



INTERNATIONAL PARTNERS WORKSHOP

BAMAKO, MALI: 12-14 MARCH 2012



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Day 1

Introduction	6
Opening ceremony	6
Organising ourselves	8
Strengthening country partnerships: lessons from three countries	8
Prolinnova networking and partnerships in 2012 and beyond	15
Assessing the general situation of network after the end of DGIS support	16

Day 2

Update on FAIR programme	16
POG update	19
Update on GCARD	22
Fundraising progress and opportunities	23
PID for climate-change adaptation	23
Parallel regional review and planning meetings	25

Day 3

Local innovation & experimentation for climate-change adaptation in Asia (Linex-CCA)	25
Combining local innovative capacity with scientific research for CCA (East Africa)	27
Southern Africa regional meeting	28
West Africa regional meeting	29
Open space	29
Wrap-up	34
Evaluation	34

Annex 1: Opening programme	36
Annex 2: IPW schedule of activities	37
Annex 3: List of participants	38
Annex 4: Fundraising mapping exercise	39
Annex 5: Outputs of group discussions on fundraising	41
Annex 6: Action list Prolinnova IPW 2012	45
Annex 7: Spider web workshop evaluation	48
Annex 8: List of Power Point Presentations	49

List of acronyms

AARINENA	Association of Agricultural Research Institutions in the Near East and North Africa
AgTrain	Agricultural Transformation by Innovation
APAARI	Asia-Pacific Association of Agricultural Research Institutions
ARD	Agricultural research for development
AOPP	Association of Professional Farmer Organization
CBO	Community-based Organisation
CCARDESA	Centre for Coordination of Agricultural Research and Development for Southern Africa
CEDAC	Centre d'Etude et de Développement Agricole Cambodgien
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CRPs	CGIAR Research Programmes
CIDA	Canada International Development Agency
CSOs	Civil-society organisations
CLIC-SR	Combining Local Innovative Capacity with Scientific Research
CC	Climate change
CCA	Climate-change adaptation
COMPAS	Comparing and supporting endogenous development
CORAF	Conference of the agricultural research leaders in West and Central Africa
CPs	Country Platforms
CSO-GARD	CSO Group on Agricultural Research for Development
ERA-ARD	Agricultural Research for Development (ARD) dimension of the European Research Area
FAIR	Farmer Access to Innovation Resources
FARA	Forum on Agricultural Research in Africa
FORAGRO	Forum for the American on Agricultural Research and Technology Development
GFAR	Global Forum for Agricultural Research
GFRAS	Global Forum on Rural Advisory Services
GCARD	Global Conference on Agricultural Research for Development
IEC	Information, Education and Communication
IIRR	International Institute of Rural Reconstruction
INHERE	The Institute of Himalayan Environmental Research and Education
IPW	International Partners Workshop
IYFF	International Year for Family Farming
IST	International Support Team
INSARD	Integrating Smallholders in ARD
JOLISAA	Joint Learning in Innovation Systems in African Agriculture
KARI	Kenya Agricultural Research Institute
KZN	Kwazulu-Natal
LI-BIRD	Local Initiatives for Biodiversity, Research and Development
LINEX-CCA	Local Innovation and Experimentation: An Entry Point to Climate-Change Adaptation for Sustainable Livelihoods in Asia
LISF	Local Innovation Support Fund
LSC	Local Steering Committee
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MoA	Ministry of Agriculture
MSP	Multi-stakeholder partnership

NAPA	National Action Plan for Adaptation
NSC	National Steering Committee
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
PID	Participatory innovation development
PROLINNOVA	Promoting Local Innovation in ecologically oriented agriculture and NRM
POG	PROLINNOVA OVERSIGHT GROUP
PK	PROLINNOVA–KENYA
RELC Ghana	Research and Extension Linkages Committee - Ghana
RP	Regional Programmes
RUAF	Resource Centres on Urban Agriculture and Food Security
SA	South Africa
SCI-SLM	Stimulating Community Initiatives in Sustainable Land Management
SRI	Systems in Rice Intensification
VDC	Village Development Committee
WFR	World Rural Forum

DAY 1 (March 12, 2012)

The day started with participants and guests for the opening session visiting the Information Market. The following Country Platforms (CPs) displayed posters, publications, CDs and other documents featuring PROLINNOVA work in their respective countries: Cambodia, Ghana, Uganda, South Africa, PROFEIS (Promoting Farmer Innovation and Experimentation in the Sahel) Mali, Kenya, Ethiopia and Nepal. PROLINNOVA International comprised of ETC in the Netherlands and the International Institute of Rural Reconstruction (IIRR) also displayed their materials. It also set aside a table where IPW participants picked up their copies of the new booklet *Farmer-Led Documentation*.

OPENING CEREMONY

The theme of the IPW 2012 is “Building research on farmer generated solutions and not on constraints”. In French, “Batir la recherché a partir des solutions paysannes et non sur les contraintes”. See Annex 1 for the programme of the opening.

Welcome by ADAF-Gallé

Mr. Lassina Sylvestre Diame of the board of ADAF-Gallé welcomed the participants and guests to the PROLINNOVA annual international workshop. He acknowledged the presence of farmers, international participants from 17 countries and representatives of partner organisations present.

Remarks on behalf of PROFEIS Mali

Assétou Kanouté, coordinator of PROFEIS Mali, expounded the need to focus on smallholder farmers because they have little resources and yet they play very strategic role in a country’s economy. She said that the current research practice in most of Sahel does not consider the fact that farmers have been experimenting for decades to address agricultural production issues in the region. This calls for transformation based on the creativity of the farmers and their ability to experiment leading to local innovations that solve their own problems. PROFEIS, she declared, focuses on promoting farmers’ contribution to socio-economic development by increasing agricultural production that take into consideration both ecological conditions and climate-change issues that threaten sustainable natural resources development. PROLINNOVA is a global network that recognises the innovation of farmers. In Mali, PROFEIS takes on this role. Out of the 40 farmer innovations that have been identified, 10 are currently supported by the collaboration between researchers/scientists, extension professionals and the farmers. Where the practice was more top-down in the past, Mali is experiencing efforts towards initiatives drawn from the grassroots and farmer-generated experimentation as entry points for development work.

Remarks on behalf of PROLINNOVA global network

Scott Killough, Co-Chair of the PROLINNOVA Oversight Group (POG), appreciated the organisation of the workshop by the local partners, ADAF-Gallé and PROFEIS Mali. PROLINNOVA as a global network is interested in working in ecologically oriented agriculture, fostering local innovation and joint innovation

processes, focused on the dynamics of indigenous knowledge and local innovation. Scott stressed that PROLINNOVA is interested in how to enhance innovation capacities of local resource users so that they can adjust to the adverse conditions that affect their production. It supports local resource users to develop and adapt their own systems and processes and institutions that will appropriately push for community-led development. Representation in PROLINNOVA is comprised of 19 countries around the world. It is an NGO-led initiative at both national and international levels. It is comprised of multi-stakeholder partnerships such as the academe, research institutions, government departments, NGOs and farmer associations. It seeks to enhance the capacities of farmers as well as extension agents to engage in learning and national development, and engages in regional and national policy dialogue to stimulate participation. Its funding comes from various sources and it has developed materials to share the work from the various CPs.

Remarks by the President of Association of Professional Farmer Organization

Mr Tiassé Coulibaly, president of the Association of Professional Farmer Organizations acknowledged the farmers and the farmer organisations for coming to the event. The collaboration from researchers, extensionists and farmers has led to local innovations, something new that has solved the farmers' problems. To be able to create something new, those who have stakes have to be involved. Researchers have to encourage and support the farmers; without supporting them, we will not go anywhere. No one has to be isolated from the other. He also sends greetings on behalf of the President of the Business Chamber, who is not present due to an illness. He emphasised the need to work hard together and not to underestimate the innovations that farmers are doing. Researchers, he said, are also at the heart of these innovations and that has to be acknowledged. Objectives may not be achieved immediately but all stakeholders have to trust each other. Without trust, he said, change will not happen. He formally declared the workshop open.

A two-person team summarized all opening remarks in Bambara language.

Video presentation on PROLINNOVA

A video on PROLINNOVA's work was presented. The video described the need for linking science with people who are directly involved in the production of our food, alliances with government, civil-society organisations (CSOs) and research institutions in order to produce food in sustained ways. It described the work of PROLINNOVA in improving the capacities of the rural poor to address food-security issues. Some of the work featured includes the promotion of the Systems in Rice Intensification (SRI) in Cambodia, which focuses on ecological practices that reduce consumption of water, reduce the use of chemicals, improving access to market and other efforts towards building people's capacities to do something for themselves.

Slide presentation on local innovations in Mali

A slide presentation on local innovations in Mali followed the PROLINNOVA video presentation. The slide presentation featured the following innovations: Formulating herbal solutions to solve tomato pest infestation, low-cost hatchery made from mud, improving the *npegou* fruits by grafting with *ngouna* to make the *npegou* fruits bigger and sweeter, use of ash in raising guinea fowls to reduce mortality rates, use of a root of a plant to treat open wounds of donkeys which can be fatal. Some of the farmers have been working with researchers for more than four years. One innovation was not focused on technology but on an organisational approach towards poor children's education in a village where donkey cart owners contributed to the building of a community school and funding the salaries of teachers. A group of women monitors the quality of education and meets with parents when children are not able to attend school. Those farmers who tested the innovations were also introduced.

The formal IPW sessions started in the afternoon.

ORGANISING OURSELVES

Laurens facilitated the preliminary activities. He apologised for those who were not able to join the IPW due to reasons which include funding limitations to bringing all CP representatives to IPW 2012 and a case of one person missing his flight. He thanked the members who were able to source funds for their attendance. He welcomed India as a new CP. He shared that Malawi expressed interest in PROLINNOVA and went further to explain that the Uganda CP was able to bring more than one person to the meeting because it was able to find creative ways to fund their attendance. He reviewed the schedule with the participants and touched on the logic behind the programme. See Annex 2 for the full programme.

The course of the discussions in the next two and half days according to Laurens might bring about issues/topics that the participants (see Annex 3 for the full list of participants) could explore during the Open Space session. The issues in the Open Space will be collected in a continuous process. Jean-Marie and Ann volunteered to identify the issues that would emerge.

Aissata, the person responsible for the administrative and logistics support for the workshop, outlined briefly travel-related requirements such as visas, tickets and reimbursements. All PowerPoint presentations are listed in Annex 8.

The afternoon was chaired by Amanuel Assefa.

STRENGTHENING COUNTRY PARTNERSHIPS: LESSONS FROM CASE STUDIES IN KENYA, TANZANIA AND UGANDA

There were two presenters for this session: Teresiah Ng'ang'a and Joseph Ssuuna.

The PROLINNOVA–Kenya case study

Teresiah presented the network study in Kenya. She works with the Kenya Agricultural Research Institute (KARI). She is currently the PROLINNOVA–Kenya (PK) coordinator, a position funded by the JOLISAA (Joint Learning in Innovation Systems in African Agriculture) project. She presented a brief background of the study which centred on the importance of multi-stakeholder partnership (MSP) for PROLINNOVA. This had been confirmed during the IPW 2011 in Morogoro, where a presentation on a study about and the case of Nepal was made. The PK platform started with 40 partners interested in PROLINNOVA in 2006. This number came down to less than 10 by the time of the study.

The objectives of the study were as follows:

1. To examine PK as a network, identify the bottlenecks experienced and explore strategies to strengthen it.
2. To provide increased insights in the appropriateness of the MSP approach in institutionalising participatory research and extension approaches.
3. Examine how to improve the functioning of country-level MSPs as key entry points to relevant organisations.
4. To offer lessons on multi-stakeholder processes to PROLINNOVA globally.

It used the Appreciative Inquiry approach facilitated by two independent consultants guiding the face-to-face discussions and interviews. It focused on the past successes articulated through a timeline. This helped identify the milestones of PK. The key milestones include:

- 2006: formation of task force in a meeting attended by more than 40 organisations; first PK Coordinator was appointed
- 2007: PK was officially launched and received the first funding allocation from PROLINNOVA International
- 2008: second funding allocation, second PK coordinator appointed, members began to become inactive and by 2011 there were only 5 active members, who were all members of the National Steering Committee (NSC)
- 2009: innovators and farmers were trained on LISF (Local Innovation Support fund) and LISF/Local Steering Committee (LSC) started in Eastern and Western Kenya, JOLISAA project under the PK platform was born
- 2010: third PK Coordinator appointed, LISF continues, POG visit
- 2011: fourth PK Coordinator appointed, innovators participated in exhibits and gained recognition, members received more frequent information, LISF funds disbursed in Eastern and Western Kenya, external evaluation of LISF conducted, policy workshop organised and inactive members began to become active.

She presented the following challenges identified during the study:

- Not being legally registered limited PK's ability to mobilise resources and grow its activities

- The need to sustain the enthusiasm of innovator farmers in the FAIR (Farmer Access to Innovation Resources) programme, since it is the key driving force for PK
- Members have benefited from training; however, since the first meeting in 2006, this is not utilised within PK.

Key recommendations from the review:

- Registration of PK as a legal entity
- Policy advocacy: by coordinating organisations in appropriate policy formulation
- Resource mobilisation
- Documentation and dissemination of innovations
- Joint learning: farmer-led exhibitions, participatory innovation development (PID), facilitation of exchange visits...
- IEC (information, Education and Communication) to members and the general public.

It is important to strengthen PK focusing on its branding, administration structures, better communication among the NSC members and membership strengthening through recruitment and sustaining their active involvement.

As a way forward, PK came up with a strategic plan as direct output of the study. It has crafted its Vision and Mission statements, agreed on key principles that would guide the functioning of the CP and identified key strategies to fulfil its mission. It has also identified the following key work objectives for 2012–17:

1. Resource mobilisation: adequate resources generated to enable implementation of PK activities
2. Joint learning: platforms and frameworks for information and knowledge generation and sharing created
3. IEC: information and knowledge on local innovation generated, documented and disseminated
4. Advocacy: stakeholders sensitised and influenced on the importance of local innovation in ARD
5. PK strengthening: functional national secretariat established with representation at county level
6. Institutionalisation: incorporation of PK approaches into the core business of the member organisations.

Plenary Discussion

- Ann explained further how PK started: while Tanzania and Uganda, the two other cases in the study, were part of the DGIS funding, what Kenya received when it started was very little and even unable to pay for a coordinator.
- Sonali stated that PROLINNOVA–India started out with few resources but it got connected to other NGOs and stakeholders. There will be a number that would come on board and fall out and she sees this as a normal process. It is a dynamic process where we should see that there is no obligation for organisations to remain.

- Samson commented that making it a legal entity will change the current set-up and relations with country partners. It would be to its advantage to remain as a loose network for advocacy purposes. Teresiah responded by saying that they are not yet clear what form they would like to be but the idea is towards having a legal framework.
- According to Laurens, PK is different from other CPs, which started small, with only a few partners, and then grew. PK started large with 40 interested organisations and scaled down to a few. We can look at this as two different processes: from small to big and from big to few, which may not be bad. The role of the International Secretariat is to support the partnership to grow.
- Moses raised the issue that PROLINNOVA members usually focus on their interest and without funding, they backslide. If there is an opportunity for raising funds for their organisation and for PROLINNOVA, one will have to prioritise.
- Assétou asserted that it is important that those who are joining be clear of the stakes. Who are the key actors? Who is the key leader of PK? Is it the farmer, researcher or extension? How were funds allocated among the partners?
- Amanuel raised the question if we really need to have a full-time independent coordinator? In Ethiopia's experience, a professional coordinator reduced the involvement of the NSC. There were serious gaps in information. A full-time coordinator may not be a good idea. Teresiah responded that there is quite a good level of support from the IST. The first coordinator sustained interest for some time while working as a volunteer. When she left the NGO, no-one took on the coordination. The funds available were only for small activities so there is no question on how to allocate to 40 members. What it needs is a strong coordinator who can take the process through.
- Laurens commented that, with a big number of partners, we cannot expect all of them to be fully engaged. Followers may withdraw; we should focus on why they withdraw. But it is important to also keep organizations/people not directly involved in key activities such as FAIR informed and up to date, e.g. by organising a wider Email update to those that showed interest!
- Amanuel added that this presentation is a good reflection on our partnership. There are impressive things about PROLINNOVA and building institutions for each country is very different. He suggested that PROLINNOVA continue the study.

Overall network MSP study

Joseph Ssuuna explained that this is still work in progress. Apart from Kenya also Tanzania and Uganda are involved in this study, each with their own consultants. Joseph is overall in charge of the study and tasked to draw out lessons learnt across all three countries. Joseph stressed that the comments and reflections that come out of the discussion will be built into the report.

The study was guided by the following research questions:

- There is an emerging dwindling in the ownership of PROLINNOVA why?
- Why was there a loss of interest and drop-out among some members?
- Why were some members failing to fulfil their commitments to the partnership?
- Some members expressed dissatisfaction with how the coordination function in the network was fulfilled. Why?
- There were contestations over resource allocation in the network? Why?

In summary, the focus of the study is finding out the reasons behind fading commitment and interest and finding ways to re-energise the PROLINNOVA networks under study.

In each country the consultants organised consultations with the national secretariats, did face-to-face interviews, used E-consultations and organised a national workshop where initial findings were shared and validated. The workshop also generated additional insights.

Joseph touched on the key aspects of PROLINNOVA work, which include: networking, capacity development, mainstreaming of local innovation, information sharing and policy influencing and the Local Innovation Support Fund (LISF).

On networking, PROLINNOVA has served as a platform for networking within countries and with the broader global PROLINNOVA network. The extent it has allowed interaction at various levels kept members interested and committed.

On capacity development, the CPs provided opportunities for understanding the value of action learning, reflection and analysis. There is appreciation for international and national workshops, conferences and training as well as links to scholarships. All of these enhanced member engagement and commitment in PROLINNOVA activities.

On mainstreaming agricultural innovation system, PROLINNOVA plays an important role in integrating PID into government programmes. It has managed to enhance successful implementation of national laws and policies supportive of PID and its institutionalisation into agricultural research and development. In Kenya, for example, local research institutions have become more open to the participation of farmers.

The LISF, an innovative approach to generating new technologies initiated by farmers, served as a mechanism to operationalise PID on the ground. It provided practical ways to link with local communities. Since it is a global initiative, there is network-wide sharing on lessons and insights from country-level implementation. LISF is also emerging to be a strategic tool for empowering farmers as they take on the responsibility for managing the funds and the accountability associated with it.

On information sharing and policy influencing, PROLINNOVA is a dynamic source of information widely shared in both electronic and print forms. It offers opportunities for influencing the policies government and research institutions. For example, KARI in Kenya has now recognised farmers as innovators.

The fluid management practice has allowed people to take responsibility and leadership, which enhance ownership. Organisations put in resources. The nature of coordination and management in the network

reflect the depth of participatory practice within the network. In all three countries, there is a Secretariat and a NSC with open and flexible members. There is joint planning at the national level. Host organisations commit human and financial resources beyond the resources allocated to them.

Joseph presented the following challenges in making the MSPs function:

1. The three CPs have not been registered, limiting their ambition and making them dependent on the benevolence of its members to implement its programmes.
2. Since it is not a legal entity, the roles, obligations and responsibilities of the different stakeholders were not clearly defined and necessary structures, rules and regulations were not sufficiently in place.
3. The documentation of the process and evolution of the partnership has been weak. Despite the significant increase in recognition of local innovation development, there is limited public awareness. Its publications, field days and agency-level briefings have not been sufficiently used to support the popularising and dissemination of farmer innovations and associated processes.
4. Funds from the International Secretariat are earmarked for specific projects such as JOLISSA and LISF and therefore are insufficient to keep all members actively involved, creating tensions and contestations between those who take on the lead in implementation and those who do not. There is also scanty involvement in joint proposal development and resource mobilisation.
5. Varying interests and expectations of a range of partners affect the way members perceive and respond to their roles and obligations to their partnership.
6. Proactive internal advocacy targeted at its member organisations has not been fully taken up to enhance wide ownership of the PROLINNOVA
7. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) is still weak despite the training courses offered by PROLINNOVA, which could be due to absence of or weak performance indicators.
8. The Secretariat is a one-person team who works only a few hours per week.

He recommended the following to address the challenges:

1. Strengthening the network. He suggested having more partner interactions without relying on the Secretariat to organise such events, transforming local innovation into major cross-cutting themes, take on farmer innovations to the next generation of farmers, the students, provide CPs legal stature and conduct induction programmes clarifying roles and responsibilities of members on the onset.
2. Share a lot of information by making use of IT and other media such as blogging. Hold regular meetings and retreats, involve members in hands-on learning and provide a platform for publishing case studies and proactively looking for ideas that work.
3. International support through the International Secretariat and International Support Team (IST) needs to be more visible by holding monthly meetings via Skype. It should encourage participation in joint strategy setting, concept development and fundraising. It should focus on strategic planning and network building.
4. Encourage more than one representative during CP events and meetings to address the challenge of staff turnover. While senior leader representation in these meetings are ideal, they are often too

busy and are unable to drive the PROLINNOVA agenda in their organisations, thus, establishing the case for a second representative.

5. Make more frequent visits to partner organisations and presenting to the leadership of these partner organisations updates to strengthen their link with PROLINNOVA.
6. Strengthen participation by inviting all partners to contribute to the drafting of proposals and mobilisation of resources.
7. Apply participatory M&E to the programmes implemented and to assess member participation.

The outcome of this study will be refined further and published in a booklet form.

Plenary Discussion

- Scott commented that many of the findings have similarities to the Nepal study last year
- Assétou asked if PROLINNOVA is registered in the Netherlands. Ann responded that it is not. PROLINNOVA activities are funded through individual partners, which then share the funds with other partners in the network.
- Sonali remarked that turnover of staff is a reality and that has to be accepted, especially if they get better opportunities. It is a regular process that organisations go through. What is most important is for PROLINNOVA to be mainstreamed in the partner organisations.
- Zimi commented on the need to critically look at the varied interests of the partners so that we can know who can drive the PROLINNOVA agenda as soon as the partnership is formed. The CPs cannot champion the interests of international institutions; we need to document the varied interests of the partners so that we are properly guided on how to direct PROLINNOVA in country.
- Brigid finds the registration of PROLINNOVA quite difficult as there are varying capacities for organisations to receive funds, for example, government departments have more complex financial systems.
- Amanuel: What incentives should be provided to increase the levels of participation of members?
- Ann: What do you mean by having a legal framework? Joseph: There are different ways for legal existence in a country. I am referring to a situation where members can simply walk in and out of the partnership without a legal framework binding them, a framework which all members subscribe to. These are the rules of procedures, a document that people sign up to express their commitment. The members are of different categories; they have different interests that drive them to join. Some think of PROLINNOVA as an opportunity for funding. Others are committed as they see that the partnership could enhance their programmes.

The participants were divided into four groups to respond to the following three questions:

1. Which of the recommendations by Joseph do you agree with?
2. Which of these recommendations you do not agree with?
3. Give examples of how some of these are already happening

The small groups wrote their main points on cards and attached them to the relevant recommendations. Joseph will incorporate these comments and examples into the final version of the study report.

PROLINNOVA NETWORKING AND PARTNERSHIP IN 2012 AND BEYOND

Presenter: Scott Killough

Scott reminded the participants of the “PROLINNOVA networking and partnership in 2012 and beyond” document which was circulated to them earlier. The document contains the basic agreement on the minimum commitments to sustain the network. The dramatic reduction in the International Secretariat funding had implications for our international, regional and national network, and during IPW 2011 we asked ourselves whether we can continue. Our collective response was to continue and agree on what would be the minimum level of activities we can commit to even if we do not have CP- or international-level funding. We agreed on what we can sustain at the minimum level. Some of us may be able to do much more because we are able to find resources.

Scott also presented the addendum to the minimum requirements. The addendum, which is now the final section of the document, lists the consequences of not meeting the minimum commitments that would lead to declaring a CP inactive. All participants were requested to read and send in their comments to Ann or Scott by the end of the week.

PLENARY DISCUSSION

- There is a message sent by Ann with an annual report from Cameroon, which can serve as an inspiration to all of us for the type of brief annual reports that we all agreed to do; this was the newest CP and has no funding through the International Secretariat.
- South Africa has not done the full report but has submitted the half-year report.
- Joseph: Do members sign up to these minimum requirements? Scott: In a way yes, when it is circulated, the members are given time for comments and, if they do not give any comments, they are in principle agreeing to the minimum requirements.
- Ann: What we have is commitment to the principles.
- Scott: It was discussed last year for further comments; last year the draft was circulated. We are finalising today, which means it becomes effective beginning today.
- Joseph: Who has the final say that a CP is declared inactive? Scott: The POG, since it is also the POG that is responsible for accepting new CPs.
- Amanuel: What about rejoining? Is it possible for a CP declared inactive to rejoin? Scott: The idea of rejoining can be added.

ASSESSING THE GENERAL SITUATION OF NETWORK AFTER THE END OF DGIS SUPPORT

Presenter: Marise Espineli

Marise distributed the assessment form she developed with other members of the POG. The format followed the minimum requirements for CP functioning. She explained the format and how the CP and IST representatives can fill it in. Participants were given 15 minutes to fill in the form.

Question: Is it possible to have more than one answer for each item? Yes, for items after number 1. It is important to substantiate response by citing specific titles, for example, of documents uploaded and published.

DAY 2 (March 13, 2012)

UPDATE ON FAIR

Presenter: Laurens van Veldhuizen

Laurens presented the lessons from the action research on Local Innovations Support Fund (LISF) of the past few years based on discussions of the pre-workshop meeting of the countries involved. The action research was guided by the following questions:

- Does the LISF work effectively? Does the system generate applications, process them, disburse money and monitor its use?
- Is the LISF cost efficient? Does it perform all of above tasks with acceptable handling and overhead/management costs?
- Is the LISF a sustainable system? Has it a farmer co-managed institutional setting to continue beyond project funding?

The basic operation of LISF is characterised by the following: farmers/groups write and submit a grant/loan application which includes plan and budget for an innovation development activity. The farmers are actively involved as members of a screening committee that selects and disburses funds. Basic to grant approval is that the activities are for innovation and learning and not for farm investments.

The implementation of LISF varied following diverse designs that worked for each implementing CP. Cambodia implemented in many provinces and districts. In Ethiopia, it is implemented in three districts. Approval of the grants was vested in farmer groups (community-based organisations / CBOs) in Uganda, one district in Ethiopia and South Africa, whereas, in all the other CPs and in the two other districts in Ethiopia, this is a decision taken either in the district, regional or national-level Steering Committee (whichever is applicable in the country).

There were 1180 proposals received within the span of 3-7 years implementation by the CPs. There are 759 proposals approved. In some countries, proposals were made by individual farmers while, in others, these were submitted by groups. There are also some differences in mobilising applications:

- Some decentralised, farmers making the decisions
- Some consist of partner organisation
- Group applications with applications from many members
- Others accepting wider range of applications

- Some consider only those that will be done with researchers while others accept proposals even without researcher involvement.

Of the individual applications, 43% came from women. Processing time also varied. From entering the application, it took 97 days for Uganda and 37 days for Nepal. The M&E system is not perfect. Some are able to collect and keep relevant data while others not. Average grant is 85\$ per innovation.

LISF is mostly used for joint experimentation, farmers' own experimentation and strengthening farmer innovations. "Farmers' own experimentation" refers to experiments done by the farmers themselves. Some grants are also used for training by and with farmers, cross visits and farmer-led documentation. More than 60% of the applications were approved. There is increasing success percentage because of the support by the partner staff in improving the first drafts of proposals.

There is also diversity in decision-making procedures. Each country would fall in any of these three approaches: (1) centralised multi-stakeholder where a screening committee decides, (2) decentralised multi-stakeholder where a committee at the district level decides and (3) decentralised multi-stakeholder where a farmer/CBO-based committee decides. It follows a dynamic process especially when the committees are strong.

Transaction costs differ. Because of the small grant size there are considerable transaction / coordination cost. Typically 30-40% of the total cost has been allocated to farmers. Apart from coordination and transaction funds were also used for training and the action research and M&E itself.. This raises a question of what is a fair distribution to the farmers. In order to allocate more funds to farmers, transactions costs can be further reduced. After piloting, there can be less coordination costs. More LISF funds can be processed with the same costs (more districts, more grants, larger grants for joint experimentation). Transaction costs may also be reduced if greater role is assigned to farmers/CBOs, stimulate CBO-managed revolving funds to continue LISF grants without agency costs and simplify LISF procedures, application forms and formats.

He concluded his presentation on the following notes on lessons learned:

- There is no single best model. It is important to consolidate and identify 2 or 3 models that would work.
- Keep in mind that these models change over time as people involved get more experience and face new challenges.
- Farmers are interested in experimentation funds once they understand how it works.
- LISF cannot be done without organisation. It has to be done with existing participatory programmes. It requires a good institutional setting where LISF can be done more efficiently.
- Decentralisation is the way to go. This has to be coupled with capacity building and ensuring that quality controls are set in place.

In summary, he presented the following response to the action research questions:

1. Models for LISF implementation that work well have been found; most are still work in progress and not fully clearly documented;
2. Current models needs to be more efficient and further streamlining is possible;
3. LISF has not yet found a sustainable farmer co-managed institutional basis in the country but is implemented as an externally funded project. This is now a key priority.

This year is a transition year. We need to prepare to make these findings solid. We need to consolidate the models as found feasible in the country by documenting with clear description on how the model works. We need good documentation so that we can be better prepared to upscale the model, to be able to identify what institutional arrangement would move it forward. With this, we will be able to bring government staff and heads of organisations to the field and mobilise LISF implementation on a bigger scale.

A potential LISF upscaling scenario may include:

- A National Local Innovation Fund within a credible national farmer organisation
- Integration into Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) extension e.g. through RELC (Ghana)
- LISF sub-unit under government research like a sub-unit under KARI
- Establishment of National Innovation Fund with a new legal identity, perhaps under responsibility of the MoA
- Self-managed, resourced CBO-based LISFs
- Link to existing innovation funds.

PLENARY DISCUSSION

- Brigid: In South Africa, the cost of transaction is allocated to organisations. How is this in others? Does the allocation to the farmers include staff salaries associated with the initiative? Laurens: Part of it pays the partners' time.
- Vitou: In our case, partners' time is based on the activity approach, if they plan for providing one day training to farmer organisation, they charge only for one day. Only actual days for training are charged, not the whole salary.
- Zimmi: The partners sponsor their own time in Ghana. Partners can also absorb part of the cost since it will benefit them anyway. There are real costs to the organisation, even if these are not charged to FAIR.
- The allocation that goes to the farmers is very low, as observed by Amanuel. In Ethiopia the law says that 70% of the funds received by NGOs must go to the farmers. AgriService Ethiopia considers most of its work in PROLINNOVA as administrative. LISF will lead to cases of PID, joint experimentation. There is a need on the part of the researchers to build farmers' confidence in

the researcher. In Ethiopia, farmers get 50% but only up to 35% for coordination, which does not include training and M&E. The host get less than 15% of the total amount.

- Joseph: Who sets the criteria for approving the grants? Laurens: The criteria are based on agreed joined principles for FAIR. The CPs operationalize and set their criteria often through interaction with farmers
- Suman: In Nepal, there are LISF guidelines; the partners follow the guidelines.
- Scott: Are we aware of resources available in the country that can be tapped for the LISF or similar efforts done in a country? Are we able to influence those?

POG UPDATE

Presenter: Scott Killough

Scott gave a brief introduction about the purposes of the PROLINNOVA Oversight Group (POG), which are mainly to ensure the effectiveness of its work and transparency and accountability to its national, regional and international level partners and donors. The POG is responsible for overseeing the functioning of the Secretariat including its financial management, arbitrating conflicts between and among partners and donors and ensuring that there is adequate M&E and that advocacy efforts are done effectively.

The POG has nine members: four from the CPs/RPs (one each from Andes, Asia-Pacific, Francophone Africa and non-Francophone Africa), three independent members (non-PROLINNOVA), one from the IST (excluding ETC) and one ex-officio Secretary from ETC.

He commented on the outstanding secretariat support from IST to organise and coordinate POG meetings. The POG supported and participated in IPWs 2011 and 2012. In 2011, four new POG representatives were elected: Assétou for Francophone Africa, Vitou for Asia, Sergio for Latin America and Marise for the IST. The election for 2012 for the non-Francophone Africa, which is currently represented by Brigid, and an independent member (seat that will be vacated by Oliver) was postponed until after the March 2012 IPW. The independent nominee should represent the interests of smallholder farmers. Joseph warned that having a farmer representative could cause some challenges, as the network is not primarily composed of farmers. It might be advisable to name someone from the PROLINNOVA network who is given the mandate to focus on linkages with farmer organisations. Scott agreed that there are real practical challenges to having farmer representative and these include language and access to the internet. However, we should still try, and a seat for a smallholder farmer representative will be created next year if the elected independent POG member is not someone who represents the interests of this stakeholder group. Each CP has one vote for the independent seat and the IST can put in one vote. Susan has been requested to extend her term by one year. Marise was voted as Co-Chair; because of this, her term was also extended up to 2014.

Scott welcomed PROLINNOVA–India as a new member of the network and expressed the POG’s great appreciation of the work under the leadership of Sonali to initiate the process of establishing this new CP and sustaining the process over the past year.

Scott added that the POG initiated and coordinated the development of the following policy guidelines: partnership principles, performance indicators for CP coordinators, minimum requirements for CPs/RPs (Regional Platforms), IST and POG, process for determining “inactive status” of CPs/RPs and updating the POG terms of reference. All these were based on evolving experience/practice of the network. He requested the members to review the “Performance Indicators for Country Platform Coordinator” and asked the participants to review it and give their comments to Brigid within this week. For this performance analysis, monitoring the functions is important. This is not necessarily a paid position and the work may not be done by only one person within the CP. Each CP will need to work out how to fulfil these functions. In the case of Kenya, the coordinator is in one partner organisation (KARI) and the funds for PROLINNOVA activities come through another (World Neighbors). PROLINNOVA–Kenya had little funds; the coordinator is paid by JOLISAA, which is hosted by KARI. It is usually easier to channel funds through an NGO partner because of the greater flexibility than in a government organisation. The functioning hinges on the good collaboration between the NGO and KARI. Each CP has to make such decisions for itself. What is important is that the NSC makes a clear statement of lines of accountability.

The POG also played a role in monitoring and overseeing the following processes within the network: programme impact assessment, programme-level M&E, mainstreaming gender into the global programme, strategic linkages with global and regional ARD fora (GFAR, FARA, CORAF, APAARI, GCARD etc), reviewing special initiatives such as FAIR, fundraising and donor contact and follow-up, financial management, issues within/between CPs/RPs and/or IST/Secretariat, strengthening CP-POG linkages and information sharing and partnership with other initiatives (SCI-SLM, JOLISAA, INSARD, AgTrain etc.)

Despite the challenges, PROLINNOVA continues to survive and even thrive with the addition of the CP in India and the reinvigoration of the CPs in Ghana and Kenya. There is evidence of partners coming together at regional level for planning, action and fundraising (Asia and Eastern Africa). There is a more positive external environment supportive of local innovation and PID among formal ARD institutions including donors. There are more dynamic exchanges and linkages based on interest and commitment from existing and new partners. It has more diversified funding and more active inclusion of PROLINNOVA global network and Secretariat in proposal development/fundraising. However, many CPs are stretched to sustain activities without the minimum core support. There are a lot of pressures on the IST to respond to and support CPs/RPs. There are cases where minimum requirements are not met and very limited resources to sustain and support partnerships with other platforms, networks and alliances. Gender integration in its activities is progressing very well. The initial work that was started on curriculum development should continue. The network should maximise face-to-face events for proposal/concept note development. The POG also believes on aiming for stronger strategic linkages with global/regional ARD fora: GFRAS (Global Forum on Rural Advisory Services) at CP level, GFAR

linkages and support and FARA, APAARI, etc at regional level. It has to continue its partnerships with other platforms such as PROFEIS, INSARD, JOLISAA, SCI-SLM, AgTrain, etc.

PLENARY DISCUSSION

- In response to a question about who is in the IST, Ann explained: Laurens, Chesha and Ann from ETC in the Netherlands; Marise, Emily, Annie and Julian with IIRR in the Philippines; and Bara Guèye and Jean-Marie Diop as backstoppers of PROFEIS.
- Joseph commented that it is a struggle to find a legal framework that does not imprison the network. Listening to the discussion of minimum commitments and the partnership principles, he feels that they present in fact a legal framework that would not prevent the network from operating, but would still allow people to have a structure to which they subscribe. How soon will these be adopted as working principles that people sign up to? Now, with a deeper understanding of how the network functions, he recognises that the members need a way to be bound together, e.g. by signing up to some kind of document about principles.
- Amanuel pointed out that this is referring more to formalisation (agreeing on principles) rather than enforcing a framework for a network through a legal system.
- Scott pointed out that the minimum commitment document is enforced as of December 2011. When the POG wants to amend it, a new formulation will go out for feedback and eventually acceptance by the partners. The text on partnership principles and the text on performance indicators for CP coordinators will go out to the network and be posted on the website by the end of this month as a set of principles that applies to the entire network.
- Sonali reminded the participants that the vision and mission of PROLINNOVA is to mainstream PID and MSP at all levels. We want and need to increase our numbers to have the necessary impact. If we start thinking in terms of a formal and legal structure, that structure will get involved in just maintaining itself and the growth will stop.
- Scott affirmed the spirit of Sonali's comment. It is a struggle to find that appropriate balance of formality and structure to allow us to do the work we want to do. It should not be our self-interest to continue to exist but rather to exist in order to mainstream PID and MSP into ARD. This should continue to be the vision of PROLINNOVA as a global network.

UPDATE ON GCARD

Presenter: Sonali Bisht

Sonali introduced the Global Conference on Agricultural Research for Development (GCARD) to the participants. She shared that the non-achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) drove the need for transforming the CGIAR (Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research) system as articulated in 2008. The first GCARD was held in 2010 at Montpellier, France. GCARD replaces the GFAR Triennial Conferences and the Annual General Meetings of the CGIAR. GCARD is a 6-year multi-

stakeholder process aimed at transforming agricultural research to have greater impact on development. It is organised biennially. The next meeting will be in October 2012 in Uruguay.

In summary, its objective is to ensure that agricultural research outputs are accessible and relevant, that is, driven by the needs of resource-poor farmers. The following strategies have been identified to achieve its objective: knowledge generation, alignment of funding systems for research and development, constructive and effective innovation pathways development and integration of international agricultural research systems towards development impact.

GCARD I focused on identifying development needs where agricultural research for development (ARD) can play its best role. It was in search of effective pathways to creating impact for the poor. It came out with a Roadmap which aimed at transforming ARD around the world to achieve large-scale impact where stakeholders work more effectively together, capacities and investments required are put in place and millions of resource-poor farmers in diverse environments form part of innovation processes from the outset. The roadmap also demands that ARD and related knowledge sharing is embedded in the wider development agenda.

GCARD II will focus on “Delivering the Change”. It will review what has been achieved so far, evidence of impact and how these changes are happening. It will take stock of progress and experiences in developing and strengthening actions and partnerships and transforming innovation processes to achieve large-scale development impacts, in particular on the livelihoods of resource-poor smallholder farmers.

It shall reflect on the following:

- *Partnerships* required for implementation and impact of CGIAR Research Programmes (CRPs)
- *Capacities* required in ARD systems to turn innovation into impact
- *Opportunities* for interaction and partnership around other programmes – national and global
- Links between agricultural innovation and *market opportunities for smallholder farmers*
- How innovation can better serve the needs of *women*.

GCARD II is expected to have tracked progress and learning in regard to the Roadmap, identified collective actions that can take forward improved foresight, partnerships and capacity building globally in ARD and improved mutual accountability for all stakeholders. There are a number of opportunities for CSOs to contribute. These include: interaction on CSO-GARD (CSO Group on Agricultural Research for Development) e-list, CSO-GARD page on GFAR website, Steering Committee and Organizing Committee of GCARD II, pre-conference meeting of CSOs, the marketplace, pre-GCARD thematic conferences and other opportunities at regional level, and thematic presentation and participation in GCARD II.

PROLINNOVA is a Global Partnership Programme of GFAR with experience in facilitating multi-stakeholder ARD platforms. Its experience, successes and challenges need to be shared with the global community. At the regional level, it can contribute through FARA, APAARI, FORAGRO and AARINENA. It can also display documents at the marketplace.

FUNDRAISING PROGRESS AND OPPORTUNITIES: PROLINNOVA WHEN THERE IS NO FUNDING

Brigid mapped out the existing funding-generation efforts within PROLINNOVA (See Annex 4). Seven selected opportunities for funding were analysed, presented and commented upon (Annex 5). Brigid had assigned each of these to selected participants who were asked to draw out the pertinent details. During breaks and the open space people could organize themselves and join hands in following-up any of these opportunities.

PID IN CLIMATE-CHANGE ADAPTATION

Presenter: Ann Waters-Bayer

The presentation built on the results of the PROLINNOVA/COMPAS/RUAF workshop “How to adapt and innovate in response to change in development trends, thematic interests and donors’ agenda: the case of climate change” held in Doorn, Netherlands in February 2011. The workshop provided an opportunity to explore the linkages between PROLINNOVA and the new donor agenda of climate-change adaptation (CCA), specifically, the role of grassroots innovation and PID in the processes of adapting to climate change (CC).

PROLINNOVA has been studying local innovation efforts, implementing PID on the ground and documenting these for wider sharing. It has established MSPs for planning and learning, provided opportunities for capacity building, and has been actively involved in influencing policy dialogue and mainstreaming PID at various levels: local, district, national and international. Since 2008, it has done extensive literature review on grassroots adaptation initiatives in the face of CC, conducted field studies with communities in Ethiopia, Nepal and Niger, conducted workshops in these countries and prepared a policy brief on strengthening local resilience to CC.

Ann gave examples of farmers in Nepal reducing tillage and using mulch for garlic to cope with less rain, adding millet as a winter crop as they are able to withstand frosts, established hanging nurseries on platforms to protect seedlings against floods and doing their own crossbreeding to develop maize varieties that withstand water-logging. In Ethiopia, pastoralists developed their own cut-and-carry feeding system, created private and public community water points, increased market interaction, changed herd composition and settled on islands in dryland lakes. In Niger, donkeys are used as dowry for young women to cover long distances to waterpoints. In India, bamboo is introduced for flood protection. In Jamaica, farmers developed protection for bananas from high winds and, in Indonesia, constructing fencing for flood protection and constructing houses that can easily move location. People are adapting to CC.

She went on to explain the issues involved in local adaptation to CC, which include: the multiple-factor dimension of vulnerability, invisibility of women’s innovation, the process of adaptation to CC is never-ending, and not all local innovations lead to positive impacts. Most often these are being done with limited options, less systematically and results oftentimes are not widely shared. Building community resilience requires strengthening their local adaptive capacity by recognising their local innovation efforts, assisting smallholders to improve and/or validate local innovations, spreading successful

innovations, introducing new ideas/practices/formal science into farmer-led processes and creating direct local access to resources for experimentation (LISFs). All these plus linking farmer groups and support organisations with sources of information on CC, building local capacities in participatory tools for CC-related analysis, supporting CC-related local analysis, and building local capacities in agro-meteorology and linking these with indigenous forecasting practices.

It is important to promote PID within a community framework with other members, not only the innovators, going beyond individuals through self-organising and building community adaptive capacity. This implies broadening PROLINNOVA partnerships to include people working on community mobilisation.

She further explained that local adaptive capacity depends on the ability to live with change and uncertainty, ability to access and combine diverse sources of knowledge for innovation, and ability for self-organisation and networking (adapted from Folke *et al* 2003). Each of these elements she defined further in the context of PID.

Ability to live with change and uncertainty includes:

- Nurturing diversity: encouraging different ways of doing things
- Participatory vulnerability / risk assessment & management
- Development of trust within the community
- Disaster early-warning systems and rapid feedback for change

Ability to access & combine diverse sources of knowledge for innovation

- Local innovation and its recognition
- Links to information sources and services
- Collaborative experimentation / PID
- Capacity for monitoring

Ability for self-organisation and networking

- Local mechanisms for governing natural resources
- Conflict management
- Equity in resource access and allocation
- Interaction with external agencies.

PARALLEL REGIONAL REVIEW AND PLANNING MEETINGS

The overview presented by Ann provided a good background on two major projects that PROLINNOVA is currently working on: the LINEX-CCA project in Asia on PID and CCA funded by Misereor and the CLIC-SR Eastern Africa proposal along similar lines submitted to the Rockefeller Foundation.

The participants were divided into regional groupings to discuss either above projects or to explore opportunities for regional collaboration and submitting regional proposals to the funding opportunities

described earlier. Four groups were thus formed and worked till the end of the day: Asia: LINEX-CCA, Eastern Africa, Southern Africa, West Africa.

DAY 3 (March 14, 2012)

The parallel regional group presented the result of their discussions.

LOCAL INNOVATION AND EXPERIMENTATION: AN ENTRY POINT TO CLIMATE-CHANGE ADAPTATION FOR SUSTAINABLE LIVELIHOODS IN ASIA (LINEX-CCA)

Presenter: Suman

The group was composed of Laurens (ETC), Sam (CEDAC, Cambodia), Suman (LI-BIRD, Nepal) and Sonali (INHERE, India). They agreed on the acronym LINEX-CCA.

Project features:

- Duration: 1 January 2012 – 31 December 2014 (3 years)
- Total budget: Euro 400,000 (approx)
- Location:
 - Nepal: (1) Ramechhap District: Rampur VDC and (2) Siraha District: site selection under process. Sites were selected based on the Vulnerability Assessment Report prepared by NAPA (National Action Plan for Adaptation)
 - India: (1) Chamoli District and (2) Almora District. Sites were selected based on the vulnerability and representativeness and major involvement in agriculture
 - Cambodia: (1) Kampong Chhnang, (2) Kampong Speu and (3) Takeo
- Legal holder: CEDAC, Cambodia
- Content coordinator: LI-BIRD, Nepal
- International backstopper: ETC, Netherlands

The group presented the budget details and shared that agreement has already been signed between CEDAC and Misereor, fund request has been sent and CEDAC is already expecting 50% of fund release for 2012. They also agreed on the following:

- Roles and responsibilities of the countries/organisations identified
- Agreement draft between partners almost finalised
- Yearly Plan of Action (YPO) almost finalised [Misereor Activities 2012 WBS.xls](#)
- Discussion on baseline format going on [LINEX CCA Questionnaire Draft.doc](#)

PLENARY DISCUSSION

- Scott asked the group on what they thought would be 2 or 3 gender issues to come up in the project? Suman remarked that innovation by women farmers and the effect of these innovations to women and men. Sonali said that she is looking at the perspectives of women in these two communities and PID and joint experimentations addressing women's concerns.

- Amanuel asked how the group would be communicating among themselves. Suman identified email, inter-country visits for review, coinciding their meetings with the IPW, share learning among themselves. He said they agreed on sending reports on a regular basis
- Ann suggested that, in the website, there is the CCA page where reports can be uploaded.

COMBINING LOCAL INNOVATIVE CAPACITY WITH SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH – STRENGTHENING RESILIENCE TO CLIMATE CHANGE (Eastern Africa)

Presenter: Teresiah

She presented the summary features of the project as follows:

- Partners: Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda CPs
- Duration: 1 March 2012 – 28 February 2015
- Funder: Rockefeller Foundation
- Budget: 750,000 USD approx

The group arrived at the following understanding about the proposal:

- The term “especially” women was clarified as not focusing on women alone but the project puts emphasis on the role of women during implementation
- There will be launching workshops in the three countries present at national level aimed at policy awareness, complementation with government policy and climate change programmes. At the district level, the launching workshop aims at planning with the stakeholders.
- The field study is separate from the baseline survey but there might be data from the field study that can be used in the baseline survey and vice versa. These can be done together and is understood as the first activity for implementation. IIRR will provide format for the baseline, which would feed into the M&E.
- Three innovations will be selected for joint experimentation (PID). If there are no researchers or research institutions interested in these, the CPs can use experts who may be extensionists able to do research. These innovations for PID are not under the LISF component. Documentation will cover both process and the results.
- The training on meteorology will include indigenous knowledge in predicting weather, to be included in the survey, and should be applicable in the PID process.
- The training of CSOs with 100 staff trained can be interpreted as coming from CSOs involved in the entire project even though they are not implementing the project. However, Ann thought that this notion has to be corrected since the training is meant not only for CSOs but also for people in local government organizations (extensionists, etc).
- LISF will be implemented in the same districts selected. It is possible to take up one new district where LISF is not operational. Two districts can be completely new and initiate LISF.

The group also agreed on the acronym CLIC. They have to prepare a three-year overall budget and a one-year detailed plan of action. They agreed to form a yahoo group, which includes all those that will be involved in management of the project. They also agreed to look for complementary funding and assigned Amanuel to explore EED funding. The training will be based on needs and will be identified during the field study or the baseline survey. NUFFIC will be explored individually in their respective countries as a source of funding for training. Gender issues will be dealt with at the beginning starting with the baseline survey, agreed to be mindful during implementation of the division of roles and selection of the innovations and percentage of participation of women and men. The M&E backstopper is Marise, IIRR, and general backstopping by ETC.

PLENARY DISCUSSION

- Laurens informed the group that Rockefeller needs a more detailed budget so this must be sent very soon, if possible before everybody leaves. The LISF must continue with the previous districts of implementation; implementing in new districts would require more funds.
- Moses shared that the districts they selected for this project did not have LISF before. This is because the previous districts selected did not consider CCA.
- It will be good to implement LISF in one district that already implements it and the other in the district with the CCA issue, especially as CCA will be relevant for farmers in no matter which district.
- Amanuel raised the need to identify our global learning agenda for these two projects. Laurens responded that each of the projects includes a learning and sharing dimension but it would be good to cleverly put this together to achieve a global learning agenda.

SOUTHERN AFRICA

Presenter: Brigid

The group was comprised of Brigid, Moses and Ann. They looked at other funding opportunities for a concept note on water management in Southern and Eastern Africa.

- CIDA requires 15% of own contribution and must be led by a Canadian organisation; Ann to contact Coady Institute and Guelph University
- ERA-ARD must be led by a European research organisation; funds are limited to what each European country contributed; Ann to contact Jim Woodhill.
- Worked on the IID (Innovation for Inclusive Development) concept note on women innovators processing natural products for Brigid to take to the Tanzania workshop next week on innovation in Africa.

PLENARY DISCUSSION

- Scott: What happened to the African Union opportunity? Brigid responded that it requires both concept notes and proposal by 20 April and it is for scientific research; we may not have the time to put these together by the deadline. The UN Women's Equality proposal call can be led by KARI but has a deadline of March 23.
- Amanuel said that there might be an opportunity for Sudan; the lady coming to Ethiopia from Sudan is working on research on technology appropriate for women.
- Laurens flagged that the McKnight Foundation is keen on collaborating with PROLINNOVA. All the participants should touch base with the regional contact persons, monitor the calls, invite them to the opening of IPW, excite them.

WEST AFRICA

Presenter: Assétou

The West Africa group plans to submit to both Misereor and CIDA. They are looking at the following activities to build into the proposal: capacity building, documentation and sharing, networking and participation in IPW, joint planning and review and M&E by the backstoppers (Jean-Marie and Bara Guèye).

PLENARY DISCUSSION

- Scott: Is a regional proposal also going to be submitted to Misereor? Assétou: Submission to Misereor would be per country, likewise for CIDA, as it would take too much time to develop a common proposal.
- Ann said that, for CIDA submission, the group will need a Canadian partner. Jibril remarked that, for submission by one country, a Canadian partner is not needed.
- Jean-Marie shared that actually it was discussed within the group that this issue of finding a Canadian partner will be discussed with Ann. In Burkina Faso, they have a partner: World Neighbors Canada.

OPEN SPACE

Facilitator: Jean-Marie

Jean-Marie presented the objective of the Open Space, which is to understand what is currently being done on the issues on the table, explore actions and possibilities. He identified the following tables:

- Assessment of farmer organisation (Djibril)
- International Farmer Innovation Day (Laurens)
- Integrating PID in educational institutions (Amanuel)
- PROLINNOVA plan for International Year for Family Farming (Joseph)
- GCARD (Sonali)
- UN Women's Equality proposal (Teresiah).

The café table manager will have to explain to the next set of customers what has been discussed. Jean-Marie suggested two rounds but there were suggestions to make it flexible so that people can move around. The host is expected to take key actions with specific timelines from the discussions and to bring these into the plenary. Summary of main outcome per table

Integrating PID into educational institutions (Amanuel Assefa)

There are already existing curriculum development initiatives in Nepal and South Africa. These are also integrated in adult-education activities in Kenya, Niger, Ethiopia and Cambodia. Ghana will explore University of Cape Coast. Some ideas on the table include: CCA project outputs to be fed into the curriculum.

Action points

Activity	Responsible	By when
Document Ghana experiences and share of PID integrated within University of Cape Coast	Zimmi	Asap
Study working paper on web for future discussion	All	June 2012
Internship programmes for students	Samson	2012–13
Mainstreaming within existing projects instead of stand-alone projects	FAIR/CCA project coordinators and participants	2012–13
Involve universities in monitoring	FAIR/CCA projects	

International Farmer Innovation Day (Laurens van Veldhuizen)

The group comprised JBE, LVE, Samson and SA. There were a number of proposed dates. These are in March, April, May and December. The CPs will discuss the idea for an joint international internally. Niger, Senegal, Cambodia, Burkina, Ghana and Mali suggested December. South Africa, Cambodia, Uganda, Cameroon, Nepal, Ghana, Burkina, Kenya and Mali agreed with October. Kenya, Uganda, South Africa and Cameroon are okay with the last Thursday of May.

Activity	Responsible	By when
Circulate information from IPW and facilitate decision making on date	Samson, Etoa, Laurens	End of March

International Year for Family Farming (IYFF) (Joseph Ssuuna)

The International Year for Family Farming just has been approved by the UN international assembly to recognise the work of smallholder farmers. It is the climax of a long campaign that started in Rome in 2004. It is an opportunity that PROLINNOVA should not let pass because it works with small-scale farmers. Its efforts on IYFF can be linked with the events in the IFI Day. PROLINNOVA can liaise with the lead team for this (World Rural Forum / WRF).

This is an opportunity to increase PROLINNOVA's visibility and a potential theme for IPW 2013. This needs a champion within PROLINNOVA. Possible actions:

- Evaluate IYFF activities and see whether PROLINNOVA expectations are met
- PROLINNOVA can organise exhibitions on small-scale farmer innovations per CP and a global event – explain how partners are contributing.

Activity	Responsible	By when
Collect small-scale farmer issues and present these as advocacy issues	Joseph Ssuuna	ASAP
Circulate one pager to the email group	Global Platform	
Organise exhibits on small-scale farmer innovations per CP and a global event	CPs	

GLOBAL CONFERENCE ON ARD (GCARD) (Sonali)

There will be efforts to reach out to regional organisations. For West Africa, Assétou suggests if someone else can take this on instead of her because she is already a member of the Pan-African group. Cameroon can lead for Central Africa.

How do we take advantage of opportunity to mainstream PROLINNOVA concepts?

1. Focus on LISF which gives farmer opportunity to access and lead their research agenda	PROLINNOVA Asia
2. Innovations in CCA	
3. Participation in CSO-GARD for Nepal	
4. NGO-led multi-stakeholder partnership and how is it organised, lessons and challenges	Africa group – PROLINNOVA (March)
5. See website and decide	(Burkina Faso)
6. See website, posters for display available	(Uganda)
7. Follow-up with partners in Andes	(Scott) (by end of March)
8. Leaders for regions in Africa – Strategy (Mali)	Eastern Africa – Amanuel West and Central Africa – Assétou

Item 3 in the list of opportunities above was further detailed in terms of specific action points.

Action points

Activity	Responsible	By when?
Showcase LISF innovations in CCA for Asia	Suman/Chesha	Start March
Enlist in CSO-GARD	Suman	
NGO-led multi-stakeholder partnership showcase	Amanuel	
See website and decide	Burkina Faso	
See website poster available	Uganda	
Follow-up with partners in Andes	Scott	End of March
Leaders for regions in Africa to follow up for strategy	Eastern Africa Centre and W. Africa Southern Africa: Brigid/Monique	Amanuel (to replace Assétou) FARA e-list CCARDESA

UN Women’s Equality Call for Proposals (Teresiah)

The focus of the call is on women’s economic and political empowerment. Criteria include women-led NGO or government-led agency like ministry, not a research organisation. Neither regional intergovernmental agency nor global and international NGOs qualify. If a regional proposal is to be put in, it should be a maximum of four countries. Some participants felt that this is a discriminatory call. Some men-led organisations can defend women’s interests better. It might be easier to approach it nationally rather than regionally.

Action points

Main topic	Activity	Responsible	By when
A regional approach to proposal development is possible	Check another possible date or next call for better preparation		
A national approach to proposal submission		Only possible NGO is ADAF-Gallé	

ASSESSMENT OF FARMER ORGANISATION IN DECISION-MAKING (CP level) (Djibril Thiam)

The following methods were identified: inventory of how farmers are involved in decision-making such as role in the NSC, member of the LISF review committee, organising Innovation Fairs, etc; organise a focus-group discussion to bring out more details. Some of the tools that can be used include: case studies in Cambodia, Kenya, Uganda, Nepal, survey/information gathering through email, check list, etc.

As to the criteria for selecting CPs, the following were suggested: identify CPs with good farmer representation, consider farmer vs someone from a farmer organisation (hired) vs farmer representing a farmer organisation and fund management by farmer groups and representation at all levels. The process must consider participatory evaluation and decision-making by farmers/farmer innovators in joint experimentation such as their role in deciding the research questions, how it is done and how results will be measured and assessed. Refer to existing documents such as the LISF guidelines, LISF study by Bernard Triomphe, CP impact assessment and Cambodia CP experience, which featured a high level of farmer involvement.

Action Points

Main topic	Activity	Responsible	By when?
Assessment of farmer organisation in decision-making (country platform)	Inventory of how farmers are represented in CPs	Thiam, Jean-Marie (send a checklist)	24 March 2012
	Share case studies in Cambodia, Kenya, Uganda, Nepal (farmer involvement, partnership) MSPs	Vitou, Moses, Suman, Teresiah	End of March 2012
	Inventory of a Participatory Evaluation System (PES)	Thiam, Jean-Marie	25 March 2012
	Share the LISF guidelines from Nepal	Suman	End of April 2012

WRAP-UP

Laurens facilitated the synthesis and summary of all agreed action points (Annex 6 has the full action plan out of IPW2012). The following are key follow-up actions:

- Report on IPW by IIRR and PowerPoints uploaded on the website
- MSP report can be improved further, add the work of Fanos and the Nepal study; the output will be ready by April, well in time for the GCARD meeting in October
- IPW 2013;: the following CPs expressed interest to host it: Kenya, Cambodia; as there are the two projects on PID and CCA, in the next two years, the IPW can be in these countries involved in these projects
- CP, IST and POG evaluations will be summarised and circulated by IIRR
- POG elections: there are interesting nominations already received; Chesha will be handling the election process
- Minimum requirements already in effect; the procedure with non-active CPs will be sent to the POG for comments and the revised minimum requirement document including this section will be finalised by the International Secretariat

EVALUATION

The evaluation was facilitated by Marise using the Spider Web tool. Outcome is given in Annex 7. Participants were asked to rate ten topics covered during this IPW. Participants rated each topic from 1 to 4 where 4 is most useful and 1 least useful. The following are the results of the rating.

Topic	1	2	3	4
Report from FAIR (LISF)		1	4	10
Updates from POG			6	9
Fundraising processes and opportunities				15
Regional collaboration and review		1	2	12
PID for climate-change adaptation			3	12
Open Space			10	5
GCARD opportunities		5	8	2
Assessing minimum requirements for PROLINNOVA functioning			4	12
Information market			8	8
Strengthening country partnerships		1	5	10

Generally the evaluation is very positive. Fundraising received the highest score followed by the sessions on PID for climate-change adaptation, Assessing minimum requirements and Regional collaboration and review. It is also clear that for several participants the GCARD process is still something quite remote from their own work and perhaps the relevant session received some lower scores because of this.

Participants were asked to respond to two questions by writing on cards.

On the question about what they liked most about IPW 2012, fundraising discussions and concept notes/proposal development were identified by seven participants. Four respondents commended the organisation and support from the host organisation, including the traditional dinner and visit to the museum. The Opening Ceremony, ideas from the World Café, evaluation, POG notes, minimum criteria, report on LISF, CCA session, regional project review and study case on networking had a card each. Three cards expressed appreciation of the way the interaction and presentations were done.

On the question how IPW 2013 can be better, nine participants suggested the inclusion of a field visit. Two cards suggested interaction with farmers. Two cards suggested review of 2011 action points. One card suggested continuing the fundraising/proposal development discussion. Other cards suggested the following: consider a theme for the next IPW, cultural exchange, no e-mails during session, inviting external people to provide new perspective and draw distinction between the sharing and the business aspects.

All in all, it can be concluded, despite the limitations in funding, the 2012 IPW is a success.

Laurens thanked the organiser, PROFEIS and ADAF-Gallé for doing a wonderful job. He personally conveyed to the support team led by Aissata the participants' appreciation on the great support provided.

Assétou expressed appreciation to Scott, whose term ended as member of the POG, for a job well done in co-chairing the POG with Susan. She presented Scott a gift. She also presented a key holder as gift to each participant.

Annex 1: Opening Programme

International Partners Workshop
Atelier International des Partenaires
12 – 14 March, Hotel Olympe, Bamako, Mali

Program for the opening ceremony / Programme de la ceremonie d'ouverture

Monday, 12 March 2012 / Lundi 12 mars 2012

08h30 – 09h00	Registration / <i>Inscription</i>
09h00 – 09h15	Welcoming speech by ADAF/Galle (Mr. Lassina Sylvestre) <i>Allocutin de bienvenue de ADAF/Galle</i> Summary in Bambara / <i>Resume en Bambara (Dianne, member of BOT ADAF)</i>
09h15 – 09h30	Speech by PROFEIS-Mali / <i>Allocution de PROFEIS-Mali</i> Summary in Bambara / <i>Resume em Bambara</i> (The coordinator of PROFEIS-Mali)
09h30 -09h45	Speech by IER / <i>Allocution de l'IER</i> Summary in Bambara / <i>Resume en Bambara</i>
09h45 – 10h00	Speech by Prolinnova / <i>Allocution de Prolinnova (Scott Killough)</i> Summary in Bambara / <i>Resume en Bambara</i>
10h00 – 10h15	Opening speech by the President of AOPP in Bambara <i>Allocution de President de L'AOPP et ouverture en Bambara</i> (The President of AOPP (Association of Professional Farmer Organization))
10h15 – 10h35	Prolinnova Overview video / <i>Apercu sur Prolinnova en video</i> Summary in Bambara / <i>Resume en Bambara</i>
10h35 – 10h50	Film of farmer innovations in Mali <i>Video innovations paysannes au Mali</i>
10h50 – 11h30	Visit of stands / <i>Visite des stands</i>
11h30 – 12h00	Break with drinks / <i>Pause avec collation</i>

Annex 2: Programme Prolinnova IPW 2012 Mali

Note: Sunday 11 March: Joint dinner at 18.30 and informal get together at 20.30

Time	Monday 12 March	Tuesday 13 March	Wednesday 14 March
8.30 – 9.30	Organization of the Market	Outcome of FAIR meeting on Local Innovation Support Funds	
9.30 – 10.30	Opening session: Presentation on LI and PID West Africa? Key notes	POG report and issues; election process	Open space/world cafe
Tea break	Market open		
11.00 – 12.30	Opening, continue:	Fund raising: progress and opportunities; Prolinnova when there is no funding GCARD, GFAR, role of Prolinnova	Open space/world cafe continued Wrap-up/ next steps Evaluation and closure
LUNCH	Market open		
13.30 – 15.30	Strengthening country partnerships: Lessons from case studies Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda	PID for climate change adaptation: rational and potential Briefing on regional meetings Regional collaboration: intro Parallel regional review and planning meeting	
Tea break			
16.00 – 17.30	Strengthening CPs (continued)	Parallel regional review and planning meeting	
EVENING		Town visit and dinner	

Annex 3: List of Participants

	Name of participants	Country	Gender	Organisation
1.	Teresiah Ng'ang'a	Kenya	F	Kenya Agricultural Research Institute (KARI)
2.	Zimi Al-Hassan	Ghana	M	Ministry of Agriculture, Bolgatanga
3.	Amanuel Assefa	Ethiopia	M	Agri-Service Ethiopia (ASE)
4.	Sekate Moses	Uganda	M	Environmental Alert
5.	Samson Akankize	Uganda	M	Environmental Alert
6.	Patreck Lameck	Tanzania	M	INADES
7.	Suman Shekhar Manandhar	Nepal	M	LI-BIRD
8.	Sonali Bisht	India	F	INHERE
9.	Assetou Kanoute	Mali	M	ADAF-Galle
10.	Sam Vitou	Cambodia	M	CEDAC
11.	Brigid Letty	South Africa	F	Institute of Natural Resources
12.	Susan Karia	Kenya	F	Ford Foundation
13.	Scott Killough	USA	M	World Neighbors
14.	Marissa Espineli	Philippines	F	International Institute of Rural Reconstruction
15.	Laurens van Veldhuizen	Netherlands	M	ETC
16.	Ann Waters-Bayer	Germany	F	ETC
17.	Jean-Marie Diop	Belgium	F	
18.	Joseph Ssuuna	Uganda	M	Consultant, PSO networking study
19.	Bourgou Tsuamba	Burkina Paso	M	World Neighbors
20.	Mathieu Ouedraogo	Burkina Paso	M	Reseau MARP
21.	Djibril Thiam	Senegal	M	AGRECOL

Annex 4: Fundraising mapping exercise

EXISTING FUNDING

RF FAIR 2 EXT.	NEPAL, CAMBODIA, SOUTH AFRICA, TANZANIA, UGANDA, ETHIOPIA, KENYA, GHANA
RF FAIR TRANSITION	CAMBODIA, GHANA, ETHIOPIA, UGANDA, KENYA
MISERIOR – PROFEIS II	SENEGAL, MALI
EC – JOLISAA	KENYA, SOUTH AFRICA
<u>LOCAL SOURCES</u> EED ACTION AID FUNDACION ICO	CAMBODIA AND TANZANIA ETHIOPIA MOZAMBIQUE
MISERIOR LINEX-CCA* NEW	NEPAL, CAMBODIA, INDIA
CLIC/SR FOR CCA, ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION	TANZANIA, UGANDA, ETHIOPIA, KENYA

ACQUISITION EFFORTS

GFAR GEF FAIR 3 IDRC – FAIR FF/ILRI-WOMEN, L/STOCK LISF		ETC/IIRR From the list now E+S AFRICA
IDRC – E+S AFRICA	X	
IDRC – S. AFRICA	?	
IDRC – MOZAMBIQUE	X	
IDRC REGIONAL CCA	X	TANZANIA, UGANDA, ETHIOPIA, KENYA
AFRICA/BRAZIL CALL	?	SOUTH AFRICA, KENYA
MISERIOR PROFEIS III	NOT SUBMITTED	CAMEROON, NIGER, MALI, SENEGAL, BURKINA FASO
EU ASIA CALL	X	CAMBODIA
CIC BATA	X	MOZAMBIQUE

CSSP	ETHIOPIA (LISF)
LEMELSON FOUNDATION	INDIA
CORAF	PROFEIS MALI, SENEGAL, NIGER
SWISS MRI	PROLINNOVA INDIA, UGANDA

Annex 5. Detailed analysis of selected fundraising opportunities

1. African Science and Technology Consolidated Plan of Action

FUNDER	African union (10 th European Development Fund)
WHO IS LEGIBLE	All African nationals – organizations not specified
TYPE OF ACTIVITIES	1. Post-harvest and agriculture 2. Renewable and sustainable energy 3. Water and sanitation
THEMES/FOCUS	Scientific research that contributes to the science and technology of African nations
DEADLINE	20 April – Both Concept paper and Proposal have to be submitted together
AMOUNT OF FUNDING	Minimum – 500,000 EUR Maximum – 750,000 EUR

2. FUND FOR GENDER EQUALITY

UN-2nd Call/Phase 2011-2012

- Innovative Programme to help women achieve political and economic empowerment
- Multi-Year Grant – 3 years
- Ranging USD 200,000 USD/million
- Open from 12-23 March 2012
- African countries : Cameroon, Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Burkina Faso, Ghana, Mali, Senegal, South Africa
- Asia : Cambodia, Philippines, India, Nepal
- **Activities: Women-led organization**
- Women Economic Empowerment
- 12 paged online application form

3. Case studies modernizing extension and advisory services

Funder	USAID
Eligible	All countries aligned with USAID consortia partners
Activities supported	Teach, Learn, Apply
Themes/Focus	Define and disseminate good practice, strategy and approached
Deadline	Open until funds last (May 2012)
Amount of funding	25,000 USD
Own contribution	Not applicable

4. NUFFIC TAILOR-MADE TRAINING

- ELIGIBLE: ALL CPS
- SUPPORTS GROUP TRAINING (6-20 PEOPLE) IN OWN COUNTRY/REGION
- NO SPECIFIC THEME
- FUNDING: <50,000 EURO NO TENDER PROCESS, 50,000-200,000 EURO TENDER
 - DEADLINE (PROPOSALS) 1 APRIL , 1 AUGUST
- CONDUCT TRAINING WITHIN 12 MONTHS
- <50,000 CAN DEVELOP PROPOSAL WITH TRAINING PROVIDER IN NL
- COMBINE DUTCH AND LOCAL TRAINING PROVIDERS
- CONTACT WITHIN EACH NL EMBASSY
- OPTION E.G. PID/TOT + FOLLOW-UP

5. INNOVATION FOR INCLUSIVE DEVELOPMENT

- **IDRC:** ASIA, AFRICA, LATIN AMERICA
- BUT EXISTING PARTNERSHIP ALREADY IDENTIFIED (SOME SCOPE FOR UNSOLICITED) AREAS OF SUPPORT
- INTERMEDIARIES + INNOVATION LIVELIHOODS (NRM, SERVICES, CULTURAL)
- GENDER INCLUSION (WOMEN INNOVATORS)
- CROSS-CUTTING ARE BENCHMARKS + INDICATORS
- TYPES OF ACTIVITIES: NETWORKING + COLLABORATION
- MEETINGS; SHARING; DEVELOPMENT OF RESEARCH FRAMEWORKS; SUPPORTING COMPARATIVE RESEARCH; SYNTHESIZING RESEARCH RESULTS
- CALLS FOR “EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST”
- AIM TO BUILD CAPACITY IN SOUTH
 - RESEARCH INSTITUTES
 - UNIVERSITIES

6. AFRICAN CLIMATE RESILIENCE

Funder	CIDA
Eligibility	Private Sector, CSO
Countries	CIDA countries, Ethiopia, Ghana, Mali, Mozambique, Senegal, Tanzania, DRC, Burkina Faso, CM DRC, Kenya, Rwanda, South Africa, Zambia

Activities	CCA activities, Food security, Energy, Water
Theme	Agriculture, Forestry, Energy
Deadline	19 th April 2012
Funding	15% local contribution
Time frame	18 months by 31 st March 2014

7. ERA-ARD II

Funder	European commission
Eligibility	Research consortia – minimum of 2 partners from sub-saharan Africa, European institution
Type of activities	Activities that led to generation and adaptation of technological, sociological, economical innovations for use by farmers and other actors in agricultural sector
Theme/focus	Improving rural livelihoods in sub-saharan Africa: sustainable climate smart intensification of agricultural productions
Deadline	22 May 2012 – Application form
Amount	1.6. m Euros – in kind contribution (15%)
Time frame	3 years

Annex 6: Action List Prolinnova IPW 2012

Topic	Activity	Responsible	By when
IPW Report	Draft action plan IPW2012 and circulate	Marise	Next week
	Prepare workshop report and circulate	Marise + IST	Mid April
	Upload PPTs used in IPW to website	IIRR	Asap
CP Review study	Improve report (add from work by Fanos and the Nepal study) and circulate	Joseph and Julian	Early April
	Print and distributed report widely (GCARD!)	IIRR and IST	End of April
Hosting IPW2013	Follow-up with CPs with expressed interest (Kenya, Cambodia) to take decision	Laurens	May
Internal evaluation	CP, IST and POG evaluation forms will be summarised and circulated	Marise	End of April
POG elections	Continue nominations	All	19 th March
	Facilitate election process	Chesha	End March
Procedure for non-active CPs	Comment on current draft text	All	End of March
	Revise text	Scott	
	Integrate text with minimum requirement documents	Ann/Chesha	
Integrating PID in Universities: next steps	Document Ghana experiences and share of PID integrated within University of Cape Coast	Zimmi	Asap
	Study working paper on web for future discussion	All	June 2012
	Internship programmes for students	Samson	2012–13
	Mainstreaming within existing projects instead of stand-alone projects	FAIR/CCA project coordinators and participants	2012–13
	Involve universities in monitoring	FAIR/CCA projects	
International Farmer Innovation Day	Circulate information from IPW and facilitate decision making on date	Samson, Etoa, Laurens	End of March

International Year for Farming Family	Circulate one pager to the email group	Joseph Ssuuna	Asap
	Collect small-scale farmer issues and present these as advocacy issues	Global Platform	
	Organise exhibits on small-scale farmer innovations per CP and a global event	CPs	
Tool for assessment of farmer organisation in CP decision-making	Inventory of how farmers are represented in CPs	Thiam, Jean-Marie (send a checklist)	24 March 2012
	Share case studies in Cambodia, Kenya, Uganda, Nepal (farmer involvement, partnership) MSPs	Vitou, Moses, Suman, Teresiah	End of March 2012
	Inventory of a Participatory Evaluation System (PES)	Thiam, Jean-Marie	25 March 2012
	Share the LISF guidelines from Nepal	Suman	End of April 2012

GCARD Related


1. Focus on LISF which gives farmer opportunity to access and lead their research agenda	PROLINNOVA Asia
2. Innovations in CCA	
3. Participation in CSO-GARD for Nepal	
4. NGO-led multi-stakeholder partnership and how is it organised, lessons and challenges	Africa group – PROLINNOVA (March)
5. See website and decide	(Burkina Faso)
6. See website, posters for display available	(Uganda)
7. Follow-up with partners in Andes	(Scott) (by end of March)
8. Leaders for regions in Africa – Strategy (Mali)	Eastern Africa – Amanuel West and Central Africa – Assétou

Detailed action points on GCARD process

Main topic	Activity	Responsible	By when?
Participation in GCARD process	Showcase LISF innovations in CCA for Asia	Suman/Chesha	Start March
	Enlist in CSO-GARD	Suman	
	NGO-led multi-stakeholder partnership showcase	Amanuel	
	See website and decide	Burkina Faso	
	See website poster available	Uganda	
	Follow-up with partners in Andes	Scott	End of March
	Leaders for regions in Africa to follow up for strategy	Eastern Africa Centre and W. Africa	Amanuel (to replace Assétou)

		Southern Africa: Brigid/Monique	FARA e-list CCARDESA
--	--	------------------------------------	-------------------------

Annex 7: Spider Web



Annex 8: Power Point Presentation

The following PowerPoints were presented. Access these PowerPoints through the following link:

<http://prolinnova.net/resources/ipw-resources>

- 73237 CCA and PID for IPW 2012 060312
- 83245 LISF Synthesis of lessons learnt 2012 short
- CLIC-SR
- LINEX_CCA_IPW2012
- MSPs review- Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda
- Network study IPW presentation
- POG report to IPW 2012
- PROLINNOVA in GCARD 2