority to collecting data on these crops. They want to organise a workshop to present available data to the other WGs.

### 3.6 Plant Protection

A new plant protection WG was formed with three members: Lumta (MAFRD), Basri (SPHP-K) and Ismael (IBK). They have not started with any description, but four issues came up in the discussion:

- border control (visit IBM-project and to border)
- Atlas for diseases (screen data at IBK on phyto-sanitary test)
- Visit IBK
- Work on IPM approaches of the selected products

The position of this WG is special. It was created in respond to the urgent need to develop appropriate measure against the fire blight that proved a major problem for apple producers supported by SPHP-K.

The mission advises to make a clear ToR for this WG, with two main directions:

- support to strategic planning process by presenting (in a seminar and in short overview paper that could be an annex to the horticultural strategy):

- an overview of all relevant laws and regulations
- the division of tasks and responsibilities between relevant organs (policy making; inspection and certification systems; etc.).
- existing projects and initiatives
- design a quick and practical approach to address the problem of fire blight.

It could be advantageous to sign a separate MoU on the cooperation between SPHP-K and MAFRD on the second aspect.

### 3.7 General conclusions on the Working Groups

The WGs use the strategic planning structure in their presentation, but they still struggle to put their ideas in a wider, strategic context. People are too much focused on actual problems in production and marketing and forget the support systems. The WGs focus on the primary actors in Value Chains. Maybe the most efficient way of supporting them is to allow them to do so. Let each WG indeed focus on the particular and specific aspects of their sub-sector. Then the more general context of the support systems in the horticultural sector can be analysed together. All WGs can profit from the same strategic analysis of some of these cross cutting themes:

- fiscal policies
- trade policies and (free) trade agreements
- training, extension and applied research
- producers associations / organisations
- plant protection
- quality control and certification
- export promotion
- packing and labelling industry
- marketing organisation
- credit
- etc.

A second conclusion is that the impact of the strategies could be very much enhanced if other departments of MAFRD (e.g. on research, extension, export promotion, etc.) would also gear their (support) strategies to the most important crops in the horticultural sub-sector. The following criteria were proposed to select the most crucial crops:

- a. area, yield
- b. price, Gross Margin, production costs (in absolute numbers and as % of most competitive country), profitability, man-days/ha,
- c. quantity, value and sources of imports and the quantity, value and destination of export,
- d. yield gap (potential yield minus actual yield), best yield in Kosovo, best practice (why was this yield is so high)
- e. constraints for average farmers to get such good yields.

A last conclusion was that general training is not the most efficient way to make people think strategically. In the previous mission a large number of questions were provided that the WGs could use to structure their analysis. Few made use of that. Most simply worked along the well know line of describing the issue and problems they meet in their daily work. However useful and interesting this might be, it does not automatically lead to strategic issues. The mission proposes to work more with an 'on-the-job-coaching' model for of the different

WGs. This counts both for the role of the facilitator who will start to work as of January 2008 as well as for the mission.

## 4 THE PLANNING

### 4.1 Working Groups

It was agreed that the WGs will:

- meet at least twice per month (coordinator makes schedule).
- make monthly plans and reports.
- discuss monthly plans with coordinator and report on progress in previous month.

The WG will use the following format to plan their work for the coming month. It is filled with an example:

Opinions/ data needed	Activity (incl. preparation)	When?	Who takes part in what?	Date report
How does the Albanian government support grape producers ?	- Internet search - Ask Albanian colleagues - Visit Albania - Calculate cost price in Alb.	- 5 Jan. - 6 Jan. - 14-17 Jan.	- Mrs. X. - Mr. Y	20 Jan.
-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-

The following tables will be used to report on the progress made:

Planned activity (incl. date)	Ideas/ Data collected	Strategic conclusion	Which part of final report	Who will write this?
- Internet search (5 Jan.) - Ask Albanian colleagues (6 Jan.) - Visit Albania (14-17 Jan.) - Calculate cost price in Alb.	- reports of FAO, IFAD, Oxfam - opinions and ideas on support to grape producers - costs price in Albania -	- Albanian grapes are cheaper but Kosovo ones taste better - We need to support our producers more - Our producers get good prices but the processors are no competitive.	- par. on export (3.1) - relevant par. on support systems (chap. 4,5 or 6) - par. on competitiveness (10.4)	- Mr. Y
-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-

The next page gives the table that can be used to collect all relevant data to select the ten horticultural priority crops for Kosovo.

During the general workshop the participants asked the mission to provide them with a structure that would be similar for all WGs. The mission agreed on that; see Annex III.



## 4.2 Coordination/ Facilitation

From January 2008 onwards, SPHP-K will employ a facilitator to coordinate the work on the strategic planning in the horticultural sector in Kosovo. Her main responsibility is to ensure that the WG learn effectively. She will act as a facilitator to the work to be done in the WGs. Her concrete tasks are:

- Assist the WG in implementing the methodology provided by the IA. In case the method is not clear, contact the IA.
- Monitor the progress in the WG and ensure a smooth working process. In case of lack of progress call a meeting with head of DPD in MAFRD and SPHP-K manager
- Facilitate the planning and implementation of activities by WGs
- Facilitate WGs in making presentations and in writing
- Organise seminars on Cross Cutting Themes
- Assist WG in making ToRs for studies, field visits, etc. Ensure that people know what they want to learn during these activities and that they reflect and report on the experience afterwards
- Report on the progress to MAFRD, IC and IA via monthly reports, to which the reports of the WG are annexed.
- In case a WG asks finance for activities, advice MAFRD and/or IC on the approval of the ToR
- Prepare Steering Committee meetings by providing (quarterly) progress reports
- Promote the work of the WGs and seek for learning opportunities for them
- Prepare ToRs for the IA. This included training needs.

The facilitator has to ensure that the WG can work and learn effectively and efficiently. Yet the responsibility for the final output of the WG (both in terms of content and timing etc.) lies entirely with the WG and more especially with its chairperson.

Every three months the Steering Committee is informed about the progress

## 5 CONCLUSIONS AND THE WAY FORWARD

The training on Value Chain Development was successful; people participated actively and the subject was relevant for the process of sub-sector strategy development.

The work with the WGs underlined their difficulties in thinking strategically. People are too much involved in the matters they discuss, to reflect on the issues in more general terms. Many participants have lots of ideas of what should be done and they spend much more time and energy in improving these ideas than on how such improvements fit into a more general strategy. Many ideas expressed in the WG are very relevant. These are the issues to be tackled; only the way to tackle them needs a different way of entering the discussion. The issues have been identified in a bottom-up-process with the industry; yet now we need to bring in a more long-term strategic dimension.

Although people are active in the training and they seem to appreciate it; they do not use the method offered in the training. Maybe the approach to strategic planning was a bridge too far. The idea was to train people in general strategic planning skills and then let them apply this in their WG. Although people appreciated this approach and although it was useful in creating a common language, the mission proposes to change it towards an 'on-the-job coaching and mentoring'. Working with each WG (directly during missions and indirectly via the newly appointed facilitator) will allow the mission to give more attention to the actual strategic discussions. In the same way, hopefully the clear 'Table of Content' for the sub-sector strategies will allow us to focus more on the 'content' and less on the 'form'.

The next support mission should be in April. Before that the WGs should have completed the description of the sub-sector; or at least of one of the key-Value Chains of this sub-sector.

**ANNEX I: TOR MISSION**

<b>Swiss Project for Horticulture Promotion - Kosovo (SPHP-K)</b>		<b>Projekti Zvicran për Promovimin e Hortikulturës - Kosovë (PZPH-K)</b>
Prishtina office: Mithat Frasheri, Str. 6, Arberia/Dragodan 038/243034		Gjakova office: M. Grameno, Str.3 0390/325479

## ***Terms of Reference***

Second backstopping mission of Gerrit Hotland - short-term consultant in Horticulture Sector Strategic Planning  
November 2007

### **Background information**

In 2001, Intercooperation was mandated by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation to implement the Swiss Project for Horticultural Promotion in Kosovo. The objective of the Project is to support Kosovo horticultural producers to better compete in quality, price and continuity of supply with imported products. The focus is on market-oriented producers in selected areas with enabling conditions (land, water, access to the market, etc.).

### **Purpose of the backstopping mission**

The purpose of this backstopping mission will be to support both the Project and MAFRD in the strategic planning for the Horticulture sector. Assess the progress between two mission and provide guidance for future.

### **Specific Tasks**

#### ***Training “Value Chain Development”– 2 Days***

Training on Value chain development, similar to one that provides MDF and HPC, will help the MAFRD and IC staff to better understand what a VC is and who are different actors of VCs.

#### ***Workshops – 3 days***

- Five workshops (one with each working group) to assess the progress made and advise on future steps
- One workshop with all working groups to present the findings and provide guidelines for future steps

#### ***Other businesses***

- Meeting with the MAFRD officials regarding strategic planning and policies.
- Field visits to the SPHPK clients.

Duration

Working days	7
Travel days	2
Backstopping days from the Nederland's	2
Total	11

### **Expected outputs**

This consultancy should lead to:

- A short report in English
- Recommendations for further steps

### **Programme:**

From 21st to 30th November 07

<b>Day</b>	<b>Main Activity</b>	<b>Responsible persons</b>
Wednesday, 21 <sup>st</sup>	Arrival Prishtina airport Discussion with SPHPK and MAFRD	
Thursday 22 <sup>nd</sup>	Training "Value Chain Development"	
Friday 23 <sup>rd</sup>	Training "Value Chain Development"	
Saturday 24 <sup>th</sup>	Training "Value Chain Development"	
Sunday 25 <sup>th</sup>	OFF	
Monday 26 <sup>th</sup>	Workshop with fruit group Workshop with ornamental/MAP group	
Tuesday 27 <sup>th</sup>	Workshop with wine and grape group Workshop with vegetable group Workshop with plant protection	
Wednesday 28 <sup>th</sup>	Government holiday – discussions with SPHPK	
Thursday 29 <sup>th</sup>	Workshop with all working groups	
Friday 30 <sup>th</sup>	Report writing and debriefing Departure	