

## PROLINNOVA e-evaluation 2015

### Summary report

February 2016

### E-evaluation process

The PROLINNOVA e-evaluation covering the year 2015 was conducted on 7 January 2016 with a deadline for receiving responses on 15 January. The deadline was extended to 22 January. One response which was turned in on 29 January was included in the analysis since the responses were still being consolidated. Just like the last e-evaluation (in 2014 covering the year 2013), there was only one round of performance assessment by the Country Platforms (CPs) and the International Support Team (IST). The PROLINNOVA network assessed its performance as an international network under the same themes: governance, learning and sharing among partners and CPs, capacity building, functioning of the IST and International Secretariat, increased international awareness on PID and partnership functioning at the national level.

The assessment followed the same e-evaluation format that was used in 2014 with the following changes:

- Item 3 under the 'Governance' theme was updated: the LINEX–CCA and SOLLINKKA projects were removed from the list since these projects ended prior to 2015
- Item 4 under 'Learning, sharing of information among partners and country platforms' was removed since there was no provision for cross-country visits from any of the existing projects during the period
- Item 2 under 'Capacity building' was removed since there was no funding for training events at the international level. Item 3 under the same theme was reworded to: "On-the-job" support and backstopping to your CP by IST, **if any IST member could manage to visit your CP** (no funds were available in 2015 for CP backstopping visits) and Item 4 included an additional note in parenthesis: (also self-organised during a visit to another country for another purpose – see Guideline 8 on minimum commitments)
- Item 1 under 'Functioning of the IST and International Secretariat' was edited to drop LINEX–CCA and SOLLINKKA and Item 4 under the same theme was edited from 'development of new sub-programmes' to 'development of new thematic activities'.
- Minor edits on the items under the 'Self-assessment' theme were made.

We received 10 responses from the following: India, Kenya, Ethiopia, Nepal, Cameroon, Bolivia, Senegal, Ghana, the International Secretariat at the Royal Tropical Institute (KIT) and the International Institute of Rural Reconstruction (IIRR) representing 15 respondents. IIRR, the International Secretariat and the Kenya CP sent group responses.

## Analysis

A detailed breakdown of the scores on the six themes is given in Annex 1. The table below summarises the average scores for each theme and the sub-themes under it. Scores were given on a scale of 1-5; where 1 was “weak” to 5 that meant “excellent”

Table 1: Summary results assessment for each of the six main themes

|   |  |  |   |  |   |   |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|---|
| <b>Governance</b>   | Functioning of PROLINNOVA Oversight Group  | (Opportunity for) influencing decision making in the network   | Efficiency and transparency of management and control of funds handled by the Secretariat | Joint strategy development and planning, monitoring and evaluation                       |   |   |
| <b>3.58</b>   | <b>3.8</b>   | <b>3.5</b>   | <b>3.22</b>   | <b>3.8</b>   |   |   |
| <b>Learning, sharing of info among partners and CPs</b>     | Direct country-to-country exchange of information  | Sharing through the Yahoo group and website  | Sharing and learning through the international meetings                                   |  |   |   |
| <b>3.04</b>   | <b>2.33</b>  | <b>3.4</b>   | <b>3.4</b>  |  |   |   |
| <b>Capacity building</b>                                    | Opportunities to attend international workshops/ seminars/ meetings                                    | “On-the-job” support during CP backstopping visits by IST, if any IST member could manage to visit your CP | Backstopping by other CPs   |  |   |   |
| <b>2.41</b>   | <b>3.0</b>   | <b>2.67</b>  | <b>1.56</b>   |  |   |   |
| <b>Functioning of the IST and International Secretariat</b> | Secretariat’s role in info provision and handling planning process, contracts and financial management | Regular IST support to your CP by Email, Skype,  | Facilitating and supporting M&E at various levels   | Supporting fund raising for PROLINNOVA and encouraging development of new sub-programmes |   |   |
| <b>3.5</b>  | <b>4.0</b>   | <b>3.88</b>  | <b>2.5</b>  | <b>3.62</b>  |   |   |
| <b>Increased international awareness on PID/PROLINNOVA</b>  | Recognition by, partnership with, international research and development organisations and donors      | Number and quality of international PROLINNOVA publications, their spread and use                          | Reference to PID and PROLINNOVA experiences in publications, websites etc of others       | Actual institutional change towards PID in international partners/ organisations         |   |   |
| <b>3.05</b>   | <b>3.8</b>   | <b>3.0</b>   | <b>2.89</b>   | <b>2.5</b>   |   |   |
| <b>Self-assessment by CPs</b>                               | Extent of reaching goals and objectives of CPs   | Governance at the CP level   | Functioning of the country level secretariat  | Communication between and among partners   | Capacity of CP level to continue PROLINNOVA without funding from PROLINNOVA International | Achievements at CP level in fundraising |
| <b>2.64</b>   | <b>3.11</b>  | <b>2.62</b>  | <b>2.0</b>  | <b>2.89</b>  | <b>3.0</b>  | <b>2.22</b>                             |
| <b>Overall performance average: 3.04</b>                    |  |  |   |  |   |   |
| <b>International level: 3.12</b>                            |  |  |   |  |   |   |
| <b>National level: 2.64</b>                                 |  |  |   |  |   |   |

Table 1 shows that, for 2015, PROLINNOVA’s overall performance is scored at 3.04, a bit higher compared to 2013’s performance score of 2.87. Scores on two themes are below the overall performance average: (1) Capacity building; and (2) Self-assessment by CPs. Governance scored the highest at 3.58 followed by the functioning of the IST and International Secretariat at 3.5.

The following analysis can be drawn from Table 1 and the list of comments/suggestions/recommendations given by the respondents:

1. *Governance* received the highest overall score of 3.58. Functioning of the PROLINNOVA Oversight Group and Joint strategy development and planning, monitoring and evaluation scored highest at 3.8 each. Efficiency and transparency of management and control of funds was scored lowest at 3.22. The following summary of comments explains these scores:
  - The POG was able to manage some face-to-face and virtual meetings in 2015.
  - There was mixed perception of the POG's being active and providing regular information to members and not being very active except for some personal communications from Ann.
  - The network is perceived to be democratic following a participatory approach where members feel welcome to participate. However, there are members that are not able to fully participate. This could be due to language difficulties and other competing activities.
  - Most of the respondents appreciated the way the PROLINNOVA strategy was shared to the network to generate comments and suggestions. One respondent remarked that monitoring and evaluation has been consistent over time.
  - Two respondents expressed not being aware of how funds are handled at the level of the International Secretariat.
  
2. *Learning, sharing of information among partners and country platforms* is scored at 3.04. Direct country-to-country exchange of information was rated lowest at 2.33. Sharing and learning through the website and international meetings got high scores of 3.4 each. The following summary of comments supports the scores for this theme:
  - For most respondents, the IPW was a good platform for sharing information about the CP and for peer-to-peer learning across the network. After the IPW, participants are not so actively exchanging information.
  - Most sharing happened through the PROLINNOVA website (updated, maintained and managed by IIRR through its own funds), information is easily uploaded; however, interaction is very limited and not many CP actively uploaded information.
  - Many respondents said that they did not experience direct country-to-country exchange. This could be because there is no deliberate plan and there are no resources for this. One respondent said that, towards the end of 2014 or early 2015, the Cambodia team visited Nepal.
  
3. *Capacity building* received the lowest average score at 2.41 among the five themes at the international level. The sub-theme Backstopping by other CPs which was scored by all respondents except 1 received the lowest (1.56) of all the items in the questionnaire. 'Opportunities to attend international workshops/seminars/meetings' was rated highest at 3.0. The following summary of comments supports the scores given to this theme and sub-themes:
  - The IPW is the only opportunity for attending international events/meetings during the period. This is not enough to keep the network functioning. The West African Farmer Innovation Fair (FIF) provided opportunity for several CPs in the region to come together. Funding is the biggest constraint for most CPs in attending the IPW, especially in recent years when funding support for CPs has declined.
  - Exchanges between CPs are mostly done through the website.
  - Given limited funding for backstopping support by the IST to CPs, IST members piggybacked on other overseas assignments to backstop CPs. There were eight backstopping visits made and one visit by a CP partner to the IST office in the Netherlands during 2015. Backstopping activities through visits or virtually that were mentioned included: visit to PROLINNOVA–Uganda by Chris Macoloo, Suman's support to the organisers of the West Africa FIF, Gabriela's visits to Sahel partners, Ingrid's support

for FIPAO and the video during the FIPAO in Burkina Faso, and Ann's visit to PROLINNOVA–Ethiopia and two visits to PROLINNOVA–Kenya.

4. *The role of the International Secretariat and the IST* is still considered positive (composite score of 3.5). The Secretariat's role in providing information and handling planning processes, contracts and financial management scored highest at 4.0, followed by regular IST support to the CP by email, Skype and backstopping visits at 3.88. Supporting fundraising for PROLINNOVA and encouraging development of new sub-programs was scored at 3.62 and facilitating and supporting M&E at various levels was scored at 2.5. The summary of comments below explains the scores for this theme:

- Collaboration with the Secretariat is very limited since many of the respondents did not implement any project facilitated by PROLINNOVA funding. PROLINNOVA–Philippines has not taken off fully due to lack of resources. It is currently tied up to IIRR's programme on climate smart agriculture in one province.
- The support from the IST is important. In 2015, communicating information to CPs, organising the FIPAO, writing proposals, providing encouragement and settling disputes between organisations, Gabriela's support to Spanish-speaking member CPs and regularly doing follow-ups were appreciated.
- Comments on M&E include the following: Electronic M&E happens annually, M&E tools are quite general and respondents have not been involved with IST on M&E.

5. *Increased international awareness of PID/PROLINNOVA* was scored at 3.05. In 2015, recognition by and/or partnership with international research and development organisations and donors was scored at 3.8, followed by number and quality of international PROLINNOVA publications, their spread and use scored at 3.0. Reference to PID and PROLINNOVA experiences in publications, websites, etc. of others was rated 2.89 and actual institutional change towards PID in international partners/organisations was rated 2.5. The following summary of comments supports the scores for this theme:

- Innovation and participatory innovation development (PID) have started to become widely used and accepted terminology in most development organisations and research institutions. The online survey done as part of the GFAR stocktaking showed an increased interest in PID/PROLINNOVA among partners in agricultural research and development. Papers presented in international fora have led to some linkages and collaborations.
- International Farmer Innovation Day has been maintained and the campaign sustained in a number of CPs. The FIF has drawn attention to PID. PROLINNOVA–Kenya specifically benefitted from this attention to PID when one of its farmer innovators was invited to share perspectives during an Expert Consultation on Small-scale Farmer Innovation in Bio-diverse Food Systems organised by Quaker United Nations Office in May. During the IPW 2015, recognition of PID by major international research institutions was shared. During the FIPAO, recognition of donors and other institutions were evident. This recognition could boost fundraising for PROLINNOVA.
- Publications were uploaded to the website. There are not many new publications in 2015, but the videos made during FIPAO and much other information were shared electronically and uploaded to the website. Translation of these documents into other languages (French, Spanish) must be supported.
- PROLINNOVA is an established recognised network. Its Local Innovation Support Fund is a good model for others.

6. *The self-assessment of the overall CP performance* received a score of 2.64. There were six components explored: (1) extent of reaching goals and objectives of Country Platforms, (2) governance at the CP level, (3) functioning of the CP Secretariat, (4) communication between and among partners in the CP, (5) capacity at the CP level to continue PROLINNOVA work without funding from PROLINNOVA international and (6) achievements at CP level in fundraising.

Extent of reaching goals and objectives of CPs was rated highest at 3.11, followed by Potential for continuation without funding from PROLINNOVA international scored at 3.0. Communication between and among partners was scored at 2.89, Governance at the CP level scored 2.62, Achievement at CP level in fundraising scored 2.22 and Functioning of the country-level secretariat got a low score of 2.0.

- The CPs strived a lot to achieve their goals and objectives and there are ongoing activities to support these goals and objectives. PID activities were mainstreamed in the host organisation's programmes and projects in the case of PROLINNOVA–Philippines.
- Energy was spent in conflict resolution in one CP. Individual motivation has kept up the interest and encouraged participation of new members.
- Fundraising was a challenge. There were a number of efforts made to increase fundraising during the year. While membership of stakeholders has been generally declining, the members of the National Steering Committee of Prolinnova Kenya has remained the same for the last several years and membership of farmers and farmer groups has been increasing due to its opening up of new area. The phase out of the host organisation of PROLINNOVA–Nepal has rendered the CP inactive. There is currently no ownership of the network in Nepal, and working groups are inactive.

## Suggestions for improvement

Under each theme, respondents gave suggestions on how to improve functioning of PROLINNOVA at the international level. The following summarises the suggestions given by the respondents:

- To make governance more robust, it was suggested that: CPs should relate more with the POG; and the POG should interact more even with no face-to-face meeting possibilities. Having POG co-Chairs is a good practice that must be continued. More avenues for information exchange must be cultivated. Try joint strategy development, planning, monitoring and evaluation at the regional level.
- To enhance further the learning and sharing of information among partners and CPs: West African Anglophone CPs with PROLINNOVA projects should share information with the rest of the network; need for clear responsibility to lead and support the group; remind the CPs to review their website pages; create more opportunities for mutual sharing and learning such as attending international meetings; twinning of CPs for experience exchange; interacting with individuals not affiliated with PROLINNOVA; and promote regional meetings.
- To beef up capacity-building efforts: Keep sending materials, news, articles and every available information; increase fundraising efforts to create provision for attending international meetings and for backstopping amongst CPs; organise international workshops and seminars for information dissemination and cross-learning; generate resources for joint activities, more IST support; organise training in other languages; and backstopping support to continue.
- To enhance the role of the International Secretariat/IST: do not forget support to Latin America; customise M&E tools to local setting to be more functional; let CPs take on some of the IST functions such as fundraising and documentation; strengthen support for fundraising; and continue the active response of the IST to mediate fundraising.
- To further increase international awareness on PID/PROLINNOVA, a few suggestions include: develop new publications or update current publications on PID; document the beneficiaries of PID trainings and effectively quantify the impact of PID in their work; develop systems and structures to support effective functioning of the IST and International Secretariat of PID in organisational programmes; and PROLINNOVA members should publish in international journals beyond sharing with members.

- Suggestions coming out of the CPs' self-assessment included: need resources for effective secretarial and fully functional CP; create avenues for better interaction, participation and partnership within the network; identify strategies for active participation of partners; revitalise the national steering committee; and strengthen the current host organisation.

## Other feedback

The evaluation concluded by providing an opportunity for respondents to give any other feedback or suggestions. Below are the key suggestions from the respondents:

- It is important not to lose the objective of the network and be open-minded to changes at all levels.
- Keep up and improve the communication and coordination.
- PROLINNOVA international provide opportunities for exchange between farmer innovators who were recognised and rewarded in the country fairs (FIFs) as in the case of PROLINNOVA Kenya.
- Do more for strengthening CPs in Latin America and work on strengthening planning in each country.
- Translate some publications of the network into other languages.
- The evaluation format was designed several years back and we are still using the same instrument. We believe it is a generic format and can be used by anyone and anytime. However, it is also appropriate to draw evaluation questions from the joint plan of action of PROLINNOVA which is prepared every year after the IPW meeting. In other words, there are several issues that the CPs agree to undertake in the coming year. The POG and IST also often make similar commitments. All these are, however, not addressed in the evaluation and it is important to design an instrument that could address these all.

## Conclusions and proposed action areas

Respondents rated the overall performance of PROLINNOVA in 2015 with an average of 3.04. Given the circumstances and contexts within which most CPs operate, this score is high. The above analysis identified a number of possible areas for improvements that are summarised in the table below for review and decision-making during the IPW 2016.

| Action area  | Proposed actions   | Possible lead |
|--|--|---------------|
| Make CPs more active and increased ownership of PROLINNOVA             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue regional-level formation/discussion to include structure, strategy and implementation plan and M&amp;E</li> </ul>  |               |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify during the IPW what IST role/s can be taken up by CPs</li> </ul>   |               |
| Responsibility for CPs to update their pages and upload to the website | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Share again the instructions on how to upload documents to the website</li> </ul>   |               |
| Enhanced learning on other PID programmes/practices                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Invite resource speaker from outside the PROLINNOVA network during IPW 2016</li> </ul>  |               |
| Enhance fundraising efforts  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Before IPW 2016, target opportunities for fundraising, share in advance, CPs to bring ideas for regional, international or country-cluster fundraising</li> </ul> |               |
| More visibility through publications                                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify publications for 2016 and the support needed for these publications.</li> </ul>  |               |

## Annex 1: Detailed breakdown of the scores on the six themes

| <b>1. Governance</b> |   |  |  |  |
|----------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Country              | Functioning of PROLINNOVA Oversight Group | Opportunity for influencing decision-making in the network | Efficiency and transparency of management and control of funds for activities handled by the PROLINNOVA International Secretariat (CLIC–SR, FIPAO, FaReNe etc) | Joint strategy development and planning, monitoring and evaluation |
| Bolivia              | 4   | 4  | 3  | 3  |
| Cameroon             | 4   | 3  | 2  | 3  |
| Ethiopia             | 3   | 3  | 4  | 4  |
| Ghana                | 4   | 4  | 4  | 5  |
| IIRR                 | 4   | 4  | 3  | 3  |
| India                | 3   | 3  | 2  | 3  |
| IST group            | 5   | 4  | -  | 4  |
| Kenya                | 4   | 4  | 4  | 3  |
| Nepal                | 3   | 3  | 4  | 2  |
| Senegal              | 5   | 4  | 4  | 4  |

| <b>2. Learning and sharing of information among partners and Country Platforms</b> |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|
| Country  | Direct country-to-country exchange of information | Sharing through the Yahoo group and website | Sharing and learning through the international meetings |
| Bolivia  | -   | 4   | -   |
| Cameroon   | 1   | 2   | 4   |
| Ethiopia   | 4   | 5   | 5   |
| Ghana  | 2   | 4   | 5   |
| IIRR   | 2   | 2   | 4   |
| India  | 2   | 2   | 2   |
| IST group  | 2   | 3   | 5   |
| Kenya  | 2   | 4   | 4   |
| Nepal  | 4   | 2   | 2   |
| Senegal  | 2   | 5   | 4   |

| <b>3. Capacity building</b> |   |   |  |
|-----------------------------|---|---|--|
| Country                     | Opportunities to attend international workshops/seminars/meetings | “On-the-job” support and backstopping to your CP by IST <b>if any IST member could manage to visit your CP</b> (no funds were available in 2015 for CP backstopping visits) | Backstopping by other CPs (also self-organised during a visit to another country for another purpose – see Guideline 8 on minimum commitments) |
| Bolivia                     | -   | 5   | -  |
| Cameroon                    | 5   | 1   | 1  |
| Ethiopia                    | 3   | 3   | 3  |
| Ghana                       | 5   | 1   | 1  |

|           |    |   |   |
|-----------|----|---|---|
| IIRR      | 2  | 1 | 1 |
| India     | 2- | - | 1 |
| IST group | 3  | 3 | 2 |
| Kenya     | 2  | 3 | 1 |
| Nepal     | 2  | 2 | 2 |
| Senegal   | 3  | 5 | 2 |

#### 4. Functioning of the IST and International Secretariat

| Country   | Secretariat's role in general info provision and handling planning process, contracts and financial management in case of projects (co-) handled by the Secretariat (CLIC–SR, FIPAO, FaReNe etc) | Regular IST support to your CP by email and Skype | Facilitating and supporting M&E at various levels | Supporting fundraising for PROLINNOVA and encouraging development of new thematic activities |
|-----------|--|---|---|--|
| Bolivia   | -  | 5   | 4   | 4  |
| Cameroon  | 4  | 4   | 1   | 4  |
| Ethiopia  | 5  | 5   | 3   | 3  |
| Ghana     | -  | -   | -   | 4  |
| IIRR      | -  | 2   | 4   | 1  |
| India     | 2  | 2   | 1   | 1  |
| IST group | -  | -   | -   | -  |
| Kenya     | 5  | 5   | 4   | 5  |
| Nepal     | 3  | 4   | 4   | 3  |
| Senegal   | 4  | 4   | 3   | 5  |

#### 5. Increased international awareness on PID/PROLINNOVA

| Country   | Recognition by and/or partnership with international research and development organisations and donors | Number and quality of international PROLINNOVA publications, their spread and use | Reference to PID and PROLINNOVA experiences in publications, websites etc of others | Actual institutional change towards PID in international partners/ organisations |
|-----------|--|---|---|--|
| Bolivia   | 3  | 3   | 3   | 4  |
| Cameroon  | 3  | 3   | -   | -  |
| Ethiopia  | 4  | 4   | 3   | -  |
| Ghana     | 5  | 4   | 4   | 4  |
| IIRR      | 4  | 2   | 3   | 1  |
| India     | 4  | -   | 4   | 4  |
| IST group | 4  | 3   | 4   | 2  |
| Kenya     | 3  | 2   | 2   | 2  |
| Nepal     | 4  | 3   | 3   | 3  |
| Senegal   | 4  | 3   | 5   | 3  |



| <b>6. Self-assessment</b> |  |                            |                                   |  |  |   |
|---------------------------|--|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Country                   | Extent of reaching goals and objectives of Country Platforms (CPs) | Governance at the CP level | Functioning of the CP Secretariat | Communication between and among partners in the CP | Capacity at CP level to continue PROLINNOVA work without funding from PROLINNOVA International | Achievements at CP level in fundraising |
| Bolivia                   | 4  | -                          | 4                                 | 3  | 3  | 2                                       |
| Cameroon                  | 3  | 3                          | 3                                 | 2  | 3  | 2                                       |
| Ethiopia                  | 4  | 3                          | 3                                 | 3  | 4  | 3                                       |
| Ghana                     | 3  | 2                          | 1                                 | 4  | 2  | 1                                       |
| IIRR                      | 2  | 2                          | 2                                 | 2  | 2  | 2                                       |
| India                     | 3  | 2                          | 2                                 | 3  | 2  | 2                                       |
| IST group                 | -  | -                          | -                                 | -  | -  | -                                       |
| Kenya                     | 3  | 3                          | 3                                 | 2  | 2  | 1                                       |
| Nepal                     | 2  | 1                          | 1                                 | 1  | 1  | 1                                       |
| Senegal                   | 3  | 4                          | 3                                 | 4  | 5  | 3                                       |

## **Annex 2: All suggestions for improvement**

### **1) Governance**

- It is important, for the CPs, to have more relationship with the POG
- Cultivate more avenues for information exchange/ direct lines of communication between the POG, IST and CPs.
- Nothing much has been done in joint strategy development and planning, monitoring and evaluation. If not at international level, it should be tried at regional level.
- More effort should be made to share addresses of potential partners that can help CPs to propose their proposal and find funds.
- Continue to have co-chairs in the POG (this is particularly important if an IST member has the position of chair)
- More effort should be made to share addresses of potential partners that can help CP to propose their proposal and find fund.
- Any things
- More interactions of the POG, even using non-face-to-face means

### **2) Learning and sharing of information among partners and Country Platforms**

- The International Secretariat plays a clue role in the connection among countries.
- West African Anglophone CPs which have PROLINNOVA projects need to share information with the rest of us.
- Clear responsibility to leader and support for group.
- CPs have not been very active in uploading information onto the website. They should be more proactive in doing this. It is simply a matter of sending information to Annie at IIRR if they are unable to do this themselves.
- The CPs need to be reminded from time to time that they need to review their CP pages on the website and send relevant information to Annie at IIRR.
- Create more opportunities for mutual sharing and learning such as the CPs identifying various avenues to participate in various international meetings that provide an opportunity for interaction with other organisations and individuals who might or not be affiliated to PROLINNOVA.
- Deliberate efforts to raise resources or allocate funds from existing resources for country exchange.
- See how the minimum commitments in the country can include sharing information with other network members.
- Promoting regional meeting (Sahel, francophone, etc.)
- Twinning of countries for more experience exchange and sharing; recognise the most successful twins in the sphere of PROLINNOVA international.

### **3) Capacity building**

- Sometimes could appear that nobody read the articles or news that many people send by the email, but for some of us was an important source of new knowledge! So, please keep sending materials, news, articles and everything possible.
- Difficult in the present circumstances and without resources.
- Increase fundraising efforts to create provision for attending international meetings and for backstopping amongst CPs. This will go a long way in creating opportunities for information dissemination and cross-learning between CPs.

- Except for regular IPW, I don't find any opportunities to attend international workshop/ seminars. The POG and IST should try to organise or find out other international workshops, seminars so that PROLINNOVA CPs are regularly meeting each other.
- Meeting once a year at IPW is not enough so as to keep the network live and functioning.
- Deliberate efforts to raise resources for joint activities, international workshops, IST support.
- Organise a training course in other languages, for example, in French.
- I suggest continuing the backstopping support.

#### **4) Functioning of the IST and International Secretariat**

- Please, do not neglect the support to country teams, especially in Latin America, we are in the effort to strengthen the network within PROLINNOVA.
- Customise M&E tools to local setting so as to be more functional. Some of the functions of the IST can be undertaken to some level by the CP; therefore, there is need to strengthen the capacity of the CPs to effectively undertake some of these IST functions e.g. fundraising and documentation, and therefore minimise reduce reliance on the IST.
- Strengthen support for fundraising, especially to expand PROLINNOVA efforts in a new CPs
- Any things
- I suggest the active response and support of IST continue. It will create transparency and we learn from their innovative mediation between different organisations such as donors and implementing organisations.

#### **5) Increased international awareness on PID/PROLINNOVA**

- When we talk about PID we think on it as a approach, no as a methodology. I mean, the focus of PROLINNOVA is the recognition and revaluation of the local innovation and knowledge, how each institution discovers it, manages it, promotes it, depends on the context and the institutional expertise, we are correct?
- There is need to develop new publications or to update current publications on PID. There is also need to document the beneficiaries of PID trainings and to effectively quantify the impact of PID within their work.
- There is also need to develop systems and structures to support effective institutionalisation of PID into organisational programmes.
- PROLINNOVA members should go further for international journals beyond sharing among members.

#### **6) Self-assessment**

- We have to work on catching funds for local innovations issues!
- We need resources for effective secretariat and fully functional country platform.
- Create avenues for better interaction, participation and partnership within the network in 2016. In addition, PK needs to step up its resource mobilisation efforts.
- Though PK has several partners, there is need to identify strategies that will enhance the active participation (technical, administrative, financial etc) of its partners.
- Support to fundraise or provide funding form initial activities to introduce PROLINNOVA and promote PID–PID.
- To support the CP in fundraising.
- Revitalising the national steering committee and strengthening the current host.

### Annex 3: Other feedback given

- It is important not to lose the objective of the network and be open mind to changes, at all levels.
- Keep and improve the communication and the coordination.
- PROLINNOVA International provides opportunities for exchange between innovators farmers (as), could be who were recognised and rewarded in the country fairs.
- Think and do more for strengthening country platforms in Latin America and work on a strengthening plan in each country, within the framework of their strategies.
- Translate some publications of the network in other languages.
- The evaluation format was designed several years back and we are still using same instrument. We believe it is a generic format and can be used by any one and any time. However it is also appropriate to draw evaluation questions from the joint plan of action of PROLINNOVA, which is prepared every year, after the IPW meeting. In other words, there are several issues, which the CPs agree to undertake in the New Year. The POG and the IST also often do similar commitments. All these are, however, not addressed in the evaluation and it is important to design an instrument that could address all.

### Annex 4: Respondents

|     | Country Platforms | Number of respondents |
|-----|-------------------|-----------------------|
| 1.  | Bolivia           | 1                     |
| 2.  | Cameroon          | 1                     |
| 3.  | Ethiopia          | 1                     |
| 4.  | Ghana             | 1                     |
| 5.  | IIRR              | 3                     |
| 6.  | India             | 1                     |
| 7.  | IST group         | 3                     |
| 8.  | Kenya             | 2                     |
| 9.  | Nepal             | 1                     |
| 10. | Senegal           | 1                     |