



PROLINNOVA International Partners Meeting

6 to 10 March 2006

Phnom Penh and Siem Reap, Cambodia



Philippines/ the Netherlands, September 2006

Table of contents

Introduction	3
Opening	4
Workshop on Participatory Innovation Development	4
Workshop on Local Innovation Support Fund	5
PROLINNOVA mid-term review	10
Field Study	17
World Café: Open space for discussing key issues	18
Strategic planning for PROLINNOVA 2007-2010	18
Follow-up planning, evaluation and closure	20

Annexes

1	Detailed schedule of the meeting
2	List of participants
3	Expectations and concerns from participants
4	Output of group work on Participatory Innovation Development
5	Revised PM&E framework for LISF pilots
6	Output of group work on key challenges
7	Guidelines for field study
8	Observations from field study groups
9	Workshop café outputs
10	Action plan matrix

Introduction

The 2006 PROLINNOVA International Partners Meeting was held from 6 to 10 March with sessions in Phnom Penh and Siem Reap, Cambodia. The meeting followed the 2004 international workshop in Ethiopia and the 2005 partner's meeting held in Entebbe, Uganda. The Steering Committee of the PROLINNOVA-Cambodia programme, coordinated by the NGO CEDAC, hosted the event as well as two smaller meetings that followed the main event: the meeting of the PROLINNOVA Oversight Group (POG) and a planning meeting of partners involved in the Farmer Access to Innovation Resources sub-project.

The annual international partner's meetings are a key events in PROLINNOVA and strengthen the programme partnerships. They have proven to be excellent opportunities for mutual learning about critical programme concerns, such as farmer innovation, PID, PM&E and facilitating multi-stakeholder processes. It is also the platform for actual participatory monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) of the PROLINNOVA itself.

Design of the 2006 meeting

The specific objectives of the 2006 meeting workshop were to:

- Provide an opportunity for PROLINNOVA representatives – both from Country Programmes (CPs) and from the International Support Team (IST) – to come together to update each other on programme progress and to learn and share from each other.
- Review programme progress, accomplishments, challenges and remaining work to be completed ; and
- Discuss future directions for PROLINNOVA for the period 2007-2010.

The objectives were addressed through eight key activities:

1. Opening (Internal opening, Information market exchange and Formal opening session)
2. Workshop 1: Promoting local innovation and Participatory innovation development (PID)
3. Workshop 2: Local innovation support fund (LISF)
4. Workshop 3: Mid-term review
5. Field study
6. World café: Working and sharing on identified critical issues
7. Strategic planning for PROLINNOVA 2007-2010
8. Follow-up planning, evaluation and closure.

The sessions under 1. were held in Phnom Penh to allow close interaction with a wider group of Cambodian organisations. With the attendance of the minister of agriculture this also allowed to support the policy dialogue activities of the This is seen as a concrete approach to participatory monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) of the PROLINNOVA Cambodia partners. The rest of the meeting took place in Siem Reap involving only the partners.

Annex 1 gives details of the workshop schedule. The meeting was co-funded by the Netherlands Ministry of Development Cooperation through its grant to PROLINNOVA's core programme and by CTA, Misereor and the GFAR.

Participants

A total of 36 participants gathered for the 6-day meeting, including 24 representatives from all 9 Country Programmes (CP), members of the International Support Team (6), POG members, an external evaluator, a GFAR representative and 3 representatives from new countries interested to start-up PROLINNOVA type of activities. Full list of participants is given in Annex 2.

Opening

A short technical opening session at the CEDAC office dealt with the usual workshop introductory items. As part of this participants formulated their key interests and concerns for discussion for the meeting (Annex 3) and briefly reviewed the implementation of the action plan formulated at the 2005 meeting in Uganda. While considerable progress was made with many action points a number were proposed for further analysis during the forward planning session later during the meeting

The official opening was organized by the Steering Committee of PROLINNOVA-Cambodia as a separate event with an aim of raising the profile of programme activities within Cambodia. It had two main activities. First, workshop participants set up an “Information Market Exchange” as a venue to share information about PROLINNOVA activities in each of the CPs. Videos, posters, leaflets/brochures, publications and websites were all prominently displayed. Participants and guests, including Cambodian development practitioners, farmers, donors, and government officials – were invited to learn more about the work of the PROLINNOVA partners.

The second part was a more ‘formal’ Opening Programme facilitated by various members of the PROLINNOVA-Cambodia programme Steering Committee. Mr. Laurens Van Veldhuizen, IST member, made a presentation about the global PROLINNOVA programme. Cambodian farmer innovators also shared some of their experiences. Lastly, the Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry – H.E. Chan Sarun – officially opened the programme, and encouraged other government agencies and NGOs in Cambodia to become involved in promoting local innovation as a strategy to promote agricultural development.

Workshop on Participatory Innovation Development

After the move to Siem Reap the first workshop, facilitated by Mr. Ahmed Hanafi, Sudan CP and member of the POG, looked into promoting local innovation and the PID approach. This allowed CPs to share some of their practical experiences on the theme. The group was divided into two working groups:

- Group 1 – Ethiopia, Ghana, Nepal, Uganda
- Group 2 – Cambodia, Niger, South Africa

Each CP representative made a brief presentation on their experiences with documenting and promoting local innovation. Questions for clarification were raised after each presentation. Participants formulated key insights they gained from the presentations, the questions they still have, and what they consider a priority issue that must be addressed in this workshop. A brief plenary discussion was held on participants’ priority issues.

Both groups found the sharing/presentations to be particularly useful and relevant to their own CP programme work and activities. There was a lot of interaction and questions-answers generated during the session. As output for sharing, Group 1 prepared a matrix of Insights, Questions, Priority Issues that were identified from the four presentations and the discussions. Group 2 prepared a list of lessons learnt. (See Annex 4.)

In the plenary session, the following key issues were combined from the group work:

1. **Why are we doing PID?** We need to further clarify concepts of local innovation and PID. There is a vision, but programme partners need to better articulate a conceptual

framework together based on experiences gained so far. We need to justify our focus on innovation versus good practice to promote sustainable livelihoods.

2. **How are we doing this?** Our methodology of documenting must be less extractive and more participatory. What next after documentation, experimentation and dissemination? How do we ensure that farmers benefit?
3. **Policy influence** – How can we lobby within own institutions, as well as set legislation at multiple levels to promote/support local innovation.
4. **Farmer's fear of bio-piracy is real** – PROLINNOVA must promote farmers (defensive) property rights.

The workshop was concluded by a brief synthesis presentation on the various strategies and approaches that can be used to build on and support local innovation; always keeping in mind that local innovation is a process to be promoted – not just the innovations that are results of this process.

Multiple strategies to promote local innovation processes:

1. Professionals, be aware of its existence and relevance, take away the notion that farmers know more than they assume.
2. Integrate innovators/innovations in extension activities, local training, field days – Can be included into existing extension work and activities.
3. Study, verify and write up farmer innovations and disseminate widely. Verification not the same as doing research, with group discussion and investigation, criticizing and conclude that it can be shared more widely.
4. Farmer-led joint experimentation, helping farmers to sort out what is going on, help them understand farmers, outsiders. Help farmers improve on the innovation/s to support the existing innovation, document and spread it widely through mass media and others.
5. Supportive on-station/lab research – Local innovation may need the support of research lab work.
6. Work with farmer innovators on new issues, keen researchers on their own right, key persons /community issues, research and extension agenda from NGOs and other development organizations, use these for our training materials, capture these in the publication and bring it to researchers, etc.

Workshop on Local Innovation Support Fund

Workshop 2, Local innovation support fund (LISF) was facilitated by Mr. Alex Lwakuba, Uganda CP. The aim of this session was to share information about this new activity within PROLINNOVA to establish and foster local innovation support funds as sources of funding to promote grassroots local innovation processes, also known as the Farmer Access to Innovation Resources (FAIR) sub-programme. The workshop included three presentations (each briefly outlined below), and small group work.

Introduction into LISF and FAIR, Anton Krone

Anton Krone, South Africa CP and overall FAIR coordinator, made a brief presentation outlining the key ideas, main concepts and approach of the FAIR sub-project. It is a PROLINNOVA project which aims to operationalize the idea of local innovation support funds. The project is working four CPs with funding from DURAS – Cambodia, Ethiopia, South Africa and Uganda –and hopes to secure additional funding from GEF to work in an additional two CPs. Key ideas from Anton's presentation are briefly outlined below.

Problem statement

- Increasing challenge in integrating production with conservation amidst threats to natural resources due to poverty, climate change, resource pressures and ineffective intervention
- Current R&D undertakings tend to be supply driven and not sufficiently rooted in local knowledge and action
- Against this backdrop, the innovation support funds can be provided to small farmers in order to support creative efforts towards responding to the challenge described above.

Project objectives

To mobilize area-based partnerships that...

- Stimulate local innovation and action
- Which are learning-centred and give rise to more replicable and sustainable practice
- Which lead to long term improvement in farmer practices and resource management
- That impact favourably on the poor and their livelihoods in terms of processes, outcomes and spread.

Specific objectives

1. Identification, design and piloting of innovation support funds (ISFs) in four countries as promoters of local innovation;
2. Documentation and dissemination of lessons learnt re: appropriate ways, mechanisms and conditions for ISFs to become effective promoters of local innovation; and
3. Establishment of sustainable long term ISFs actively supporting community managed funds in four countries.

Key activities

For Objective 1: Country-level feasibility studies, international backstopping on feasibility and design, stakeholder design workshops, implementation of pilots, monitoring and evaluation of pilots and exchange and assessment of experiences across countries.

For Objective 2: Documentation of country experiences, preparation and dissemination of country experience and synthesis report and sharing results on the internet

For Objective 3: National policy dialogues and longer term resource mobilization and preparation of operational plan for longer term ISF development.

Project impact

The following were identified as expected project impacts:

- Contributions to more effective interaction of key actors
- A better understanding of models for enhancing farmer innovation and securing more sustainable natural resources management
- Shedding light on the effectiveness of ISFs as a strategy
- Generation and spread of locally effective approaches with potential to scale up across developing countries
- Policy changes in aid packaging and development interventions
- Contributing towards more sustainable development processes

Monitoring and evaluation

Three levels of M&E were identified: Programme level, ISF pilots and Innovation in natural resource management.

Some operational issues

The following were raised as important issues to deal with in operationalizing ISFs:

- The ISF must be located within the broader approach of the implementing organization and the PROLINNOVA programme. It requires a good understanding of the local context. One role seen for ISF is to provide support to local innovation partnership-based activities from a macro/regional platform. It is expected to lead to other local processes that promote innovation. For a local ISF to succeed, there will have already been a

considerable work in this area and/or complementary interventions that secure a more enabling environment.

- An ISF will not always be the right intervention. It is not the answer to the various issues described in the problem statement.
- Placing funds amidst poor people can easily have detrimental results. We must be sensitive to the effect a local ISF may have on the local social, political and economic forces and vice versa. What we do locally must be informed by the livelihood strategies of the community and it must seek to reward positive and sustainable strategies. Likewise, it must respond to local vulnerabilities (e.g., HIV AIDS, gender and social inequality).
- The current funding trend especially in Africa has distorted relationships between and among development actors where people's concern has increasingly focused on what they can extract from donors/NGOs.
- Timing is an important factor as to whether local partners are ready for ISF.
- ISF alone will not be able to address the problem described. It is important to identify complementary interventions needed to bring out the best of an ISF.
- As far as PROLINNOVA programme is concerned, the ISF can be taken up within the following sectors: NRM, agriculture, food security, rural production, livelihood security/economic and social development. Which one to prioritize will depend largely on the local context, capacity of the organization and the presence of other actors addressing other imperatives and partnership options.
- The need to ground discussion on ISFs with focus on the description of the context and the kinds of overall strategic thrusts that are relevant to the context and how these tie together.

Review of existing innovation fund experiences, Mariana Wongtschowski

Mariana presented the key findings from a review by the IST of selected experiences in various parts of the world with innovation support funds. Nine cases were reviewed, all of which were agriculture/natural resources management (NRM) related and focused on small farmers. Seven of the cases come from Africa, one from Nepal and one from Europe. Key ideas from Mariana's presentation are briefly outlined below.

List of cases reviewed

1. CATF – Competitive Agricultural Technology Funds (Uganda)
2. CIAL – Local Agricultural Research Committee (Latin America)
3. SSPF – Small-Scale Project Funds (GTZ)
4. ATIRI – Agricultural Technology and Information Response Initiative (Kenya)
5. SF-FFS – Self-Financed Farmer Field Schools (Kenya and Uganda)
6. NIF – National Innovation Foundation (India)
7. C3F – City Community Challenge Fund (Zambia and Uganda)
8. Horticulture Innovation Funds (The Netherlands)
9. LIBIRD Local Innovation Support Fund (Nepal)

Strategic choices people make

The review of these cases revealed some strategic choices that need to be taken, including:

- *The level of decentralization* – Projects either operate at the national, regional or district level. It was observed that projects are able to involve people more meaningfully at the lower level.
- *Institutional base* – LISF are either run by farmer groups or are based in institutions. Three modalities were observed: (1) LISF within an existing organization either NGOs, research organizations, etc., (2) A new organization is created to implement the LISF, and (3) Farmer groups, unions, cooperatives implementing the LISF, i.e., completely decentralized.
- *Individual vs. group applications* – There is variation in the approach as to the use of funds. Some organizations prefer group application and use of the LISF, while others

open the fund to individuals. Others would have a mix of users, groups and individuals. One of the strengths of group application of the LISF is the potential for the fund to regenerate other innovations/actions such as group learning and advocacy initiative whereas individual applications encourage creative people to experiment and take risks.

- The study shows that LISF funds a range of activities such as cross visits, experimentation, acquisition of equipments and materials, documentation, payment for involvement of resource persons and government agents, allowances and cushion for failure (covering losses). Simplified templates for fund application and use are also made available.

Criteria for ISF application

Most organizations have typically established a set of criteria for approving applications for ISF. Some criteria include:

- Innovations that are likely to be relevant to the poor
- Innovations that do not have negative gender implications
- Potential for dissemination
- Environmental aspects and sustainability
- Strength and past record of individual/group
- Farmer-owned experiments

Who selects?

A selection committee usually decides on which applications to approve. The selection committee usually includes representatives from all stakeholders. They would be willing and available to do the task, would have experience in participatory approaches and working cooperatively with others. It should not be too large nor too small. Members of the committee should not have conflict of interest in approving applications.

Issues

1. One of the key issues raised during the presentation was the time frame for the DURAS funding which is only for 2 years. This early, this threat has to be addressed by diversifying donor base, tapping on government resources and partial contributions from farmers and even possibly building an endowment fund to ensure fund replenishment.
2. Administrative issues related to transferring money were also raised. Those who have experience administering ISF felt that a contract is needed. It should be simple. The application and approval process should also be simplified. Having a shorter process for small grants and a different set of rules for larger proposals are helpful.

Discussion questions/comments

- It is important to understand the context. The small amount of money available for ISF can create a lot of damage in the community we will be working with.
- It is good to understand the roles and experiences of groups in their particular contexts. CIAT has some level of success but it has its own problems.
- Other problems include monitoring institutions involved and some organizations struggles with transaction costs that are not quite proportional with the funds available/being managed.

The LISF experience of LI-BIRD in Nepal, Pratap Shrestha

Pratap Shrestha, Nepal CP, presented the first experiences of LI-BIRD in Nepal to establish a local innovation support fund. Having learnt the idea during the first international meeting in Ethiopia, Li-bird undertook a first experiment as it felt it linked closely to the core value of LI-BIRD which gives importance to local knowledge and culture, local initiatives and innovations and local communities and institutions. Key ideas from Pratap's presentation are briefly outlined below.

LI-BIRD has always used participatory approaches, such as encouraging farmer experimentation, providing technical backstopping and resources to farmers' innovations. Their work has always been guided by several key principles:

- Farmers hold valuable knowledge
- Farmers are continuously engaged in innovation
- Farmers also seek new knowledge
- Capacity building accelerates local innovation initiatives and process
- Local innovations are practical and have high potential for application by wider communities

The approach to ISF

LI-BIRD is currently managing ISF funding for the following reasons: community priority on immediate development needs, community need capacity building for managing the process and fund and local innovators not organized to manage the fund. Therefore, it is currently operating as an external organization managing the fund for farmers. They are looking at an alternative approach in the future where the innovator's community manage the funding or the community in general is managing the funding. The profile of LISF funded local innovation proposals supported in 2004 and 2005 by LI-BIRD Nepal are more technology focused.

Funding procedures

These procedures are followed for managing the fund:

1. Announcement/call for proposals on local innovation through their project staff to farmers in the project sites. This done both in written and verbally. In the announcement the sectors/areas for specific funding is already identified.
2. Proposal development and submission. The proposal format is in Nepali and LI-BIRD provides assistance in putting concepts into proposal. These are submitted to field staff or directly to LI-BIRD office or through farmers' group/CBOs.
3. Assessment and selection for funding. Participants are informed of the criteria for selection which includes: clearly defined innovation and rationale for development, clearly defined methodology and activities, contribution to livelihoods, potential for wider application and reasearchability and relevance to the fund. A panel of assessors assess the applications according to these criteria.
4. Fund disbursement. The farmer or representative of the group of the selected proposal is invited to LI-BIRD office to sign an agreement in a publicized ceremony.
5. Orientation to fund management. The applicants are provided financial management and technical monitoring orientation by LI-BIRD.
6. Technical backstopping. A researcher works with the innovators for idea sharing and provides technical support in refining design and implementation.
7. M&E of fund utilisation. LI-BIRD LISF committee conduct field visit and monitor activities, financial records and reporting.

Process management

1. LISF is managed as one of LI-BIRD's core activities.
2. It operates on a research grant bidding model.
3. A LISF committee represented by LI-BIRD senior staff and chaired by its executive director is formed.
4. Transaction cost is currently borne by LI-BIRD.

Sustainability plan

To sustain the process of managing the fund, fundraising is currently being done to address immediate needs for funding. It is currently integrated with the PROLINNOVA ISF for medium range funding and in the long run, it is envisioned that at National Innovation Fund (NAF) a national level funding will be set up for this purpose.

Lessons and issues

1. The process of selecting innovation development proposals should start with communities where contact is already established. In this way, cost will be reduced. It should be clear what is innovative in the concept/idea being proposed. It should address the issue of exclusion whether it is addressing the needs and concerns of the poor, women, etc. It is always good to start with a concept note first before farmers are asked to develop the full proposal. A mix of direct individual application and group application is being encouraged as both approaches have its own advantages. In the identification of the assessors, it will be good to include professionals and representatives from user/farming community. Selecting for an Innovative Farmers' Award may be applied.
2. It will be helpful to establish a LISF committee. The issue of transaction cost and ways of minimizing such cost has to be looked at carefully. The organization should consider an acceptable level of transaction cost with efficiency in mind.
3. Sustaining the initiative may be approached in different ways such as opening the opportunity for other innovators outside of LIBIRD project area, continuous fund raising including raising funds locally and using tied up funds to leverage resources from multiple sources.
4. Local institutions have to be strengthened towards accessing national R&D fund. Documentation and current successful case studies are useful in drawing attention to support farmer innovations. These are also useful in awareness raising and lobbying activities through media.

Discussion issues/comments

- It is observed that much of what the LISF of LI-BIRD has approved are much more focused on technology. There is no local innovation process funded.
- Are local innovation process captured in the documentation requirement of the ISF? Simple documentations are required from the farmers.

Small Group Workshop to develop a PM&E system for the FAIR project

The presentations were discussed in small groups zooming in on the issue of monitoring and evaluation of LISF performance as input to designing the PM&E system for the FAIR sub-project. The guide questions were:

1. Review the six performance areas in the M&E framework of the FAIR project. Modify and add new performance area/s if needed.
2. Each group to look at one performance area, comment on indicators, offer concrete suggestions for measuring indicators and identify the role of farmers in the M&E process.

The results of the groups, after their discussion in a plenary session, have led to a substantial improvement of the PM&E framework for the LISF pilots. Annex 5 presents this revised framework.

PROLINNOVA mid-term review

The meeting reviewed and discussed the findings of the mid-term review, mid-term in the sense of the DGIS grant to PROLINNOVA. Prior top the meeting PROLINNOVA had concluded the internal self-assessments by all CPs and IST members and had undertaken an electronic M&E conference early 2006. An external reviewer, Julian Gonsalves, had studied the results of these internal assessment and compared these with own observations from interactions in two CPs.

This session included an introductory presentation on M&E in PROLINNOVA by Marise Espineli, IST member, presentations by three CPs their internal assessment, followed by a synthesis presentation of the results of all the internal review and the feedback from the external reviewer.

M&E in PROLINNOVA, Marise Espineli

During the PROLINNOVA inception workshop (held in Yirgalem, Ethiopia in March 2004), a broad M&E programme framework and some ideas for a possible M&E structure for the programme were developed. In that meeting, it was also agreed that there was a need to appoint a coordinator for the PROLINNOVA M&E – a role initially taken by ETC. In 2005 at the Entebbe meeting, the M&E framework was further reviewed and sharpened distinguishing between inputs, outputs and outcomes. It was further agreed that each CP would appoint an M&E focal point. From that meeting, IIRR picked up from ETC the coordination of the M&E work. At the Entebbe meeting, statements of Vision and Mission for the PROLINNOVA programme were formulated. The indicators were reviewed against the vision and mission.

Vision
A world in which farmers play decisive roles in agricultural research and development for sustainable livelihoods.

Mission
To foster a culture of mutual learning and synergy in local innovation processes in agriculture and natural resources management.

Within the M&E framework, there are eight sets of indicators at country level and four sets of indicators at international level with specific measures. Out of the nine countries, Tanzania and Ghana have not yet submitted the names of their focal points. No comments have been received on the terms of reference for the M&E focal point.

M&E practice in PROLINNOVA-Uganda, Ronald Lutalo

Ronald provided the group with an overview of the M&E work being conducted by the PROLINNOVA CP partners in Uganda. He briefly discussed country programme activities, outcomes and challenges as related to the M&E function.

Outcome of the self-assessment Prolinnova-Nepal, Rajendra Prasad

Key ideas from the presentation are the following:

- Implementation of activities has been limited; most partners are at the initiation stage. There is participatory planning and review of activities and strengthening of coordination and networking among partners. The partnership has been formalized although it required a long process. Currently hiring full-time staff for PROLINNOVA-Nepal programme. Currently initiating the documentation process and integration of PID/PTD with academic institution. Strong commitment of partners to the participatory approach is considered positive and resource constraint being faced is a challenge.
- Partner organization training has been conducted. Training and orientation at the grassroots-level (farmers) yet to be conducted.
- Planning has been good. However, the time to integrate the PROLINNOVA programme into on-going activities of the partner organizations is still a challenge. The bigger challenge is also linking PROLINNOVA concepts to the farmers in the field.
- M&E system has not been fully established but there is monitoring and review of activities done with the national working group (NWG).

- Key lessons in two years of program development and implementation: (1) A partnership programme is time consuming, (2) To start activities, partnership has to be formalized, (3) Documentation is not enough, this activity has to be integrated with other on-going activities in the projects, (4) Coordinating partner organizations is difficult to do for part time staff, and (5) There is a need to constantly make clear with partners the concept of local innovations.
- These lessons led to the following suggestions: (1) Develop guidelines, roles and responsibilities among partners, (2) Need for capacity building to work side-by-side with documentation, (3) Hiring a full-time staff to oversee the programme, and (4) Develop an innovations assessment criteria.

Role of the M&E focal point

In the Nepal country programme, the following roles have been identified for the M&E focal point:

1. Coordinate the development of M&E system for PROLINNOVA-Nepal programme. Specifically,
 - Develop M&E format and guideline
 - M&E implementation procedure (data collection and analysis)
 - Database management
2. Facilitate implementation of the M&E system within the PROLINNOVA CP
3. Facilitate assessment of the PROLINNOVA CP achievement as per objectives
4. Coordination and networking related to M&E matters at country and global level
5. Collection and sharing information on M&E matters with country partners
6. Represent PROLINNOVA-Nepal in M&E related activities

Management operational guidelines

The country programme has agreed to the following objective: To establish system for smooth operation of the country program working with different partners. It will develop a set of guidelines in managing operations at CP level. Its immediate M&E focus will include:

- Establishing M&E system of PROLINNOVA-Nepal
- M&E indicators
- Organize orientation programme on M&E system for country partners
- Compile and analyze data, and prepare M&E report
- Review M&E system for further refinement

Outcome of the self-assessment PROLINNOVA-South Africa, Brigid Letty

Brigid described the process that PROLINNOVA-South Africa followed for the self-assessment review as having basically been conducted through discussions with the core team and compiling responses to the five questions which were circulated through e-mail to the various partners.

Responses to the questions summarized

- Committed activities in the workplan: Communication and information sharing through catalogues, presentations, posters and journal articles, capacitation of researchers, farmers, documentation of innovation processes, the local innovation support funds submitted for DURAS funding and the national stakeholder workshop.
- Relevant indicators and achievements in relation to the indicators include:
 - Capacity building of farmers and development practitioners in PID (PID workshops in Limpopo and KZN included farmers not just practitioners, ARD trainees were exposed to PROLINNOVA and PID)
 - Identification and documentation of local innovation processes (catalogues, brochures, poster, contribution to the IK note, 21 innovations from 6 women, 4 community groups and 11 men)
 - PID implementation (farmers directly involved)

- Influence government policies to include local innovation and PID (arranged meetings with ARC-SRL head, identified potential linkages with BASED Limpopo Dept of Agriculture and KZN Dept of Agriculture)
- PID and local innovation approach institutionalized through curriculum development and piloting (ARD training include exposure to PROLINNOVA and PID, wide distribution of catalogues, field assignments to identify innovations to take forward)
- Establishing effective multi-stakeholder collaboration (face to face meetings with partners, little responsibility taken by partners at this point, need more delegation of tasks but partners are busy with own programmes, financial reports available, collaborative activities extended beyond the PROLINNOVA plan)
- Challenges: Poor communications with core team, need for more face-to-face interactions; PROLINNOVA not the main focus of people's work; Change of secretariat from MIDNET to INR; Participants to Philippines PID Training of Facilitator's (TOF) course no longer involved.
- The workplan is basically the tool for M&E. The self-assessment was the CP's first opportunity to be systematic where they found the indicators useful during the assessment.
- Key lessons: (1) Not preach PROLINNOVA, rather promote the philosophy behind it through acknowledging experiences/synchronicities, (2) To have a programme coordinator proved to be useful, (3) Programme will not take on extra tasks unless commitment from core team members or within current portfolios of CP or PC, (4) Draw on experience of other CPs in terms of experience in PID.
- Some reflections from the M&E exercise:
 - The South Africa CP was able to see the usefulness of the backstopping activities, the need for strengthening communications within the core team and with partners and workshop participants, the importance of institutionalising the PROLINNOVA methodologies, and the innovation documentation process as this relate to the evaluation criteria, timing, etc.
- The South Africa CP is looking at a more systematic approach to the M&E by ensuring that there will be more regular reviews by PC and CC, more regular reflection on activities and more collaboration with core team in the process and exploring other forms of communication. The M&E review result will also be circulated more widely to the stakeholder group. A set of indicators will be established for the Core team and a different set of indicators will be set for stakeholders in terms of how they are benefiting.

Synthesis of results of PROLINNOVA internal review, Marise Espineli

Main results

Looking at the assessment by CPs and ITS organisations, the following emerged:

- *PROLINNOVA as an international partnership/network* – strong, open, shared responsibilities, clear roles, democratic management but can be strengthened further by increasing sharing of experiences.
- *Capacity building* – considerable progress, though less in 2005 compared to 2004 due to the cancellation of the PID TOF course, top priorities for 2006 – PID, PME, policy advocacy.
- *Policy advocacy and awareness raising* – good progress, mixed views on direct involvement with some issues such as UNCCD, publications commitment met, attendance to international workshops quite high.
- *Effective, decentralized and democratic learning network* – on our way to becoming one, need to exert more effort towards actively participating in M&E, fundraising, overall management and sharing, mixed views on prescribing formats.
- *Most successful activities* – international partners meeting at Entebbe, governance, lobbying and advocacy and backstopping by IST.

- *Areas for improvement* – exchanges between countries, documentation and publication, PROLINNOVA image, backstopping can be more systematic and more proactively pursued by partners.
- *Actions suggested for 2006 and beyond* – strengthening and expansion of in-country networks and activities of existing CPs, synthesizing lessons on PID and learning about partnership, piloting innovative mechanism for policy influence, expanding to more countries, establishing PM&E and establishing LISF for countries that have not done so and up-scaling for those who have.

Programme management

Except for one CP (Sudan) all contracts have been signed, budgets discussed and funds released to all countries. Recruitment of programme coordinators proved to be very helpful for the three CPs who did so. The frequent communication with IST and the PROLINNOVA Secretariat, ETC was very helpful, especially during the project start-up. There are substantial backstopping sessions, based on requests by CPs. CPs have submitted their reports but these need to be shared with other CPs and IST members.

Partnership development

There is a mix of partnership coalitions (GOs, NGOs, universities, research organizations, training institutions and networks). Within these partnerships, action plans have been developed. The national workshops were viewed differently as a means for awareness creation, formation of the National Steering Committee, sharing experiences, strategizing project implementation, stakeholder identification, etc.). The partners have been meeting regularly.

Monitoring and evaluation

The indicators that most CPs found relevant are the following: capacity building for farmers and development practitioners, identification and documentation of local innovations, influencing government policies, PID implementation and multi-stakeholder collaboration. Other indicators that were used by some CPs include: innovation support fund, and LI approaches institutionalised. CPs and IST subscribe to both technical and financial reporting. For the CPs, the stakeholders' workshops and meetings are venues for M&E. For all CPs, the work plan is the main tool for monitoring and evaluation. The joint proposal on the innovation support fund has been submitted to DURAS and GEF and separate agreements with CPs involved have been finalised.

What has worked

The organization of the national workshops and other local level workshops developed confidence within CP partners. The sharing of tasks and responsibilities among partners is beginning to happen much more extensively. Backstopping visits have been cited as very helpful in many ways – developing capacities, developing concepts into specific proposals, resolving operational concerns, etc. The commitment by partners has been identified as key to the success of the programme and the recruitment of CP coordinators has allowed thorough follow-up and coordination.

What did not work

Communication between and among partners at the local level, funding limitations, lack of cooperation of partners, inflation, inability to contribute to the development of the website, PID TOF cancellation, the departure of trained individuals and partners being busy in their own organizations programmes and projects were considered challenges to work around.

Main lessons

- Seeing the value addition of the program to other organizations' work
- Creating critical mass within the institution not only at the top level but also other levels
- Experiences of other CPs provide opportunity for learning and enriching own CP

- Complementation of resources from various sources
- Training and workshops as venue for M&E
- Multi-stakeholder partnership key to successful implementation of the programme, more work done through the diverse strengths and abilities of the partners
- Effective communication/feed-backing key to workable partnership

A number of points were raised during a plenary discussion:

- How has the steering committee in Uganda been kept together? The PROLINNOVA-Uganda identified key partners and invited them officially to the planning workshop. Attendance is not high but within the partner institutions, they have identified persons to represent the partner organizations. It is important to identify a committed team of people and formalize arrangement with the institutions.
- In the case of South Africa, it is difficult to formalize and decentralize approach at the national level. Various representatives from different provinces works better.
- In Sudan, M&E capacities are lacking in many of the partner organizations, either they are overloaded by work or not given the capacity to do M&E. Moreover, other officers are not providing the support that the M&E person needs to be able to do the work.
- In Sudan, PROLINNOVA should carefully consider the diversity of agriculture within 6 climate zones in the representation.

Small Group Workshop to discuss key challenges that CPs face, Bram Buscher

Four small groups discussed the key challenges that CPs face as identified from the previous presentations and discussions, as well as ways to overcome these:

1. Maintaining commitment of core team members and all other implementing partners
2. Effective and practical M&E
3. Managing PROLINNOVA and regular work, funding (becomes extra if you do not have the resource)
4. Mainstreaming of other issues (HIV/AIDS) in our work
5. How we promote PROLINNOVA as a philosophy or a programme
6. How institutions introduce the PROLINNOVA work in their own work, our plan, linking it to development agenda, how to combine PROLINNOVA work with our own work
7. How to establish an independent farmer-led innovation support fund
8. Learning and sharing between countries

Annex 6 presents the results of each of the 4 groups.

Feedback from the external reviewer, Julian Gonsalves

Julian Gonsalves had been asked to contribute to the mid-term review by providing an external perspective on PROLINNOVA's functioning. He was particularly able to do so as he had just reviewed GFAR-funded global partnership programmes of which PROLINNOVA is one. Here are the main issues raised by Julian.

Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) can only be achieved through multi-stakeholder programmes. This applies to all GFAR-funded global partnership programmes (GPPs). Multi-stakeholders bring multiple ideas towards a solution. PROLINNOVA has a strong multi-stakeholder approach at different levels: country and global. The newer GPPs have learned to garner stakeholder ownership, and PROLINNOVA might have influenced that. They have successfully engaged stakeholders at different levels in design of the programme. (For example, the CGIAR's Challenge Programme was designed by a few people and support was mobilized afterwards. It is questioned whether it really enjoys genuine stakeholder ownership, or whether they have been attracted mainly by the funding that is available.)

Partnership programmes are different from stakeholder programmes in that it needs genuine commitment and participation, and requires a strong coordinating agency. The latter function is performed effectively by the Secretariat. New partners bring in new ideas, and help establish a learning network as envisioned by PROLINNOVA.

The seven PROLINNOVA programme outcomes articulated are practical, realistic and measurable, and enable effective M&E. Some outcomes formulated at global level enable a discussion on global public goods, i.e. products that are not country-specific. The enthusiasm for this type of meeting seems fed by country-specific interests. This seems to be requirement for multiple country partnerships.

The distinction between local innovations and local innovation is interesting as it can take away the bias towards technology and in favour of participatory innovation development as a process. The concept of local innovation is exciting because it moves away from discussions that get stuck in whether an innovation is indeed indigenous or not. It provides a range of mixes of innovation and we don't need to get hung up on definitions.

Intellectual property rights (IPR) issues are important. If you don't take it up other agencies will. The POG has already discussed this and developed guidelines. This area needs more visibility within the broader programme.

Documentation efforts and PID have been led by training and capacity development, and the need to move beyond documentation has been expressed. The value of local innovation has gained widespread dissemination and support. However, there is a need to document methodologies used.

Transaction costs are important. We need to ask ourselves whether we want to focus on reducing costs or whether we can see them as necessary capacity building costs.

The concept of 'experimentation for value addition' is an interesting and useful thought. Two implications for the statement that PID needs more attention: 1. Strengthening of farmer groups is needed for scaling up to be successful. What needs to be strengthened, and how can this be done? 2. Clear definition of sites: focal points for learning.

The aspects of social technologies to be generated (e.g. social arrangements, innovative arrangements) is important.

PROLINNOVA as a partnership is effective in joint management and planning, and a strong learning focus. It is multi-stakeholder, needs-driven, and joint ownership. Mentoring country per country could be done. IST can mentor, but countries can also mentor each other. This will make a big difference in capacity strengthening and can help address challenges related to stakeholder commitment. It should be considered to have individuals to sit on other countries' panels.

Different levels of M&E are appreciated. Without heterogeneity and diversity you can't have diffusion of new ideas. Some countries seem more advanced in thinking than others, who might have had more engagement with and support from northern countries.

With regards to documentation, are the materials produced really for farmers or agency staff and researchers? The latter seems the case, raising awareness on the importance of recognizing knowledge of farmers. There is a need to generate diversified materials and knowledge products for specific target audiences.

Policy briefs need to be developed and packaged. Social and institutional issues need to be articulated more since knowledge is available in the network.

Participants generally agreed with Julian's input. The following issues were noted in the plenary discussion:

- Julian was thanked for a comprehensive analysis drawn from many interviews and consultations, and for placing the programme in the context of other Global Partnership Programmes.
- Farmer mobilisation is an area that needs strengthening within the programme. Their active involvement will also inform how to deal with IPR issues in a practical way.

Field Study

Design and organisation of the study

A field study allowed partners to visit rural farming communities and to learn about local innovation and farmer experimentation activities in Cambodia. The objectives of the field study were:

1. To visit rural communities where local innovation/experimentation activities have been conducted as part of the PROLINNOVA-Cambodia programme.
2. To interact with and learn from farmer innovators/experimenters about their efforts to innovate and experiment.
3. To interact with and learn about the roles and contributions of Cambodian agricultural research and development practitioners who have supported farmer innovators/experimenters.

The field study was an all-day activity from 07:00 AM to 16:00 PM divided into two phases: 07:00 - 13:00 the field study visit and 13:00 - 16:00 reflection on and synthesis of findings. For the synthesis the groups were asked to focus on:

1. What are the innovations and adapted techniques that farmers are applying?
2. Which factors lead farmers in applying innovations and/or adapting new technique and/or conducting experimentation?
3. What were the various roles of farmers, development practitioners, extensionists and researchers in promoting local innovation and participatory innovation development? What future roles or changes in roles would or might be envisioned for farmers, development practitioners, extensionists and researchers?
4. What views do farmers have concerning their relationships with the development practitioners, researchers, extensionists, NGO staff and GO staff?
5. What future plans do farmers have for experimentation and promoting local innovation?

Participants were divided into three groups (around 10 people per group). Each group visited a farming community in Kampong Thom or Siem Reap provinces where local NGOs or local government agencies involved in the PROLINNOVA-Cambodia programme have been working. The groups had an opportunity to interact with farmer innovation groups and/or farmer innovators, as well as to learn about the work of the various agricultural development organizations – NGOs, national research institutes, government agencies and universities – who have been working with the farmer groups as part of the PROLINNOVA-Cambodia programme. As part of the field study visit, participants were also encouraged to exchange experiences or share comments/observations with the farmer groups/local people. The groups were given a number of guidelines/TOR and logistical information as in Annex 5.

Sharing and discussing of lessons from field study, King-David Amoah, Ghana CP

The observations from the 4 groups (see Annex 8) were presented and discussed in a plenary session, leading to a number of critical observations:

- Is the farmer that group 1 visited acting as an extension person on a voluntary basis or do they have to work? Is the PDA just washing their hands and transferring the extension responsibility to farmers? The money is supposed to be given to the group, not to the

farmer. The idea is to see the group transforming itself into a cooperative. The farmer is now looking at charging 20,000 riel a day for his service to train others.

- There are two kinds of landholdings. One is communal and the other is private ownership. Most of the land is dedicated to rice farming. Some have combination of rice and vegetables.
- Much of what were observed were more experimentations rather than innovations. This observation was carefully addressed by reminding participants as to whose perspective are they defining local innovation.
- Savings and credit is referred to as a social process innovation. Participants were reminded to look not only for innovations but also for innovation.
- Factors leading to innovation include the innovators own attitude towards experimentation. The programme should also address the issue of institutional strengthening as well as the issue of sustainability. It was observed that market is also an influencing factor towards local innovation.
- Participants suggested sharing among country programmes of some examples of innovations.

World Café: Open space for discussing key issues

The World Café is an open space where participants can work on, discuss, plan issues they find relevant . The session was co-facilitated Chesha Wettasinha, IST member, and Monique Salomon, South Africa CP. From Email interaction before the meeting and discussion during and around the meeting 7 issues had been listed and theme facilitators (or, “café owners”) identified:

1. Curriculum development: What might we do (Monique and Ronald)
2. Documentation for PID book: What are our plans? What experiences do we have? (Scott and Chesha)
3. Institutionalization: What are we doing (Laurens and Koma)
4. How to keep focus on farmer organizations and farmer innovators (Pratap)
5. M&E focal points: What more to do? (Marise)
6. PID TOF International Course: What suggestions? What materials? (Mariana)
7. Potential new partners: What should we take into account? (Anne and Tony)

The various “café owners” stayed with their tables, which were visited by the others for discussion and joint work. Participants were moving along the tables of their interest, often contributing up to 15 minutes before moving on. The outputs of various discussions are compiled in Annex and are taken-up for further action as agreed during the last day action planning session (see below).

Strategic planning for PROLINNOVA 2007-2010

The discussion on strategic priorities for 2007 and beyond was part of a general ‘looking ahead’ exercise for PROLINNOVA and aimed, particularly, at generating inputs from partners for the proposal being written for a new phase of funding support from DGIS, partners. In other words, the discussion combined strategic planning on key priorities, what PROLINNOVA wants to do – no matter who might fund those efforts, and making choices of what to consider in a proposal for funding by DGIS with a deadline in April.

Main inputs into the formulation of future programme strategies and priorities are:

- The main strategies/activities currently being undertaken and prioritised only a few years ago: Still relevant?
- The suggestions for priorities from the January 2006 electronic M&E sessions
- The comments from the external reviewer

From the M&E session as well as from the dynamics of the proposal writing by ETC four new cross-cutting themes were identified for consideration in the proposal: HIV/AIDS, Gender, Climate change, Marketing. Feedback from participants on the relevance of these included the following:

- HIV/AIDS – We should be trained ourselves in how HIV/AIDS affects agriculture (discussions with experts), and the implications for our work.
- Gender – We have been trained (so, we don't need capacity building) – But, are we taking it up seriously enough? We could have workshops where we focus on our PID work from gender perspective.
- Need to cluster HIV/AIDS and gender because there are strong linkages (e.g. power relations, etc)
- Climate change – Many studies already underway, and are influencing agriculture and development work. Should PROLINNOVA take it up to a greater extent? GEF in Ghana is taking climate change very seriously. Conflicts are taking place in many communities where programmes are being conducted. GEF also involved in Sudan; work showed that poor people, if offered alternative livelihoods, will conserve natural reserves. Climate change is affecting agricultural practices.
- Marketing – Should we do more to look at innovative work in the market (study what farmers are doing to link up with markets)? Look at affects of imports (international policies – that are hindering marketing). Small scale production systems in developing countries need market orientated agricultural production. Advocacy around marketing is more important than trying to focus on marketing, per se. IFAD connected a group to a market and called it innovation (?).

Other cross-cutting issues or themes were identified and briefly discussed by the team:

- Youth – only old people are involved in agriculture and PROLINNOVA. Government is focused on how to get the youth involved or knowledge is lost. Many families in Africa select someone to pass the knowledge on to – need to work with these young people.
- Natural resource management land tenure is another cross-cutting issue.
- We need to ensure that our work does not create conflict between ethnic groups. Tolerance – need to consider the rights of others. Related to peace-building.
- Governance – another cross-cutting issue – because of involvement of many stakeholders.

Decision: It was agreed that each country should be able to have its own focus, and that we should only jointly look into a few themes at the international level. We should list cross-cutting issues and let each country prioritise, according to their context. HIV/AIDS cum gender may be among those for joint reflection. Opportunities of a certain funding window may also lead to choosing one cross cutting theme for joint work.

Another issue for discussion was the “33% own contribution” policy which has been applied by the PROLINNOVA programme. Does it show commitment by the partners? The feeling is to keep this mechanism in place even if it is reduced, but that we shouldn't reduce it too much because later on another donor may require a larger contribution. We could allow a range from 25% to 35% (both cash and in-kind).

An additional note on “own contribution” – CPs need to make sure that if they are being funded by an agency that is also funding the PROLINNOVA programme, they need to make sure that the same funds not being used for same activities.

Decision: Retain an “own contribution” amount of at least 20%.

Another matter for discussion was the budget variation between CPs. This is a question of whether countries should be funded according to their activities and evaluation, or based on proposals that they submit – or a combination of all three. Some concerns expressed that larger countries may need more funds. Comment that money is always too limited for a country programme, but challenges us to look further and also okay to do some work locally to make contribution to PROLINNOVA. Perhaps there is a need to give more guidance about allocation of funds. Suggestion was made that each CP should focus on having a number of pilots in each country, rather than trying to impact in whole country. Another reason for equal budgeting – otherwise budget decisions would become more centralized with more reviewing responsibilities on the part of the IST.

Decision: Will continue with (more or less) equal budgets for each CP, except for South Africa because of much higher costs.

Follow-up planning, evaluation and closure

Briefing on the Stimulating Community Initiatives in Sustainable Land Management Project, Bram Buscher, IST member

SCI-SLM is a collaborative project to be launched soon supported by the Centre for International Cooperation of the Free University Amsterdam with funding from GEF. Project coordination will be by University of Kwazulu Natal, SA.

Context – Communities in Africa often have their own solutions to problems of land degradation – but these sustainable land management (SLM) initiatives are not adequately recognised by western scientists.

Contribution of the project to a solution – SCI-SLM will focus on identifying innovative forms of land management amongst communities in four countries in Africa: South Africa, Ghana, Uganda and Morocco. SCI-SLM will help to add value to these initiatives – through research partnerships – as well as stimulating these communities to go forward with their efforts.

Objective – SCI-SLM aims to stimulate community initiatives in sustainable land management.

SCI-SLM will generate and manage new knowledge through:

- analysing technical and socio-economic aspects of community based SLM
- analysing technical and socio-economic aspects of community based SLM
- spread the best of these systems in areas prone to land degradation
- development of a methodology to upscale and institutionally embed SCI-SLM approaches at national level in the 4 countries
- South-to-South learning

Questions from the group

How do you intend to have policy dialogue and achieve institutionalisation: Through “mobile workshops” (in cars visiting communities with stakeholders – allows networking – and starting point for institutionalization – how do we make sure this is embedded in your organization, etc.).

What are the roles of the different organizations: FSG/CEAD on the UKZN will coordinate, CPs will direct activities within each country. Will attempt to work in tandem with the PROLINNOVA programme – both programmes have a focus on communities, as well as action

research. Will also involve students, so will be able to internalize the work we promote. FSG is a part of CEAD.

Have you already identified some initiatives in each country or still to happen: Selected four countries representing Africa (N, S, W, E – including Morocco because French-speaking). Socio-economic factors – they have identified a range of research questions they want answers for.

PROLINNOVA is supposed to partner – so obvious opportunity: Possibility of some additional countries being involved in the international SCI-SLM workshops. PROLINNOVA IST has invited SCI-SLM leaders to present the programme at the ETC office – so can give inputs.

Summarizing Action Plan 2006

Decisions taken and issues raised for future action were reviewed in a plenary sessions in order to formulate an ‘action plan’ for follow-up and action within 2006. A detailed matrix was developed outlining 1) action themes, 2) expected outputs, 3) next steps, 4) persons-in-charge, and 5) time-frame as added in annex 10.

Evaluation

Feedback to the workshop content, organization, facilitation, logistics, etc., was received in two ways – through the “Freedom Board” which was accessible to all participants throughout the workshop, and through more formal written feedback at the end of the workshop. Results are summarised in the box and table below

Notes from the Freedom Board on thoughts, concerns, feedback.....	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Looking back, PROLINNOVA has gone a long way! From a three-page concept note in 1999 to expanding the CPs into other regions! ▪ Mainstreaming – “the systematic and effective anchoring of a major issue or problem in the ‘mainstream’ of an organization. It applies both to the internal operations of the organization and to the strategic planning of all external project work aimed at the organisation’s target groups” ▪ In responding to HIV/AIDS – a practitioner’s guide to mainstreaming in rural development projects. (2005) Sabine Dorlocher – Sulser et al. ▪ What counts is the pearl not the shell! ▪ Experiment for next international workshop: start with strategic planning at the beginning when energy levels are high...All CPs have their plans and priorities already and we could identify overlaps and gaps and focus on both in the following days. 	

Things most appreciated...	Suggestions for improvement...
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Readiness to share, contribute and learn openly ▪ The involvement of almost all participants in the workshop program (organization) ▪ Diverse range of participants/experiences and open sharing ▪ Experience sharing among/between partners ▪ Sharing of experiences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Include one or two farmer innovators/representative throughout the workshop ▪ Perhaps a session on actual farmer innovations and how they have been studies (maybe two for each country) ▪ Logistics (transport) (especially PP to Siem Reap) ▪ No time for visit at P.P. ▪ Allocate more time to discuss issues in more detail

Things most appreciated...	Suggestions for improvement...
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Group sessions ▪ Very cordial personal interaction among participants ▪ Participatory and democratic decisions taking ▪ Effectively engaging participation in the sessions ▪ Besides the <u>fantastic</u> organization and wonderful Cambodian hospitality I very much appreciated the strategic planning to again get the priorities straight in a participatory manner ▪ Well organized and facilitated experience (in and outside workshop) ▪ I like/appreciated the overall standard of preparation and facilitation ▪ Workshop organization and facilitation ▪ Hospitality; opportunity to blend work and recreation ▪ Cambodian hospitality and organization ▪ The flexibility, patience and hospitality of the Cambodian hosts ▪ Having the meeting in Cambodia! ▪ Knowing each other more 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More focused fieldwork – better structure (focus on innovation) ▪ Excellence doesn't need improvement ▪ Invitation letter and information on schedule to be sent earlier ▪ Some sessions could have been better organized ▪ Working materials ▪ Share constraints/challenges faced by country programme ▪ Need to develop other forms of innovation into program ▪ Facilitation and planning of workshop sessions ▪ Focus on specific community-based PID ▪ Per diem is slightly low

ANNEXES

Annex 1: Workshop Schedule

PROLINNOVA Programme International Workshop

Time	Activity	Speaker / Facilitator	Location
Monday March 6			
08:00-11:30	Internal Opening Meeting Simple opening / Introductions Workshop schedule, Assignments for facilitation and other tasks, Logistics Brainstorm: Key issues, Questions from participants Presentation of the PROLINNOVA Oversight Group (POG) Revisiting June 2005 Entebbe Action Plan	Y S Koma Loek Sothea, Scott Killough Mariana Wongtschowki Scott K. Ronald Lutalo	CEDAC office
11:30-12:00	Travel to Goldiana Hotel	Sothea	
12:00-13:00	<i>Lunch</i>		
13:00-13:30	Travel to Juliana Hotel	Sothea	
13:30-14:30	Setting-up Information Market	Monique Salomon	
14.30-16.00	Information Market exchange	All CPs and IST members	
16:00-16:15	Opening Session Opening Remarks Cultural dance	Facilitator – Mrs. Vath Simorn Gnep Sorn	Juliana Hotel, Phnom Penh
16:15-16:30	Welcome Remarks – Member of the National Steering Committee		
16:30-16:45	Presentation of PROLINNOVA-Cambodia	Y. S. Koma	
16:45-17:00	Presentation of PROLINNOVA-International	L. van Veldhuizen	
17:00-17:15	Sharing from Farmer Innovator	Prak Chres	
17:15-18:00	Opening Speech of H.E. Chan Sarun		
19:00-21:00	<i>Dinner</i>		
Tuesday March 7			
06:00-13:00	Departure to Siem Reap Hotel check-in	Sothea	
13:00-14:00	<i>Lunch</i>		
14:30-16:30	Workshop – Promoting local innovation and PID Presentation of four country experiences in two parallel session Listing of main lessons and conclusions	Ahmed Hanafi	City Angkor Hotel, Siem Reap

Time	Activity	Speaker / Facilitator	Location
16:30-17:30	Plenary sharing and discussion of lessons and conclusions Planning September writeshop on the same themes	Scott K.	
18:00-21:00	<i>Dinner</i>		
Wednesday March 8			
08:00-10:00	Workshop – Local innovation support funds (LISF) Presentation – Main concepts and approach Presentation – The Nepal experience Presentation – Findings from review of other experiences Discussion	Anton Krone Pratap Shresthra Mariana W.	
10:00-12:00	Small group assignment: To plan the PM&E of a LISF (based on the case of Nepal) Plenary discussion	Anton K.	
12:00-13:00	<i>Lunch</i>		
13:00-17:30	Workshop – Mid-term review Presentation – Internal review from select CPs Discussion to compare with other countries Internal review main outcomes Feedback from external reviewer Discussion	Bram Buscher CP representatives Marise Espineli Julian Gonsalves	
17:30-18:00	Field study orientation/preparation	Sothea	
Thursday March 9			
07:00-16:00	Field study Visit farmer innovation groups in Kampong Thom and Siem Reap provinces	Koma Sothea Dy Sam An	Kampong Thom and Siem Reap
16.00-18:00	Travel to Siem Reap		
Friday March 10			
08:00-09:00	Sharing and discussing field study findings	King-David Amoah	City Angkor Hotel, Siem Reap
09.00-12.00	Working and sharing on identified critical issues World Café: Open Space	Chesha Wettasinha	
12:00-13:00	<i>Lunch</i>		

Time	Activity	Speaker / Facilitator	Location
13:00-17:30	Strategic planning PROLINNOVA 2007-2010 Priorities suggested during the electronic M&E conference Issues resulting from the dynamics with DGIS-MFS window	Koma/Laurens	
18:00-21:00	<i>Farewell Dinner and Socials</i>		
Saturday March 11			
08:00-12:00	Planning, evaluation and closure Coordination issues/Other business Summarizing Action Planning 2006 (who, what, when) Evaluation Closure	Brigid, Marise, Rajendra, & Laurens	City Angkor Hotel, Siem Reap
12:00-13:00	<i>Lunch</i>		
13:00-17:30	Meeting of the PROLINNOVA Oversight Group (POG) FAIR-GEF planning meeting (Others may wish to visit Angkor Wat Temple.)	POG Chair and members Anton and CP reps.	
Sunday March 12			
08:00-12:00	POG meeting		
12:00-13:00	<i>Lunch</i>		
13:00-17:30	POG meeting		
Monday March 13			
	Departure	Sothea	

Annex 2: List of participants

No.	Name	Organisation	Country	E-mail
1.	Laurens van Veldhuizen	ETC Ecoculture	Netherlands	l.van.veldhuizen@etcnl.nl
2.	Mariana Wongtschowki	ETC Ecoculture	Netherlands	m.wongts@etcnl.nl
3.	Chesha Wettasinha	ETC Ecoculture	Netherlands	c.wettasinha@etcnl.nl
4.	Bram Buscher	CIS-VU	Netherlands	brambuscher@yahoo.com
5.	Betty del Rosario	APAARI/POG	Thailand	delandel@laguna.net
6.	Ahmed Hanafi Abdel-Magid	IFAD supported program/ (POG)	Sudan	ahanafi2001@yahoo.com
7.	Scott Killough	IIRR / (POG)	Philippines	scott.killough@iirr.org
8.	Marise Espineli	IIRR	Philippines	Marise.espineli@iirr.org
9.	Ronald Lutalo	Environmental Alert	Uganda	rlutalo@envalert.org
10.	Alex Lwakuba	Environmental Alert	Uganda	
11.	Yang Saing Koma	CEDAC	Cambodia	yskoma@online.com.kh
12.	Loek Sothea	CEDAC	Cambodia	loeksothea@yahoo.com
13.	Dy Sam An	DAALI	Cambodia	dysaman2000@yahoo.com
14.	Pratap Shrestha	LI-BIRD	Nepal	pshrestha@libird.org
15.	Rajendra Prasad L.	Care Nepal	Nepal	rajendral@carenepal.org
16.	Amanuel Assefa	Profieet / (POG)	Ethiopia	kidus_aman@yahoo.com
17.	Melaku Jirata	MoARD	Ethiopia	moafs@ethionet.et
18.	Tesfahun Fenta	PROFIEET coordinator	Ethiopia	tfenta@yahoo.com
19.	Prof. Nganga I. Kihupi	Sokoine University/ Member NSC	Tanzania	pelumtz@maf.or.tz
20.	Laurent N. Kaburire	PROLINNOVA Project Officer	Tanzania	pelumtz@maf.or.tz
21.	Monique Salomon	Farmer Support Group	South Africa /POG	salomon@ukzn.ac.za
22.	Anton Krone		South Africa /FAIR	antonk@telkomsa.net
23.	Brigid Letty	Farmer Support Group	South Africa	lettyb@ukzn.ac.za
24.	Skumbuzo Nkosi	KZN Department of Agriculture	South Africa	
25.	Mohamed Yousif Mabrouk	ITDG Sudan/	Sudan	mabroukm@itdg-sudan.org Mobile Phone +2490922569475

No.	Name	Organisation	Country	E-mail
26.	Mirghani Osman Mohamed Ibnoaf	Institute for Social & Economic Studies	Sudan	ibnoafpeace@yahoo.com Mobile Phone + 2490912390196
27.	Magagi Saidou	INERA	Niger	
28.	Prof. ADAM Toudou	CRESA (Coordinator of PROLINNOVA – Niger)	Niger	atoudou@refer.ne
29.	Joe Nchor	ACDEP	Ghana- North	nchorjoe@yahoo.com
30.	King-David Amoah	ECASARD	Ghana- South	ecasard@ghana.com
31.	Stephen Hazelman	Secretariat of the Pacific Community	Fiji	StephenH@spc.int
32.	Tony Jensen	Melanesian Farmer First Network, MFFN	Solomon Islands	tonyj@kastomgarden.org
33.	Oliver Oliveros	GFAR/DURAS		
34.	Julian Gonsalves	Consultant		juliangonsalves@yahoo.com
35.	Anne Piepenstock	AGRECOL ANDES	Bolivia	annpi@agrecolandes.org

Annex 3: Participants expectations and concerns

What I want to learn...

- Experiences on partnerships and farmer experimentation from other countries
- Experiences in establishing/managing local innovators' groups/committees
- Good practices for effective management of National Steering Committee
- Winning the minds of the research community to accept PID – issues for collaboration
- What is Prolinnova? What does it do? How does it work? What is potential value to be part of it?
- Practical experiences from the CP's
- Key issues + challenges from PROLINNOVA self assessment/review
- Experiences with documenting innovation processes not only innovations
- Cost effective documentation practices
- Activities with high impacts on farmers?
- Funding possibilities?
- Strategic planning for Prolinnova
- How to work with small-holder farmers to improve production and productivity
- More ideas about innovation support fund
- LI identification
- LI documentation
- Cambodia + work of CEDAC with farmers
- How do you ensure functional and effective collaboration with your partner organisation?
- How do you measure impacts of your activities?
- Institutionalisation of PTD/PID
- Experiences of PROLINNOVA from other countries esp. a diversity of innovations/innovator cases across the globe!
- How M&E is happening at CP level
- Have you continued with Participatory Video? What are you doing?
- Have you used the info in the PTD-Circular? How?
- How other countries are managing to influence government departments that are large and have different levels of management
- From new countries to the programme, how they are involved in PID and how they view the PROLINNOVA programme
- More clarity on the fundamentals of promoting local innovations
- Institutionalisation of local innovation processes
- Hope to learn more about local network for innovation
- Learn more about PROLINNOVA country experiences and working structure
- Strategic ways of funding PROLINNOVA activities
- More on participatory Monitoring and evaluation
- How/If partners are responding to social, economic + vulnerability issues such as HIV/AIDS + gender
- To improve interaction among farmers, in terms of groups adopting individuals innovations and behaviour.
- Fund raising approach/strategy

What do I have to share...

- Good governance in agriculture and natural resources management
- What are farmers? People who farm for home consumption or only for business
- Smallholder subsistence agricultural production
- Experiences with farmers to farmers training with local leaders
- PID/PTD approach and concepts
- That there are already initiatives out there with potential linkages and similarities – we need to make use of this

- Local innovations workshop in Cambodia
- How partnerships among research, NGO, university and Min. of Agriculture has worked to promote PTD and LEISA in Northern Ghana
- Participatory documentation of small farmers experiences with ecological agriculture and resource management
- Countries with experience in local innovation
- Lessons learned from Pacific NGO network focused on capacity building for improving livelihoods for remote rural communities
- Prolinnova-Uganda experiences, examples of innovators
- Prolinnova-Uganda experience in coordinating multi-stakeholder partnership programmes
- Some thoughts from FAIR feasibility study in South Africa
- Plans for international course on PID – training of facilitators in Uganda in mid-2006. Want to get inputs/suggestions on design, materials, etc.
- PTS/Local innovation experiences of NGOs in south-west pacific (Papua New Guinea, Salomon Islands, Vanuatu)
- Farmers participation in innovation development
- Collaboration with other NGOs/organisations

Annex 4: Results group work on Promoting Local Innovation and PID

Group 1 – Uganda, Ghana, Ethiopia and Nepal

	Insights	Questions	Priority Issues
1	Still existing need to clarify concept of innovation Documentation efforts, but methodology is still missing	What is the relationship between farmers and PROLINNOVA host institutions? How to be more consequent in the application of participatory methodologies in the whole process: identification, documentation, research, and dissemination? What do we know about the factors and the routes of innovation dissemination among farmers?	Deeper look at participatory methodology of the whole process
2	Great evidence of existence and (potential) relevance of innovation by farmers/land users There are many opportunities to notice relevant local innovation beyond field documentation (e.g. FAIR Nepal)		Documenting local innovation for what: to encourage/ strengthen local development, and to spread relevant at wider scale/validate
3	Who is the recording for: us or the farmers	Documenting local innovations will give us information that we can use to compare farmers' own experiments with researcher promoted technologies (so where are the new technologies)	Promotion of local innovation versus researched recommendation
4	Each country has chosen a way of documenting innovations that suits their situation Large amount of innovation documented	The innovation scoring sheet: how did you find consensus on giving the scores on the various categories?	Clarity in local innovation and participatory innovation development
5	Various approaches could be used to document local innovation e.g. field documentation and documentation during innovation fair and workshop PID necessary for wider use/up-scaling Visual documentation could be useful for influencing policy change	Who takes the lead role and initiative in PID: innovator or researcher?	How do we ensure that documentation is owned by innovators?

	Insights	Questions	Priority Issues
6	The possibility of improving farmers' productivity and livelihood through local innovation that can be scaled up within existing capacity and building on existing experiences rather than (all the time) looking for external sources of technologies	How to participate farmers at wider scale	How to share innovations within countries (the hardware)
7	In South Africa we started with identifying farmer innovations, while other countries (Nepal, Ethiopia) started with identifying farmer innovators. This enables one to engage with innovators and prevents 'extractive documenting' with farmers as informants rather than active participants		
8	Typology of local innovations	How to handle the PROLINNOVA programme in Ethiopia as it is divided into three autonomies regions?	
9	Documentation of innovation cases – electronically	How does PROLINNOVA see the issue of IPR on farmer innovation?	Having a common definition (thought) of innovations concept
10	Various ways of documentation and challenges of these Identification of areas of synergy between CPs	How can we develop further the documentation aspect to make it more participatory	
11	What is the most appropriate way of identifying local innovation(s). This can be from experience of the different countries presented	Where PROLINNOVA goes from here after end of this phase?	Encouraging farmers (local innovators) how to share their local innovations
12	There is great enthusiasm for this documentation. But what is lacking is a conceptual framework that tracks this work back to the purpose	What is ultimate purpose of this? What is an innovation? Innovative to whom, the researcher or the farmer?	In this exercise conceptually and practically coherent? Because if the end purpose is to stimulate improved practices and livelihood security (assumed) then documenting and promoting lessons from good practices, and from poor practices and mistakes, are also very relevant? Why only focus on innovation? Surely you should tackle these critical issues at some time?
13	A lot is being done in all countries Approaches may be different but the ultimate aims is one (being achieved)	What does experimentation/research with farmers involve?	The involvement and participation of all stakeholders is very important (farmers, researchers, Government, NGOs, extensionists)

	Insights	Questions	Priority Issues
14	<p>Nepal: Efforts done on value addition</p> <p>Uganda: Farmers concerns about bio-piracy are serious</p> <p>Ghana: The women concerning endangered plant species; bringing PROLINNOVA of University curriculum</p> <p>Ethiopia: The Jury to assess innovations; identification of existing gaps to be filled by local innovation</p> <p>General: PROLINNOVA seems very flexible; each country has come up with own vision</p> <p>There is a complete lack of artistic innovations (disadvantage)</p> <p>There is no concentration on market supply and demand to assess sustainability and generation of income</p>		
15	<p>Presentations made show that a lot of things have been done on promoting local innovation that need to be appreciated</p>	<p>Clarify the difference between best practice and local innovation</p>	<p>Working on policy advocacy to influence or enhance institutionalization process</p>

Group 2 – Cambodia, Niger, South Africa

Lessons Learned

- Useful formats for documenting innovations were shared (South Africa and Cambodia experience)
- Need to discuss further about the ‘debate’ on local innovation and PID
- Useful to include the processes of identification and documentation of local innovation as part of training and learning workshops
- Reminder to promote the ‘philosophy’ of PROLINNOVA and local innovation, rather than the ‘programme’ – especially when engaging government or research actors
- It’s difficult to identify and document social or ‘soft’ innovations, as opposed to technological innovations
- Evidence seen of changes in attitudes among both professionals and farmers toward local innovation

Annex 5: Revised PM&E Framework for LISF pilots

Criteria/ Performance Area	Possible indicators	Relevant M&E tools/methods
1. Adequate awareness among farmers (and other resource users) and support agencies on ISF opportunities and access mechanisms	1 No. of applications received per round of calls for proposals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Register
	2 Percentage of applications which passed first screening on ISF criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Register
	3 Percentage of proposals reviewed meeting selection criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Register
	4 Percentage of proposals from women, youth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Register (for the participation of women)
2. Effective mechanisms to process applications	5 Number of proposals processed after screening and finally approved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Register
	6 Time period between receipt of application, screening, processing and communicating final results of selection process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Register
	7 Time taken to improve proposals (remedial)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Register
	8 Transaction cost relative to grant value – staff time involved and other resources used	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ time sheets for writing time worked ▪ financial reports/accounts
3. Effective disbursement mechanisms	9 Number of approved vs. number of disbursed grants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Register
	10 Timeliness of disbursement in relation to fund needs (e.g. seasonal imperatives)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Register ▪ Feedback on grantees satisfaction through internal evaluation
	11 Banking and other costs incurred in disbursement – both country level and international level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Financial reports/accounts
4. Utilisation of the funds	12 Expenditure in line with agreed terms for use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grant Reports ▪ Random field inspection ▪ Grantees feedback through annual assessment meeting
	13 Necessary changes/adaptations in initial plans quickly and effectively implemented	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grant reports ▪ Random in situ inspection of experimentation work ▪ Feedback from grantees and other stakeholders through internal evaluation
5. M&E of LISF grant system is in place (existence and functioning)	14 Financial and narrative grant reports received on set deadlines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Register
	15 Quality of grant reports received (clarity and completeness of information) undertaken (by whom, when, costs); lessons learned; analyses of stakeholders participation)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Register
	16 Implementation of annual assessment meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Report of annual meeting

Criteria/ Performance Area	Possible indicators	Relevant M&E tools/methods
	17 Information from grant reports processed and used in ISF planning and implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Minutes of country ISF committee ▪ Minutes of international meeting FAIR (checking that action points were followed up) ▪ Report of annual assessment meeting
	18 Dissemination of findings from M&E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Distribution or mailing list relevant M&E reports
6. ISF has a strong, farmer co-managed, sustainable institutional framework	19 Relevant stakeholders, including small farmers/ natural resource users (men, women), endorse and support institutional setting.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Minutes of ISF committee meeting ▪ Annual narrative reports
	20 Institutional setting of ISF is clarified and formalised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ToR of ISF institution
	21 Strong involvement of farmers/ natural resource users in LISF management (at least “x” farmers participating in the ISF committee, critical incidents)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Minutes of ISF committee meetings ▪ Critical incidents on farmer influence in ISF noted in minutes.
	22 Adequate resource mobilisation to replenish pilot capital expenditure, both at local (community) and country levels. Amount (and percentage) of resources mobilised for replenishing the LISF e.g.: own contributions, amount of revolving funds mobilised from selling produce, contribution from other donors, stakeholder with significant long-term research funding stream co-driving project, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Financial report ▪ Long-term operational plan for ISF ▪ Secured funding commitments

Annex 6: Results group work on key challenges to CP development

Group 1 – “If there is a will, there is a way”

Maintaining commitment of core team members and all other implementing partners

- Having proper (rational) approach to potential stakeholders (institutions and individuals)
- Transparency
- Participatory decision-making processes
- Selection/election of committed people, replacement of uncommitted members through participatory process

Effective and practical M&E

- Preparation of simple M&E plans emanating from the international M&E framework
- Joint evaluation by partners and farmer innovators
- Existence of committed core team

Group 2

Mainstreaming HIV/AIDS in Prolinnova

- Develop general awareness of HIV/AIDS by partners and the impact it has on agriculture
- Specific strategies to be developed depending on specific situation
- Identifying local innovations that can be useful to HIV/AIDS areas/affected families

Beyond documenting innovations towards PID

- Understanding that documentation of innovations is only the first step of the process of PID and not an end in itself
- Continued capacity building in PID
- PID in the curricula of universities, educational institutions, research

Mainstreaming gender in Prolinnova

- Give special consideration to women when identifying innovators
- Maintain male/female balance in representation at events, – at all levels
- Include gender as part of criteria in selecting innovations
- Gender disaggregated data in M&E
- Involvement of women in fund management
- There is gender awareness among PROLINNOVA partners, but specific aspects of the CPs should be reviewed for gender sensitivity (e.g. next international workshop)

Group 3

How to combine PROLINNOVA regular work (funding limitations)

- PROLINNOVA principles as they relate to the mandate/philosophy of the organization,
- Influence decision makers to integrate in the work
- Look for balance in the level of funding, analysis of needs, logistic realities in every country
- Delegating activities among partners, sharing responsibilities and resources
- Instead of promoting PROLINNOVA, promote philosophy and participatory approaches, able to tap resources from the projects of the organization and partners.

Beyond PROLINNOVA – how to get these principles related to your own work

- Promote bottom-up approach in building networks
- Clarity on the concepts/principles of Prolinnova
- Country level ownership – creating a space for affiliates/partners – drawing support from strengthening grassroots movements

- Looking for opportunities and creating opportunities in current programs/projects
- Organising farmers as a 'voice' to influence policies
- Parallel process of strengthening CBOs and national/multi-stakeholder level work

Group 4

How to establish an independent, farmer-led innovation support fund

- Key issues/principles (access to fund/control over fund/resources, participation in decision making process, public fund allocated to resource, options for different modalities to pilot) – work on mobilisation and diversification of funding

Learning and sharing between countries

- Farmers to lead/initiate exchange
- Assess demand for learning through sharing/articulate demand
- Mechanisms/methods for learning and sharing
- Work pressure for facilitation
- Budget constraint

Strategies

- Opportunities for collaboration
- Winning arrangements between CPs
- Explore opportunities for mobilising resources locally/cost sharing
- Farmer exposure visits generate innovative ideas and action (between government and other funders)

Annex 7: Guideline for Field Study

As a learning network; PROLINNOVA programme partners learn from each other's experiences and continuously seek to improve their work. Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) of all programme activities – especially, farmer-extension-research partnerships in PID as well as stakeholder collaboration – is a key area of attention. However, most learning across Country Programmes (CPs) is mostly done through e-mail, website and Yahoo discussion group. Feedback from most PROLINNOVA programme partners continues to place emphasis on the need to create opportunities for face-to-face interactions among CPs to encourage more intensive sharing, discussion and learning about farmer innovation, PID, PM&E and facilitating multi-stakeholder processes.

As part of the March 2006 international partner's meeting of the PROLINNOVA programme, hosted by PROLINNOVA-Cambodia and attended by key programme partner representatives, a field study will be conducted on March 09, 2006. The field study will allow the partners to visit rural farming communities and to learn about local innovation and farmer experimentation activities in Cambodia.

The objectives of the one-day field study are:

1. To visit rural communities where local innovation/experimentation activities have been conducted as part of the PROLINNOVA-Cambodia programme.
2. To interact with and learn from farmer innovators/experimenters about their efforts to innovate and experiment.
3. To interact with and learn about the roles and contributions of Cambodian agricultural research and development practitioners who have supported farmer innovators/experimenters.

The field study will be an all-day activity from 07:00 AM to 16:00 PM divided into two phases:

07:00 - 13:00	Field study visit
13:00 - 16:00	Reflection/Synthesis of field study

Participants will be divided into three groups (around 10 people per group). Each group will visit a farming community in Kampong Thom or Siem Reap provinces where local NGOs involved in the PROLINNOVA-Cambodia programme have been working. The groups will have an opportunity to interact with farmer innovation groups and/or farmer innovators, as well as to learn about the work of the various agricultural development organizations – NGOs, national research institutes, government agencies and universities – who have been working with the farmer groups as part of the PROLINNOVA-Cambodia programme.

As part of the field study visit, participants will also be encouraged to exchange experiences or share comments/observations with the farmer groups/local people. (Note: A small honorarium will be given to each of the farmer groups for hosting the field study visit.)

After the community visit, each group will have lunch. After lunch, during the afternoon session, each of the three groups will have time for a Reflection/Synthesis of the field visit. Each group is expected to make a brief presentation of their Reflection/Synthesis to the larger group on the morning of the next day (Friday). Each group is encouraged to identify note-taker, facilitator, narrator and observers, as necessary. Someone from each group will be responsible for arranging materials such as permanent pens, flip charts, glue/tape, printing paper, etc.

For the Reflection/Synthesis, the groups are encouraged to discuss the following guide questions (Groups may also wish to discuss and share other elements of the field study, as appropriate):

1. What are the innovations and adapted techniques that farmers are applying?
2. Which factors lead farmers in applying innovations and/or adapting new technique and/or conducting experimentation?
3. What were the various roles of farmers, development practitioners, extensionists and researchers in promoting local innovation and participatory innovation development? What future roles or changes in roles would or might be envisioned for farmers, development practitioners, extensionists and researchers?
4. What views do farmers have concerning their relationships with the development practitioners, researchers, extensionists, NGO staff and GO staff?
5. What future plans do farmers have for experimentation and promoting local innovation?

General information about CEDAC

The Centre d'Etude et de Développement Agricole Cambodgien (CEDAC) is a not-for-profit research and development non-governmental organization specialized in the field of ecological agriculture and rural development. The center was established in August 1997 by a group of seven Cambodians, with initial support from GRET (a French NGO).

CEDAC's mission is to work towards the improvement of the well being of small farmers and consumers by promoting ecological agriculture and building up capacity of farmer organizations and other stakeholders. Its development goals are

- to empower those who are poor, vulnerable and marginalized for the betterment of their own lives
- to strive for food sovereignty for all
- to create equal opportunity for women and men
- to enable local communities to take part in decision making processes
- to promote peace and cooperation between people, and
- to contribute to the sustainable management of natural resources.

CEDAC now employs 130 full-time staff who work within 14 provinces and cities in Cambodia. CEDAC is the largest local NGO promoting ecological agriculture and sustainable natural resources management in Cambodia.

General information about PDA-Kampong Thom

Kampong Thom is a central province located around 168 km from Phnom Penh along National Road 6. The total area is 1,506,800 ha in which 180,920 ha are devoted to rice production. Administratively, Kampong Thom is divided into 8 districts, 81 communes and 737 villages, with 913,039 inhabitants of 119,087 families.

Amongst 33 institutions belonged to the Provincial Hall, The Provincial Department of Agriculture (PDA) is in charge of facilitating agricultural activities to ensure the food security and to alleviate poverty. PDA-Kompong Thom has worked with other NGOs and international institutions (e.g., such as CBRD/GTZ, IPM, FAO, CAAP, GRET/CEDAC, PROLINNOVA, APIP Planning Statistic, World Vision and CWS) to help farmers and producers in improving their quantity and quality of production. PDA plays an important role in facilitating these institutions to work together, and also promotes new technology in rice cropping such as the sustainable rice intensification, or SRI, technique and seed selection.

PDA-Kompong Thom has collaborated with the PROLINNOVA programme since late 2004, and has been involved in training farmer experimenters and in organizing local workshop on local innovation. In 2006, PDA-Kompong Thom will organize a follow-up training of trainers program for other PROLINNOVA partners working in Cambodia.

General information about PADEK

Vision: An equitable, peaceful, self-reliant society where there is no poverty.

Mission is to build and strengthen the capacity of appropriate people's organisations in order that they can:

- become independent quickly

- access and manage necessary resources to meet basic needs and to prosper in a sustainable way and in a way that is not detrimental to other segments of the population and future generations
- support appropriate local initiatives
- network closely with government, NGOs and other people's organisations to promote and adopt appropriate models of development and to promote sustainable patterns of development for Cambodia
- promote human rights, child rights and promote gender equity

Goal: To empower disadvantaged people to improve their quality of life in a sustainable way through building and strengthening civil society organization

PADEK seeks to work in 348 villages in 42 communes, 14 districts and 5 provinces and or municipalities to promote organization building, food security and income generation for civil society organizations, education and culture and health.

Group 1 – Group of farmer innovators working with CEDAC (a local NGO)

Name of farmer innovator	Oeur Sophoan
Location	Panhachy village, Tbaung Krapoeur commune, Steung Sen district in Kampong Thom province.
Type of innovation	Creation of multi-purpose farm (MPF), zero tillage and botanical pesticide. A complex farming system with integrated rice field management, botanical pesticide experimentation and no-tillage rice.
Agro-eco system	Located next to the Sen River, flooded during the rainy season. Almost 100 % of villagers are farmers. Main agricultural activity is rice production.
Start date	2002
Field facilitator	Yang Saing Koma

This group will have late lunch (around 13:00 PM) at Arunreah Hotel in Centre-ville. The Reflection/Synthesis of the field study will be done after lunch at the Sombo Preykuk Temple Group (an old temple dating back to the 7th century) which is located around 30 km from Kampong Thom city. The group will leave there around 16:00 PM to return to Siem Reap.

Group 2 – Group of farmer innovators working with PDA-Kampong Thom (a Governmental Institution)

Name of farmer innovator	A group of farmer innovators working with the Provincial Department of Agriculture of Kampong Thom
Location	Chong Prey village, Kampong Svay commune and Krasaing village, Trpeing Rossei commune, Kampong Svay district in Kampong Thom province
Type of innovation	Earthworm raising, fish raising, biogas system, fruit trees, chicken raising and credit group, compost, farmer experimenter group
Agro-eco system	Small-scale, rice-based farming systems
Start date	2005
Field facilitator	Mr. Loek Sothea and Mr. Chhor Bieng Kong

This group will have a late lunch (around 13:00 PM) at Arunreah Hotel in Centre-ville. The Reflection/Synthesis of the field study will be done after lunch at the Sombo Preykuk Temple Group (an old temple dating back to the 7th century) which is located around 30 km from Kampong Thom city. The group will leave there around 16:00 PM to return to Siem Reap.

Group 3 – Group of farmer innovators working with PADEK (a local NGO)

The participants will meet 4 different groups of farmers:

Name of farmer innovator	Four groups of farmers working with PADEK
Location	Siem Reap province
Type of innovation	Corn production, Self-help group, Small-scale commercial cooperative and Vegetable production
Agro-eco system	Small-scale integrated farming system. Predominance of rice-based production.
Start date	
Field facilitator	Mr. Dy Sam An and Mr. Chey Tech

The participants will have a late lunch at Angkor Temple Site. The synthesis of field study will be conducted in another place near the Occidental Baray, located around 15 minutes from Angkor Wat temple.

Annex 8: Observations from field study groups

Group 1

Roles in promoting local innovation

Farmer

- Training other farmers
- Experimentation/demonstration
- Organize other farmer groups

GTZ/CEDAC

- Technical support
- Encouragement
- Provide opportunity for hosting other farmers
- Recognition by documenting/publishing local innovation work in farmer magazine

Provincial Dept. of Agriculture (PDA)

- Challenge and recognition
- Delegate responsibility of mobilizing other farmers
- Moral support

Changes in roles in the future

Farmer

- Resource person not only for farmers, but also other extension workers
- Demand services from PDA
- Mobilize own resources

PDA/other development actors

- Capacity building for marketing packaging, mobilizing resources
- Facilitate access to resources, e.g. ISF

Views of farmers on other development actors

- Positive of PDA for the trust, recognition and empowerment
- Positive contributor to own development (CEDAC), not properly applying the technology rather than seeing failure as CEDAC's fault
- Still hopeful of the PDA promise of \$600 funding

What future plans do farmers have for experimentation and promoting LI?

- Establish a resource farmer's training center
- Access to market
- Continue to experiment on organic vegetable production
- Supply other farmers with fingerlings
- Dissemination of the local innovation after completing the experimentation

Group 2

This group visited two different groups of farmers. One was supported by the PDA and the other the result of the FAO Food Security Programme. The first farmer has a composting system, neighbours are also doing compost making. The second group has a more integrated farming system, a range of technologies (ponds, termites as feed for chickens and catfish, earthworms as a protein source for chickens, compost, using the manure from the cattle in his farm, vegetable production).

Factors that lead to innovation

- A wish to improve yields
- Exposure to programmes (PDA and FAO) and new ideas which have been adopted (and adapted)

Role of different stakeholders

- Farmer – Training other farmers, Doing experimentation, e.g., termite as feeds

Role of extension

- Felt not really innovation, but surely new to the area
- Introducing things that can be a basis for innovation
- Providing training

Role in the future

- Opportunities for lobbying with the government

Group 3

Visited a community that had established a saving self-help group – an innovation in the area. It was started in 2000 with 19 members, none of whom had former experience with savings groups.

Characteristics observed

- Sustainability
- Low risk
- High trust in the group
- Strong and shared leadership
- Every member has benefits

Outcomes

- Social security (borrows without interests)
- Diversified production
- Very good market for growth, potential income in vegetable production, also focus on medical care, if borrowing is made for medical care no interest, such system provides social security,

Production activities

- With inter-household cooperation

Conditions

- Improved

The group also visited a small community shop cooperative with 72 members, a joint initiative between PADEK and ILO. The main objective is to supply cheap and good products/household commodities by selling rice from members, increases social solidarity

Sustainability/challenges

- Cover costs under business approach

Improved farmers' practices

- External input driven, contractual 'ecological production'
- External inputs: small infrastructure, capacity building techniques---low cost package

Annex 9: Workshop café outputs

Curriculum development: What might we do? (Monique and Ronald)

Summary of ideas from the café

- Curriculum review is a process that takes time
- Review existing curriculum in terms of current provisions
- Develop a good strategy in institutionalizing PID (approaches to be developed, prioritization focus, identify resources needed)
- Engagement of academia, university, secondary, primary, research institutions, colleges in discussions to include LI and PID in curriculum review
- Engage government in policy issues and strategic support on curriculum review
- Sensitization through seminars and conference involving academia, research institutions
- Degree, bachelors, units, what to focus on?
- Network currently involved universities
- Enhance/enrich existing learning materials at all levels depending on the availability of and access to relevant PID – success stories, document case studies/best practices
- Engage academicians in PID discussions, steering committees
- Engage students in experimentation/field visit to studies in relation to local innovations
- Share the outcomes of PROLINNOVA program with students and faculty
- Strengthen representation of Ministry of Agriculture, academia, research in working group and use theses as a lobby point to influence curriculum that reflect Prolinnova/PID
- Organize seminars, conferences involving academia, research etc on Prolinnova/PID sensitization
- Build coalition among interested universities
 - Cambodia – Royal Agriculture University; Mr. Duk Cheng
 - Nepal – Tribuvhan University /IAAS; Dr. Dongol
 - Niger – University of Niamey Prof. Adam Toudou
 - Ghana – CSIR, ARI, UDS, UGn, UCC; Dr. Kwazteng
 - Uganda – Makerere University; Dr. John

Documentation for PID book: What are our plans? What experiences do we have? (Scott and Chesha)

Feedback and suggestions were given on the form of the book as well as continuing the discussion that started at the beginning of the week to focus on the processes and methodologies for documenting the experiences through a publication. The idea is to cite specific examples, real life experiences from different country programmes and partners. There should be a balance on social, technological and economic dimensions of these experiences. Each country should contribute at least one example. The examples should also be drawn from various perspectives. If possible, we should produce a publication in more than one language. This is a works in progress and we will continue to add to the ideas generated below.

Summary of ideas from the café

- PID is only one methodology, development practitioner need to think/look wider; also be aware of best practice examples, opportunities for farmer to farmers training
- Starting points for PID (many)
- Look at both technical innovation, social innovations, institutional innovations, economic, financial
- Mini cases of innovations/innovators
- Emphasize on process
- Innovation not an end in itself. It's a step towards sustainable livelihoods
- The book needs to be backed-up with practical examples
- Examples should show economical value, as well as ecological aspects

- Case studies/experiences to be documented need to ensure proper recognition of the owner of the experience (farmer/FOs, development partners, PROLINNOVA partners, etc
- Possibility of producing a video documentation of PID process (~20 minutes)
- Farmers' perspective, our perspective
- This book should try to make clear the confusion around the term local innovation
- Improved farming practices and /or local innovation
- Farmer maps in Nepal
- North /Ghana farmer has developed a deed using fruits for small ruminants, exhibited during the National Farmers' Day
- What do you do in situations where IK is lost
- Should feed research agenda to research community
- At least one contribution from each country, accompanied by pictures
- More than one language (English) perhaps, French, Arabic, Spanish?

Experiences that we could document

1. The process of holding competitions – Cambodia experience
2. Linking with existing structures/initiatives – Cambodia, SA (ARC)
3. Need framework of criteria for screening innovations to take further.
4. Include innovation documentation as assignment in PID training.
5. Do we have something concrete to share I.T.O IPR (protection)
6. Document the experience of inventorising and further PID with farmers
7. Incorporation of innovations in the curriculum– Niger/Cambodia
8. Linking innovators to other service providers e.g. market (rootbos tea example)
9. The Niger women's credit system
10. Networking of farmer innovators-experience from Cambodia
11. Document from farmers' perspectives-why they have innovated, what motivated them, etc.
12. Experiences from Darfur-Sudan (stoves, refrigerators, cost embankments)
13. Documentation of ethno vet practices of farmers by a multi-disciplinary team for sharing and learning (N. Ghana)

Institutionalization: What are we doing (Laurens and Koma)

Summary of ideas from the café (7 customers)

- Institutionalization at different levels and at different institutions – government agencies, research, unit, NGOs, CBOs, FOs, donors
- Institutions consider PROLINNOVA as part of their program
- Participating in policy consultation and formulation
- Producing policy brief on PROLINNOVA
- Promoting philosophy of PROLINNOVA rather than the programme
- Working through university to orient future extension workers
- Partnership including like minded groups (farmer organizations)
- Strengthening PROLINNOVA at national level
- Strengthening farmer groups/organizations, CBOs to lobby for PROLINNOVA
- Evidence-based policy advocacy
- Pilot event to reward local innovators
- Organizing field visits for stakeholders
- Strengthening farmer innovators
- Joint exhibition of local innovations
- Joint panel to evaluate local innovations

How to keep focus on farmer organization and farmer innovators (Pratap)

Summary of ideas from the café

- Adopting a participatory approach throughout the process
- Peasant farmer regular/routine meetings

- Identify mobile peasant farmers. How? Which farmer group? Use savings as the glue
- Farmers organizations are good entry points for capacity building, awareness creation, documentation, PID
- Role of external organizations and common understanding of objectives of partnership for PID
- How do we actually engage farmers in the promotion of farmer innovators? Usually, outsiders take the lead in documenting most of these innovations. How to motivate farmer's organization to invest in the promotion of the innovation? It is necessary that we use participatory approaches throughout the process. Facilitate innovators forum, access to the forum, start from the community and build on the minimum guidelines, how to ensure that the benefits are created in investing in those innovations
- How to guarantee that when we go to farmers and invest it goes to PID and not to something else? What conditions should we ensure to facilitate that process?
- Farmers charging to create their own resources, is this part of the process? Should we be promoting LI with individuals or farmers' group? As an incentive for them to come as a group, how do we reward exchange? How do we promote farmer to farmer exchange, how can we encourage them to come together to form groups?

M&E focal points: What more to do? (Marise)

Summary of ideas from the café

Issues	Suggested actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What to monitor – progress or benefits? ▪ Capacity development for M&E – how can this be done? ▪ Link of CP PROLINNOVA M&E to existing organization M&E ▪ M&E planning link ▪ Role of farmers in CP M&E ▪ Ownership of indicators at the CP level ▪ M&E focal point relationship to the CP and the IST—what inputs to give and receive to whom and from whom? ▪ Impact indicators, only one set or a list to choose from? ▪ Evaluation of impact what indicators ▪ Frequency of evaluation reports ▪ Internal evaluation – who should be involved? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop over all M&E framework at international level ▪ Reporting framework should be designed by IST ▪ CPs set up simple M&E regimes ▪ Agree on reporting requirements/formats ▪ Collectively identify at CP level important/useful indicators ▪ Organize M&E team at CP level separate from NSC/core team

- Need to develop formats for information collection using the indicators developed – common for all CPs
- Each country is in different program status, something needs to be done immediately; organize M&E team at CP level to monitor and follow up program in each country
- Fill in formats for progress reports (6 monthly, annual)
- How can we promote the participatory monitoring and evaluation process?
- How often are reports prepared at the CP and IST levels?
- Country M&E focal point, what inputs are they supposed to receive and from whom? Inputs should be widely shared and discussed within CPs
- Long list of indicators--- narrow down/short list---collectively identify which re most useful at the CP and international level
- IST to develop the over all M&E framework suing the long list of indicators; progress e.g., quarterly, more regular; impact (annual due to time involved, requires specific impact indicators, impact measurement swill depend on the focus of each CP
- M&E activities on PID should be harmonized with already existing programmes M&E
- Unify methods of M&E in all PROLINNOVA country programmes

- Organize TOF on M&E for more sharing
- Can impact of innovation also be included in the M&E especially on efficiency of production especially for technical innovations, livelihood of innovators
- Who should be involved in the internal evaluation in terms of stakeholders
- How frequently will the CPs be asked to submit internal evaluations – yearly or more frequently?
- How were indicators formulated? Are they owned by the partners? Agreed upon in the Entebbe meeting (international level), agreed by participants at the international level
- The farmer is the one that must indicate the progress
- The monitoring and evaluation is to be based on the feelings of these farmers as to whether he has made progress or not
- What is (to be) being monitored? Progress? Benefits? Emerging impacts? How will this feed in the over all PROLINNOVA programme
- How do we measure progress, minimum set of indicators?
- What are the core activities in the whole M&E process and where are we at present?
- CPs should set up simple country specific M&E regimen
- Former innovators should clearly be stakeholders in these, these PME regimes and their roles clearly spelled out
- Use above PME required should be designed, tested and regularly reviewed do take account of prevailing development?
- A general reporting framework should be designed at the IST
- What could be the monitoring priorities for international level and at country level?
- Are we measuring achievements of deliverables or impact of the programme?

PID TOF International Course: What suggestions? What materials? (Mariana)

The course is being organized in Uganda and will be held from the end of June up to 2 weeks in July. PROLINNOVA-International will sponsor one participant per CP. Any CP can sponsor others from their CP funds at US\$1,800 (no daily allowance). The importance of participation of new comers was emphasized.

Summary of ideas from the cafe

- In many countries some of the TOT participants left and were not allowed by their organizations to conduct training for the country programme.
- Criteria for selection: involved in the programme, capacity to communicate in English, potential ability to be a trainer of both trainer and farmer
- Commitment needed from the organization sending the participant
- The facilitator should be one that could create an impact/who have better access for involving institutions who can make an impact
- Any TOF participant must be involved in the country PROLINNOVA programme
- Decision about who to send must be taken by NSC
- Better to have PID/PTD focal point for this training
- Content: take participants through process of identification, documentation and PID; practical; key innovations, not only training skills; bring the problem to the ground; look at innovations and document these.
- CP reps should bring specific cases from their own country
- Contract with the participant to stay with his/her institution for at least x time
- Small pocket money to face circumstances
- Who should attend? Must be able to work nationally
- Commitment needed from the organization sending the participants
- Participants from NGO, GO, professional trainers?

Potential new partners and countries: What should we take into account? (Anne and Tony)

Methodology fitting into the general development and participatory approach. National Steering Committee can bog down and slow down PID at local level. A core group, can come later start focusing on local activities, after a year or two we can begin to organize the NSC. A lot of emphasis on coordinating with existing initiative, starting in one area first not necessarily covering the whole country, regional, not to spread it too thin. Country programs decide which indicators would be appropriate in that particular CP. Management level supportive of stakeholders are supportive and informed and program coordinated quickly to have time to do the coordination. The international level is the high value that makes it attractive for national groups to join it. In Nepal there exists a NSC but needs to be reenergized.

Summary of ideas from the café

- Don't be purist and rigid, connect with other parts of local development
- Conceptual discussion: difference between local practice and local innovation, is it relevant, may be part of the PROLINNOVA process
- Concern over national steering committee (what is contribution?, how to manage a NSC, is it important; Nepal does not have active steering committee, Tanzania SC works like advisory committee; do not expect too much commitment from GO; be aware time consuming and do not worry about models, just are to be multi-stakeholder)
- PROLINNOVA start with experiences on the ground and move up. Who could be part from the beginning
- Make your selection according to outreach, possible impact. Important coordination with existing initiatives
- Be constant with PROLINNOVA lobbying
- Explore the international character for PROLINNOVA to interest governments
- Build up agreement to reach sustainability
- Have a look at existing bigger programmes and try to coordinate
- Regional concentration – Be aware: small PROLINNOVA funds, insufficient to work at national level from the beginning
- Monitoring – each CP can decide which performance area they choose depends on their progress
- Place high value on networking and relationship building management level of institutions who should be aware of PROLINNOVA
- Hire a programme coordinator

Annex 10: Summary of Action Plans

Action theme	Expected outputs	Next steps	Persons-in-charge	Time frame
Sharing outcomes of the Siem Reap meeting	Workshop report	Submit workshop summaries	All facilitators	Now
		Prepare workshop report	IIRR: Marise/Scott	End March 2006
2007 workshop	Plan for workshop details	Negotiate time and place (Tanzania, Nepal, Sudan)	Secretariat (Laurens)	October
M&E	Overall M&E framework	Finalise framework	Marise, Brigid, Laurens, Rajendra	Mid April
	CP indicators confirmed ME/Reporting format	CPs agree on indicators Identify focal points Draft practical tables for countries to use	All focal points CP Ghana, Tanzania IIRR: Marise	March 20
Documentation	PID book	Continue identification of cases, use lists of workshop	Editors – Scott, Chesha,	April 2006
		Planning of the writeshop; Back-to-back with other activity	IIRR: Scott	Mid-April 2006
		Identify contact person each CP	Country coordinators, Chesha	April 2006
ISF	Final proposal for GEF	Provision of remaining info, partner and focal point letters to Anton	Anton/Monique, Ronald, Tesfahun, Mabrouk	30 April 2006

Action theme	Expected outputs	Next steps	Persons-in-charge	Time frame
Capacity building	TOF course	Use inputs from World Café to design; Circulate revised design	Marise, Ken, Ronald	March 20
		Circulate criteria for selection	Marise	
		Nominations to IIRR	CP coordinators	First week April
	PM&E	Consider option to follow PME course IIRR	IIRR: Marise	
		Consider meeting of M&E focal points	Marise, Laurens (funds)	May 2006
	Policy advocacy training	Contact and plan with PELUM Host and organise logistics	Monique, Laurent, Mariana Laurent	April 2006 As agreed with PELUM
Involvement of newcomers	Plan for PROLINNOVA-Andes	Prepare and organise first inception workshop in the Andes	Mariana, Anna P and Scott	Before June 2006
	Increased linkages with Pacific countries	Organise one Pacific participant to TOF in Uganda Organise TOF in the Pacific, fund raise	Steve, Tony, Marise Steve, Scott	April 2006 2007
	Plan for PROLINNOVA-Vietnam	Explore possible interest of NGOs to coordinate	IIRR: Scott ETC: Laurens	Before end 2006, depending on DGIS approval 2007-2010

Action theme	Expected outputs	Next steps	Persons-in-charge	Time frame
Institutionalisation in educational institutes (inc. curriculum development)	Concept note including proposed activities; also for raising funds	Prepare draft and circulate	Bram	June 2006
		Comment and explore interest of universities	Adam (Niger), Ronald (Uganda), Pratap (Nepal), Koma (Cambodia)	July 2006
		Link with COMPAS	Laurens, Bram	
Farmer mobilisation	One page write-up with "models" of mobilization per country	Prepare short guidelines	Monique CP coordinators	End of March 1 st July
		Write one page on mobilizing farmers Feature in the website Training materials	Jonathan	2 nd half of year
DGIS proposal	Strategy paper	Drafting of brief strategy paper for comments by POG/CP	Laurens	May 2006
	Agreed final proposal	Incorporate results of workshop, circulate next draft for final comments	Laurens	Circulate before 10 April Send to DGIS before 22 nd April
Action research proposal	Concept note to IDRC for funding	Follow-up	Ann W	April/May 2006

