

PROLINNOVA e-evaluation 2010

Summary report

February 2010

IIRR AND PROLINNOVA SECRETARIAT

E-evaluation process

In January 2010, the PROLINNOVA network conducted its annual electronic evaluation to assess its performance as an international network. It assessed its performance under five broad themes: governance, learning and sharing among partners and CPs, capacity building, functioning of the IST and Secretariat, and increased international awareness on PID. Each theme identified specific areas of concerns rated on a scale of 1-5, where 1 is low and 5 is high.

As has been the practice, the e-evaluation was organised in two rounds. In Round 1 respondents did the assessment on the 5 themes and added their reasons and suggestions and recommendations. Following-up on these responses the IST formulated 5 further questions for Round 2 on contentious issues from Round 1

Generally the response rate was good: A total of 11 responses representing 24 respondents were received for Round 1: South Africa CP (2), South Africa Limpopo(5), Uganda (1), Ethiopia (M&E Focal person), Kenya (1), Niger (1), Nepal(1), Ghana (1), IST other(1), IIRR (5) the Secretariat-CIS/VU(4), Cambodia (1), . The second round received 8 responses (*Ethiopia, Uganda, Niger, Ghana, Nepal, South Africa CP, IIRR and the Secretariat CIS-VU*) representing 15 respondents.

This report presents a summary analysis of the findings of the E-evaluation 2010 and formulates a number of conclusions and recommendations presented for final review and decision making during the 2010 International Partners Workshop held in Wageningen, The Netherlands in March 2010.

Analysis Round 1

A detailed breakdown of the scores on the 5 themes is given in Annex 1. Table 1 summarises the average scores for each theme and sub-themes under it.

Table 1: Summary results assessment for each of 5 main themes

Governance	Functioning of PROLINNOVA Oversight Group	(Opportunity for) influencing decision making in the network	Efficiency and transparency of management and control of funds	Joint strategy development and planning, monitoring and evaluation
4.0	4.2	3.7	3.7	4.2
Learning, sharing of info	Direct country-to-country exchange of	Sharing through the Yahoo group and	Sharing and learning through	Cross-country visits

among partners and CPs	information	website	the international meetings	
3.8	3.2	4.0	3.8	4.2
Capacity-Building	Opportunities to attend international workshops/seminars/meetings	Courses/training events by Prolinnova at international level	"On the job" support during CP backstopping visits by IST	Backstopping by other CPs
3.3	3.4	3.4	3.8	2.7
Functioning of the IST and secretariat	Secretariat's role in info provision and handling planning process, contracts and financial management	Regular IST support to your CP by Email, Skype, backstopping visits	Facilitating and supporting M&E at various levels	Supporting fund raising for PROLINNOVA and encouraging development of new sub-programmes
3.9	4.4	4.3	3.5	3.6
Increased international awareness on PID/PROLINNOVA	Recognition by, partnership with, international research and development organizations and donors	Number and quality of international PROLINNOVA publications, their spread and use	Reference to PID and PROLINNOVA experiences in publications, websites etc of others	Actual institutional change towards PID in international partners/organizations
3.6	3.8	3.5	4.4	2.9
Over all performance average: 3.7				

Table 1 shows that generally people feel that PROLINNOVA is functioning rather well as an international network. Scores on 4 out of 5 themes are above 3.5 with only capacity building at international level receiving a score below 3.5.

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

1. **Governance** receives the highest overall score (4.0). While the respondents are generally pleased with the functioning of the Prolinnova Oversight Group and see the joint strategy development as positive, they rated the opportunities for influencing decision making within the Prolinnova network and efficiency and transparency in the management of funds at 3.7. The following comments explain these scores:
 - Governance as a democratic, open and consultative process requires patience, proactive support, coordination and engagement of support groups and should encourage participation among network members; PROLINNOVA DID a good job on this.
 - Consultative processes have been evident in the strategy development, proposal development, planning and decision-making either within small groups and then shared to relevant partners for comments and suggestions.
 - The consultative process for the 2010 strategy created positive involvement energy but the turn around of the process is slow and has lost the momentum it created.
 - The POG and IST are consists of talented people who have supported the CPs in facilitation and coordination at the national and international levels. These can contribute more to the capacity strengthening process for the CPs beyond the usual backstopping support. Backstopping should not be limited to coordination and communicating needs and issues but should be able to provide strategic and targeted assistance to the CPs.
 - Insufficient transparency regarding fund management (perhaps not required at an international level though) and decision regarding attendance to international events were a few of the concerns that were raised.
2. Learning and sharing of information among partners and CP is given a score of 3.8. Direct country to country exchange of information is rated lowest (3.2) while the recently started cross visits are rated highly at 4.2. The following summary of comments supports the scores for this theme:

- Some of the effective approaches for learning and sharing include: international events, yahoo group and website and cross-country visits.
 - Information sharing is perceived by several to have improved and effective in 2009 with the Yahoo group and website
 - Cross country visits are important for actually seeing on the ground examples that could lead to CP strategy towards institutionalization of PID and operational management of the CP. Positive experiences for the year include the Mozambique/South Africa and Nepal/Cambodia cross country visits.
 - International events have real impact on the attendees. The learnings from these events can and should be shared beyond the immediate participants!
3. Capacity building received the lowest average score (3.3) among the 5 themes. Backstopping by other Country Programs has been rated particularly low at 2.7. It is only recently that this strategy has been raised needing higher priority but the network has not been able yet to put it into full practice. Opportunities to attend international workshops and seminars and PROLINNOVA international courses rate relatively low at 3.4 The following summary of comments supports the scores given to this theme and sub-themes:
- The approaches to capacity building that were in use in 2009 include: field visits, participation in review workshops, meetings with management and local partners, backstopping, attendance to international training/workshop and on the job support.
 - Backstopping is viewed positively in general but its application is not the same for all country programs. Cambodia has had low consistency in its backstopping support.
 - Some suggestions worth exploring include: other capacity development activities such as the conduct of round table discussions, production and sharing of policy briefs that can serve as models for adaptation and use of conceptual notes/articles, videos and cases for analysis, attendance to international training events must be continued and explore regional initiatives for training and cross-country learning.
 - In many of these models, PROLINNOVA has encouraged and supported South-South learning exchange.
4. The *role of the secretariat/IST* is generally considered positive (composite score of 3.9). Handling of planning processes, contracts and financial management has been rated particularly high, at 4.3. The role of secretariat and IST in facilitating and supporting M&E and supporting fundraising for PROLINNOVA and encouraging the development of new sub-programmes were given lower scores, at 3.5 and 3.6 respectively. The summary of comments below support the scores for this theme:
- The performance of PROLINNOVA is perceived to have improved in 2009. Two areas are seen as opportunities for development in the role of the Secretariat and the IST: fundraising/fund management and monitoring and evaluation.
 - Fund management – It is observed that initiatives are not always followed up in a timely manner. Formal fundraising is undertaken only at the international level (DGIS). There is limited support to CPs to raise funds for local level activities.
 - Many respondents expressed dissatisfaction on their current monitoring and evaluation practice – While the M&E tables were upgraded the M&E for PID continues to be weak. Documentation has been limited to documenting results and not the process. How to use the data collected for reflection was also raised.
 - No additional new sub-programmes were established during 2009 although some funds for additional field activities were made available
5. Respondents were sometimes not sure how to assess performance of the network in reaching *increased international attention to PID/PROLINNOVA, particularly* in regard to actual institutional change toward PID at international level. Those who did answer gave an average score of only 2.9 followed by number and quality of publications, at 3.5. The following summary of comments supports the scores for this theme:
- PROLINNOVA needs to do more publications that are recognized internationally and considered scientific. There is mixed views on perceived quality of publications. While some thinks that these materials are of value to academic staff from institutions that

teach participatory approaches some thinks that there are limited examples of quality publications.

- Discussions on local experimentation are emerging but not necessarily referred to as PID. It is not clear how PROLINNOVA is creating an impact internationally. Often, interactions are limited to individuals within organizations that are liaising with PROLINNOVA partners rather than being network wide interaction.
- Locally, there is very positive response to documents that are loaded on the web

Suggestions for improvement Round 1

Under each theme, respondents gave suggestions on how to improve functioning of PROLINNOVA at the international level. Annex 2 gives a complete list of suggestions done, including those more relevant for each CP. The following is a consolidation of the various suggestions that participants gave:

- Wider sharing of POG/IST work plans with Country Programs and also seeking CP input.
- Strengthen and give more support for country to country learning and exchange
- Develop and support South-to-South back-stopping
- Develop and offer systematic and country-program specific capacity building on participatory monitoring and evaluation
- Encourage and support scientific communication and publishing from among the CPs
- Back stoppers to be allowed to upload information to the website directly. Websites should be updated at least every 2 weeks.

Other feedback from Round 1

Round 1 concluded by providing an opportunity for respondents to give any other feedback or suggestions. The full list of these is given in Annex 3. Apart from confirming that PROLINNOVA is doing generally very well and thanking IIRR for the improved format for this E-evaluation, other feedback included issues not mentioned earlier such as:

- CPs to continue serious PID training, if needed with specialised resource people; to focus on mainstreaming PID in government extension. CP Coordinators to meet with management of key partner organisations staff of which has been involved in PID/P for purpose of reviewing progress on implemented PID initiatives and to identify issues for institutional change. To be effective CPs would need more resources
- Generally strengthening and expanding work at a regional level could be of value as it would increase the scope for sharing. Regional fundraising activities for programmes with an African feel could, e.g., be beneficial.
- Production of a quarterly or bi-annual printed bulletin on PROLINNOVA with experiences, challenges and opportunities with openings for feedback from readers. This should be an additional publication and should not replace any existing ones. A suggestion that needs to be weighed against the possibilities presently used to include PID and PROLINNOVA cases and information in printed magazines by others (ILEIA, Appropriate Technology).
- To encourage critical reflection within the network the output of this survey could be an input for people from each country network to come together to discuss this and plan ahead!

Analysis Round 2

The facilitators of the E-evaluation identified a number of contentious, contradictory or confusing issues emerging from Round 1. They asked 5 follow-up questions for discussion in Round 2 of the E-evaluation. These questions related to influence in decision making, direct country-to-country learning, international capacity building, M&E and the role of the IST and the directions for

publications at the international level. Annex 4 compiles all answers given to these 5 questions. Below is a summary analysis of the responses to the follow-up questions:

Influence in decision making

Answers suggest that on the one hand there is appreciation of and trust in the present decision making processes and acknowledgement of the role of ETC as contract holder with main donors. On the other hand, people feel there is scope to create more space and participation by all partners in decision-making. Suggestions given refer mostly to strengthening the role of the POG: extending time of service from 2 to 3 or 4 years, stronger link between POG members and their "constituency" through E-consultation prior to key POG meetings and a general possible expansion of its responsibilities e.g. in relation to management and control of funds.

Country-to-country learning and exchange of information

There remains a clear consensus on the importance of this and the need to improve ourselves. Quite a few respondents point to the fact that countries can and need to be proactive themselves in knowing what's happening within other countries and initiating forums for exchanges and learning, particularly with neighboring countries. They can and should also be giving more attention to send around and share information, experiences, documents they produce. The PROLINNOVA Yahoo group and the web site are channels available for this. Face to face meetings are said to be needed to encourage electronic exchanges later and the cross visits have started to play an important role. The IST and Secretariat need to support this by linking countries with similar issues and challenges and finalize the simple data base on key expertise in the network and make it work. One respondent suggested that in some cases the IST and Secretariat should purposely hold back in providing information if this could also easily be obtained directly from another country.

International capacity building

People acknowledge resources for training at this level are limited (a conscious choice in fact to allow more resources available for country level and other work). Suggestions that were given tend to focus on ways to make best use of limited resources by 1) systematically focusing capacity building at this level to key capacities needed in supporting PID and facilitating country programmes, 2) devolve the international training events to regional level to reduce costs and allow more participants per country; 3). very critical selection of CP participants to ensure they are available to feed their learning into the CPs; and 4) a clear system of follow up after each of the international capacity building events, ensuring that relevant documents and materials are shared also with CPs that could not attend and implementation of follow-up activities in each participating CP with monitoring by event organizers.

Monitoring and evaluation

There is considerable agreement that monitoring and evaluation for Prolinnova still remains a challenge. In terms of ways forward the situation is much more complex. Not only do people point to the need for strengthened M&E at very different levels, from M&E of local innovation and PID on the ground to feed into mainstreaming efforts, to M&E and accountability within CPs as well as at the network level. There is also lack of awareness sometimes what in fact is already available (and being done) in terms of M&E planning, formats and mechanisms. Two main action areas seem to emerge from the responses: 1) Preparation of a brief but coherent summary of M&E at all levels in PROLINNOVA outlining main responsibilities at each level; this would include both existing practices, gaps identified and suggested improvements. The secretariat could work with CPs interested to prepare this; and 2) Plan, based on this, for a number of specific M&E capacity building events or mechanisms at various levels indicating again who would be responsible for each.

PROLINNOVA publications

This question has led to a rich variety of responses. Quite a few people in the CP networks may not be aware of all publications even though the full list is on the web site (Annex 5 has publication list for the last few years from the web site). Actual spread and exposure of our publications is also mentioned to be limited by lack of systematic approach to this. There is quite a call for efforts to encourage CP network members to publish internationally, and for publications in international journals with higher research and policy credibility to increase visibility of PROLINNOVA and the PID

approach. IST members do regularly contribute to such journals but CPs apparently much less. This needs further reflection when the Secretariat notes that mobilization of good PID cases by CPs (for the new PID Booklet in the series) is often very difficult and that no CP contributed a major paper to the recent Innovation Asia and Pacific Symposium. Is building the capacity of partners in scientific writing and publishing to enable them package and submit own articles for publication, as suggested by some, the right answer? Do we need to plan for more write-shops before or after IPWs as was done for FAIR case-studies in 2008?

Conclusion and proposed action areas

Respondents rated the overall performance of PROLINNOVA in 2009 with an average of 3.7. We can safely conclude that it has performed well as an international network. The structures that are in place responsible for efficient and effective functioning of a network organization such as the Prolinnova Oversight Group (POG), International Support Team (IST), Country Programmes (CPs) and the Secretariat contributed to its strengths. The above analysis identified a number of possible areas for improvements summarized in the table below for review and decision making during the IPW 2010.

Action area	Proposed actions	Possible lead
Governance: influence in decision making;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review decision-making process, strengthen link CPs POG members, longer terms POG Improve insight in duties and responsibilities of CPs, IST, POG, Secretariat 	POG
Governance: transparency in use of funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measures needed to increase transparency in fund management? 	POG
Learning and sharing: web-site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two weekly updating of the website Pro-actively looking for materials from CPs and the network Enable back stoppers and CPs to upload information directly? Need for other features? Sharing of updates? Communicating with other CPs with an option for others to join in the discussion? 	IST-IIRR
International capacity development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review need for international capacity building versus regional versus in country: Priority at what level, on what issues? Other creative approaches to capacity development internationally including South-south approach? Improve participant selection to and in country follow-up after international training events Ideas for more systematic competency assessment that are practical? 	All, IST lead CPs
Functioning of the IST/secretariat: M&E support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and analyse present M&E functioning: what is already being done? What are gaps at various levels? How do we use info for reflection? The role of focal point? Plan focused capacity building on M&E at all levels, use of local resource people and back stoppers 	Secretariat + ? CPs + Secretariat
International awareness creation: publications	Review and strengthen publications, e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prolinnova own booklets: format, topics, quality, and generation of CP experiences. Spread and awareness PROLINNOVA 	Secretariat + ? IIRR, CPs

	Publications; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More contributions to international journals, particularly by CP (co-)authors; • Prolinnova own bi-annual bulletin? • Use of writeshop process to document our work and develop writing capabilities among CPs? 	
General: fund raising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen decentralized, CP based fund raising; capacity-building on fund raising? 	

Annex 1. Detailed break-down of the scores on the 5 themes in Round 1.

1. Governance 4.0				
Country	Functioning of Prolinnova Oversight Group	(Opportunity for) influencing decision making in the network	Efficiency and transparency of management and control of funds	Joint strategy development and planning, monitoring and evaluation
Kenya	5	3	5	4
Uganda	3	4	4	3
South Africa Limpopo	2	-	-	-
South Africa CP	4	3	2	4
Niger	5	4	4	4
Ethiopia	5	3	3	4
Nepal	5	3	3	5
IIRR	4	4	4	4
Secretariat CIS	4	-	4	5
IST other	5	5	-	5
Ghana	3	4	4	3
Cambodia	5	4	4	5
Average scores	4.2	3.7	3.7	4.2

- Opportunities for influencing decision-making within the PROLINNOVA network and efficiency and transparency of management and control of funds were rated lowest in this category at 3.7 each.

2. Learning, sharing of information among partners and country programmes 3.8				
Country	1. Direct country-to-country exchange of information	2. Sharing through the Yahoo group and website	3. Sharing and learning through the international meetings	4. Cross-country visits
Kenya	5	4	4	4
Uganda	3	4	3	4
South Africa Limpopo	2	5	3	4
South Africa CP	4	4	3	4
Niger	3	5	5	5
Ethiopia	3	3	-	-
Nepal	5	5	3	5
IIRR	3	4	5	3
Secretariat CIS	2	3	4	5
IST Other	3	3	5	-
Ghana	3	4	3	4
Cambodia	3	4	4	4
Average scores	3.2	4.0	3.8	4.2

- Direct country to country exchange of information is rated with the lowest average here at 3.2, followed by sharing and learning through international meetings at 3.8.

3. Capacity-Building. 3.3				
Country	1. Opportunities to attend international workshops/seminars/meetings	2. Courses/training events by PROLINNOVA at international level	3. "On the job" support during CP backstopping visits by IST	4. Backstopping by other CPs
Kenya	3	3	4	3
Uganda	3	3	5	3
South Africa Limpopo	3	2	3	1
South Africa CP	3	4	3	3
Niger	4	5	4	2
Ethiopia	-	4	4	-
Nepal	4	3	5	4
IIRR	4	3	3	3
Secretariat CIS	-	4	-	-
IST Other	4	-	-	-
Ghana	3	3	5	3
Cambodia	3	3	2	2
Average scores	3.4	3.4	3.8	2.7

- Backstopping by other Country Programs has been rated low in this category at an average of 2.7
- Opportunities to attend international workshops and seminars and training events by PROLINNOVA at the international level rate low at 3.4 each.

4. Functioning of the IST and secretariat 3.9				
Country	1. Secretariat's role in general info provision and handling planning process, contracts and financial management	2. Regular IST support to your CP by Email, Skype, and during backstopping visits	3. Facilitating and supporting M&E at various levels	4. Supporting fund raising for Prolinnova and encouraging development of new sub-programmes
Kenya	5	4	4	4
Uganda	5	5	4	5
South Africa Limpopo	1	4	1	1
South Africa CP	4	4	2	3
Niger	5	5	4	4
Ethiopia	5	4	3	-
Nepal	5	4	4	4
IIRR	5	4	4	4
IST other	5	-	5	
Secretariat- CIS	4	-	3	-
Ghana	5	5	4	5
Cambodia	4	4	4	2
Average scores	4.4	4.3	3.5	3.6

- The role of the secretariat in handling of planning processes, contracts and financial management has been rated high, at 4.4
- However, the IST is rated lower, in terms of facilitating and supporting M&E at various levels at 3.5 and providing fundraising support and encouraging development of new sub-programs, at 3.6

5. Increased international awareness on PID/PROLINNOVA. 3.6				
Country	1. Recognition by, partnership with, international research and development organizations and donors	2. Number and quality of international Prolinnova publications, their spread and use	3. Reference to PID and Prolinnova experiences in publications, websites etc of others	4. Actual institutional change towards PID in international partners/organizations
Kenya	4	4	3	3
Uganda	4	4	5	3
South Africa	-	5	5	2
Mozambique	3	3	3	2
Niger	4	3	4	4
Ethiopia	3	1	-	-
Nepal	-	4	4	-
IIRR	5	4	3	4
Secretariat	3	2	-	-
Ghana	4	4	5	3
Cambodia	4	3	4	3
Average scores	3.8	3.4	4.3	2.9

- Here, actual institutional change toward PID, especially for international Organizations is still rated very low, even below average at 2.9, followed by number and quality of publications, at 3.4.

Annex 2: All suggestions for improvements from Round 1

1) Governance of the partnership

- a) Participation of POG and IST members in CP countries programme planning sessions could give more direction even though CPs own programmes.
- b) Timely release of funds to CPs
- c) May be good to communicate Oversight Group work plans and all activities related to conferences, workshops, side projects at the beginning of the program
- d) Create more awareness among partners and develop strategies
- e) Consider extending POG membership to 4 years;
- f) See whether the role of the POG can be further strengthened in decision making.

2) The level and quality of the learning that takes place

- a) Strengthen country-to-country learning and exchange
- b) Regional meetings might be preferable to international workshops so that more people can attend and there might even be opportunities for additional people to co-fund themselves
- c) To encourage and facilitate CPs to use the website
- d) To make sure that all CPs participate in IPWs
- e) May be further strengthen this and including other community communication tools
- f) More support to direct country-to country exchange of information. It is even good to initiate South-South backstopping as some countries have excellent resource persons and PID facilitators.
- g) In order to make more impact on the partners from CP, IST and POG should look for funds for supporting cross-country visits so that the partners will learn concrete ideas or practices from others.
- h) Develop the database Sabina is working on.
- i) Give back-stoppers access to the website, so they can add information directly
- j) Make sure website is updated 2 weekly minimally.

3) The capacity-building efforts

- a) There must be an allocated budget for Country Programme backstopping for the implementation of PID initiatives at community level. This suggestion was also made at NSC meeting held at Limpopo, Polokwane in February 2009.
- b) Country Programme Coordinators need to be given more opportunities to attend international workshops/seminars/meetings to update them and build their capacities for direction and implementation e.g. PID ToTs
- c) Develop and support south-south backstopping and coaching

4) Functioning of the International Support Team

- a) We would appreciate if the members of IST visit our PID pilots that we implement to give support and opinions on M&E processes.
- b) CP Coordinators and M and E focal persons need more capacity building on M and E
- c) The network is not having critical reflection moments to see what happened, why what didn't happen and why? This should have been the basis for the annual plan at country level and POG level.
- d) Organize a training on PM&E and PID for countries M&E focal point
- e) The frequent change of IST members could affect to quality of IST support.
- f) As financial resources would allow, have capacity building activities or training opportunities for Monitoring and Evaluation
- g) Undertake a systematic review on what we have done on M&E in the last 4 years at all levels, to identify gaps and plan concrete steps to it better for the coming years.

5) The international-level awareness on Participatory Innovation Development

- a) It is not always obvious the extent to which PROLINNOVA has managed to influence organizations unless one is actually engaging with them directly. There are definite cases of calls for proposals that make reference to participatory approaches such as PID, but the extent to which these are directly due to the impact of PROLINNOVA is not always clear, perhaps it is important for updates to be sent around the network regarding discussions that have taken place and outcomes of these activities.
- b) More collaboration with institutions that share our (PROLINNOVA) vision
- c) We may need to allocate budget for this activities and also develop capacity in research communication.
- d) Encourage and support scientific communications and publications
- e) Translate the publications in other international languages like French
- f) Need to work more in sharing PID and Prolinnova experiences outside the Prolinnova network.
- g) We need a policy how to market our publications, because publications are weakly spread.

Annex 3: Other feedback given in Round 1:

- Strengthening the network at a regional level could be of value as it would increase the scope for sharing. Regional fundraising activities for programmes with an African feel could be beneficial.
- The IST needs to seriously consider ways to encourage / facilitate teams (combinations of people from different countries) to come together to write quality international publications that highlight lessons learnt. This could take place in conjunction with events such as the IPW or the PID refresher course.
- There is a need for LDA management and PROLINNOVA management/coordinators to meet for purposes of reviewing progress on implemented PID initiatives and to identify issues for institutional change.
- Introduce a quarterly or bi-annual bulletin on PROLINNOVA. This would be a print magazine for circulation. CPs and ETC to feed it with experiences, challenges and opportunities and open it up for feedback from readers. Some local partners and farmer groups/CBOs do not have access to the internet. This magazine should be an additional publication and should not replace any existing ones.
- Encourage Ministry of Food and Agriculture (extension service) to mainstream PID in their activities
- Carry out in-country capacity building on PID. Resource persons from PROLINNOVA ETC and/or other specialist sources
- May be good to start preparing our annual report based on performance against action basis.
- There should be a critical reflection event that will help us reflect on experiences and plan the future. For example, the output of this survey could be an input for people from each network to come together to discuss on this and plan the next.
- More support for country programmes to strengthen their institutions/structures and mobilise resources
- The functioning of PROLINNOVA as an international partnership is very good.
- To date, PROLINNOVA network had grown and become stronger given the time to work and learn together. CP programs have been established and the international capacity building activities such as trainings, cross visits, IPW, had allow cross learning among the members of Prolinnova network. The challenge then is to sustain enthusiasm and commitment to promote PID by continuing to learn from the ground and bring in other organizations that can contribute to the growing body of field-based knowledge of PID.

Annex 4: Compilation of answers given in Round 2

1. *Under governance, opportunities for influencing decision-making within the PROLINNOVA network were rated slightly low at 3.7. Are those opportunities really not enough? Why do you think so? What is not working well? How can influence in decision making be improved?*
 - a) Most of the strategies used up to now are related to organizing workshops and field visits. And targeted, mainly, middle level decision makers and experts. It may be good to use other options and also target the different makers
 - b) It may be good to seriously consider the obvious advocacy strategies.
 - c) Ultimately decisions are taken at the IST level - this is also the group that is ultimately responsible to report back to the funder and thus I feel that while decisions can be shared and input can be sought from others, decision-making does have to become primarily the responsibility of ETC staff.
 - d) The contribution of country-level members to the discussion around defining the beyond-2010 agenda has been limited, at least after the first round of inputs. There could have been more bouncing of ideas and refining it through managed consensus.
 - e) May be POG representatives can organize consultative meetings with their constituencies rather than meeting during IPW
 - f) IST and POG members need to participate in CP In-country annual review and planning sessions as a function. It helps to direct grass root level and improves quality of CP programmes. Annual IPW may not be enough.
 - g) Yes, the opportunities are not enough to create visibility and influence decision –making
 - h) During Workshops and IPW it may be prudent to always invite country officials for opening ceremonies so as to create awareness and influence decision making. This was not done for most PROLINNOVA international events
 - i) One important reason is the difference in policy and working modalities among the participating organizations where diverse stakeholders are involved. Except country secretariat office, there are no provisions for staff due to limited budget and thus no staff is assigned to PROLINNOVA program. It is important to identify PROLINNOVA focal persons among the individual organizations and equivalent budget support
 - j) Generally, we feel that PROLINNOVA practices very open, participatory, planning and decision making process in which IPW, POG and delegation to country programmes play a major role. Prolinnova may be does not have a formal decision making structure where issues are voted on the countries to be brought to the POG for voting and decision making. We have chosen for a POG with a major oversight role, not as a formal representative body taking all major decisions. Do we want to go that way? Can we do that without losing the spirit of the learning network?
2. *As in previous years people are still not satisfied with the direct country-to-country exchange of information, rated lowest in this category at 3.3. Maybe this is just because we do not feel a big need for it? What does stop us from asking info or advice from other countries? What do we, CPs, the IST, secretariat need to do to improve this?*
 - a) It worked best where there has been face to face exchange between countries like Mozambique and SA. This has not really happened with other countries. In some cases there were individuals that exchanged info -perhaps this is more realistic. The IST could still identify particular opportunities for other countries to pursue.
 - b) Different CPs need to create opportunities where their members know each other. Through such opportunities, one would know the strengths of the other country's programmes and expertise. This then creates the environment which allows country-to-country exchanges to happen. Such exchanges are starting to happen between SA and Mozambique, e.g., the HAPID workshops had representatives from the other country in attendance.

- c) Seeing is believing. Countries with similar ecological features and social settings need to have exchange visits and joint forums/exhibitions/workshops.
- d) No, there is a big need and necessity for direct country-to-country exchange of information as this can help mutual learning and strengthening capacities at lower cost
- e) The mechanism is not yet official and operational as countries are not much aware of the progress made by other countries. Countries are relying on information received from IST, POG, Secretariat and back-stoppers
- f) For IST to recognize and bring out areas of progress of countries and persons from CPs in charge to be contacted; CPs to include direct country-to-country exchange of information
- g) Direct country to country exchange of information really important to know the country specific PROLINNOVA program. The context is very different from each country which cannot be used directly in other countries which requires both research and modification, ultimately increases need of expert and cost. To increase efficacy of direct exchange of information, CP should provide enough information about the context where innovation were happened and also requires to understand context of the other countries which helps them to provide information for other CPs what can be modified in their context.
- h) It might be that though the opportunity is there, it does not present itself very well to country programs. It might be good to have a particular section with the website where each country program can share their updates and communicate with other country program. These regular country updates can also be consolidated into PROLINNOVA CP-updates, which can be laid out to give its PROLINNOVA official use and be sent electronically to each CP and be posted to the PROLINNOVA website. There is also an option to print this. Consider also sharing this to other partners to help promote PID and PROLINNOVA globally.

3. *Capacity building through international level activities received a score of 3.4. Yet, this year there were three international training events organized through PROLINNOVA (SLM course cum CD workshop in Uganda, PID Refresher in Kenya and policy workshop with RUAF in the Netherlands). Given the high costs of these events can we do more or differently? Or what else can we realistically do to increase capacity building at this level? Or should we accept that our major focus of capacity building is at CP level?*

- a) What I am expecting in areas of capacity building is to have a clear picture on the competency requirements to run PID at micro level and PROLINNOVA at macro level. Then designing a capacity building strategy to build these competencies.
- b) Perhaps some members saw workshops not as training events but rather as planning events (the policy workshop for example) and thus did not consider that there were three.
- c) International workshops are good in that they minimize the resources used for hiring the resource persons. However, only a limited number of people from each country can attend such workshops. The sharing of the experiences from the workshops might not happen or can take a long time before happening. If resources permitted, efforts could concentrate on regional initiatives.
- d) Information and requirements for attending the workshops need to be clear.
- e) Country Programme Coordinators need to be given more opportunities to build their capacities for direction and implementation e.g. PID ToTs. Make it possible for all CPs, IST, POG and Secretariat to attend IPW. No visa problems
- f) Two of these international training (CD workshop and RUAF) concerned very few country PROLINNOVA practitioners and the workshop documents seems to be less shared with all countries
- g) It is good to organize regional trainings as a strategy to reduce high costs and increase participation (participants can travel by roads and increase workshop number of training days)
- h) In Nepal CP, there are only few people had opportunity for such training who have more responsibility in their organization and have limited time so they cannot serve as the resource persons for the country program.

- i) The score is partially low because of the low score for country-to-country backstopping. This is a new development that probably can be shaped better in the next phase. In terms of international training events a lot has been done in fact with little money in 2009 (IPW, FAIR meeting, IASP, CD workshop cum SLM training, PID Refresher, Policy Advocacy workshop). Maybe the problem is limited feedback and follow-up in country training following from these events so that many can benefit? Or are always the same few people from a CP attending these events limiting capacity development opportunities for others?
- j) There is always an added value for international level activities and the challenge of limiting this opportunity due to its costs is always there too. The mere fact that international level activities are being done and being provided within the PROLINNOVA already achieved its great purpose of South-South exchange. To what extent PROLINNOVA had used these international level activities to link with other non-PROLINNOVA organizations / network? It will be an added value too, if as PROLINNOVA organized such international level activities that reach is expanded, and outputs of such workshops / exchanges be packaged for wider sharing.

4. *The IST is rated lower as far as facilitating M&E is concerned. Why do you think this is so? Which part of M&E is the weakest in PROLINNOVA? What more can the IST do to support M&E? What do CPs, others need to do?*

- a) One problem may be the delay in finalizing the M&E plan or system for the networks. The other thing associated to this is networks and the over site group has not used the M&E (whatever is available) for decision making and critically reflecting on performance of the networks and PROLINNOVA in general. We have not tried to use the outputs of M&E to assess program efficiency, effectiveness, relevance and impact.
- b) What can do in the future is assess the current status of networks and PROLINNOVA Oversight Group M&E plan and make everybody to be aware about it. Then agree on what kind of M&E we are going create and for what purpose. Finally design an action plan for all partners.
- c) M&E still remains a challenge - in SA perhaps because it is remaining a responsibility of the program coordinator rather than being a task of an M&E focal point. We are still focusing on implementing activities rather than following up on the impact - a weakness that we recognize.
- d) Need to offer hands on support on developing participatory M&E tool and system
- e) The formats still remain complex and difficult to follow. Can we develop a simple soft ware for monitoring PROLINNOVA activities? The LISF register is a good start for LISF
- f) No PM&E workshop is yet organized and instability of M&E international focal point
- g) IST to organize a PM&E training of trainers workshop
- h) CPs to train and sensitize members on PM&E tables.
- i) IST can look at these expressed M and E needs, consolidate them into report (M&E capacity needs assessment) and design sort of an M&E support program. This can actually be linked to existing M and E support mechanisms already: Electronic and on site technical backstopping.
- j) Much more practical is really to design a customized course on PME, considering the PROLINNOVA context, and provide this training to the CPs. This can be a regional training so more people can attend.
- k) The idea to have funds that would sponsor CPs to attend PME courses is also a good one.
- l) Our feeling is that stronger M&E at field level is needed for evidence based advocacy. CPs would play a crucial role in it.

5. *Responses on quantity and quality of PROLINNOVA (international) publications are very diverse: There are scores from 1 to 5. How is that possible? Why do some people score 1, 2, what is the problem? Why do some score 5? Which publications are useful, adequate, and which are not? For those giving lower scores: what needs to be done to improve the situation?*

- a) I was thinking if there is a possibility to encourage and support network members to publish internationally. At least one international publication per year per network > Furthermore, encouraging members to contribute to PROLINNOVA blog (if it is feasible and established)

- b) We see international publications as those that represent cross-country learning. We also see a need for articles in journals that allow for citation elsewhere, rather than popular articles (or perhaps a mixture of both is necessary).
- c) The IPW should be used for strategizing on how to publish the Prolinnova work through international journals. Participants should be required to bring materials that they are thinking of developing into publications. There should be a dedicated person to lead the exercise during the meeting. Work on developing such publication at such meetings should have someone to steer them to ensure that everyone delivers something of high quality within a given time.
- d) Collect country outputs and outcomes on joint experimentations and make practitioners and scientific publications.
- e) Make publications in other languages such as French
- f) To increase use of publication, there should be translation provisions in vernacular languages, which increase their use and ultimately useful for awareness and capacity building activities.
- g) Big discrepancy / variations in scores maybe due to lack of awareness on these PROLINNOVA publications, although all these are posted in the website. This may also means relevance of the publications produced or an expression of the limited participation / involvement of others in the development of publications.
- h) A sourcebook that would feature contributions from the different CPs and other PROLINNOVA partners can really be very useful and relevant.
- i) Maybe small grant for CPs to document and package their experiences for wider sharing is necessary. Competency to facilitate documentation through write-shop process can be strengthened
- j) It is quite possible that many people are not aware of the (long list of) publications done by Prolinnova annually (full list is in each annual report and on the website, but who sees this)
- k) It is true that in 2009 Prolinnova did less than before in preparing international publications, particularly the joint booklet series got delayed. Part of the difficulties on the secretariat side is to mobilize good contributions from CPs, e.g. for the present booklet on joint experimentation; also for the Innovation Asia and Pacific Symposium and the book coming out of it now, no CP contributed a major paper. Why?
- l) Feedback from CTA pointed us to the fact that the present booklet series (volume 1 on recognizing local innovation, volume 2 on multi-stakeholder partnerships, volume 3 under preparation) is too much inward looking, focusing on few Prolinnova examples thus reducing its relevance beyond the own network. That may be correct? But this makes them probably more practically useful within Prolinnova and the CPs. But do CPs make use of Prolinnova (international) publications in their various activities (courses, workshops, trainings, project proposals, etc)?

Annex 5: PROLINNOVA international publications 2007 -2009 (from website)

2009:

Ecological agriculture in Uganda and the contribution of farmer innovation (PDF file; size: 1,140 KB), by Helen Kranstauber, VU University Amsterdam, 2009

Notes on Local Innovation and Participatory Innovation Development (PDF File; size: 136 K B). These notes attempt to shed light on key concepts used within the Prolinnova network.

Local innovation in range management on the Tibetan Plateau (Word File; size: 51 KB) by Ann Waters-Bayer, Yan Zhaoli and Chesha Wettasinha. Presented at the Sino-German Tibetan Rangeland Ecosystem Research Symposium, 20–26 July 2009, Lanzhou, China.

Process documentation of experiences in facilitating FLD in Tigray, Ethiopia by Fetien Abay & Gebrecherkos Gebregiorgis
[View document](#) (PDF file; size : 709 KB)

Women documenting their innovations: outcomes of a farmer-led documentation process in Tigray, Ethiopia (this appears as a printed booklet in English and Tigrigna for use in development organisations and schools in Tigray)
[View document](#) (PDF file; size : 630 KB)

2008:

Recognising local innovation: experiences of PROLINNOVA partners. A publication in the series on Promoting Local Innovation. Wettasinha, Chesha; Wongtschowski, Mariana & Waters-Bayer, Ann (eds). Silang, Cavite, Philippines: IIRR / Leusden: PROLINNOVA International Secretariat, ETC EcoCulture. Revised version, August 2008. ISBN 1-930261-16-0.

From Degradation To Innovation – The effect of support and funding in promoting local innovation in Kikandwa Environmental Association, Uganda (PDF File; size : 2.54 MB) by Kim Hagen. Thesis, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Faculteit der Aard - en Levenswetenschappen, MSc. Environment and Resource Management. July 2008

Innovation Africa: enriching farmers' livelihoods by Pascal Sanginga, Ann Waters-Bayer, Susan Kaaria, Jemimah Njuki and Chesha Wettasinha. Earthscan, London, October 2008. Paperback • £29.95 • 384 pages • 978-1-84407-672-7 • October 2008.
[View book flyer](#)
[View complete list of chapters - Earthscan website](#)

FAIR – farmer access to innovation resources (PDF file; size : 1.51 MB) by Laurens van Veldhuizen, Anton Krone, Mariana Wongtschowski & Ann Waters-Bayer. *Rural Development News* 2/2008 published by Agridea, Lindau, Switzerland: pp47-52 (this is a summary of the report on the first 2-year phase of piloting Local Innovation Support Funds in Cambodia, Ethiopia, Nepal, South Africa and Uganda)

Participatory innovation development in water management in Tigray, Ethiopia (PDF file; size :1.87 MB) by Hailu Araya, Kiflay Tebari, Leul HaileSelassie & Guesh WoldeSelassie. *Rural Development News* 2/2008 published by Agridea, Lindau, Switzerland: pp53-57 (this is about Abadi Redehay, a local innovator in water management, who is working together with other farmers and development agents of the Tahtai Maichew District Agriculture and Rural Development Office in northern Ethiopia to see how his innovation can be adapted to fields).

Article "**Farmers' Seed Management and Innovation in Varietal Selection: Implication for Barley Breeding in Tigray, Northern Ethiopia**" by Fetien Abay, Ann Waters-Bayer and Åsmund Bjørnstad, published in the June 2008 issue of *Ambio: A Journal of the Human Environment* (Vol. 37, No. 4, pp312-320), copyright Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences 2008(www.ambio.kva.se); printed by Allen Press, Lawrence, Kansas, USA (PDF file; size : 4.11 MB)

2007:

The story of a smart water harvester in Tigray Region, Ethiopia. In: B van Waes & D Bouman (eds) *Small water harvesting solutions: examples of innovative, low-cost technologies for rain, fog, runoff water and groundwater* (Netherlands Water Partners / Aqua for All), pp 36–39 (PDF file: size : 919 KB)

Supporting Local Innovation in Nepal - September 2007 Sharad Rai (PDF file: size : 396 KB)

Participatory research that builds on local innovation in beekeeping to escape poverty (PDF file: size : 92 KB). By Hailu Araya, Yohannes GebreMichael, Abera GebreAmlak and Ann Waters-Bayer. This contribution was presented and discussed at the: Tropentag 2006, University of Bonn, 11–13 October 2006, Conference on International Agricultural Research for Development.

Trees are our Backbone - Integrating environment and local development in Tigray Region of Ethiopia (In English: PDF file: size : 930 KB). Issue Paper # 145, IIED. GebreMichael, Yohannes and Waters-Bayer, Ann. July 2007. ISBN 978-1-84369-661-2; ISSN 1357 9312. IIED Dryland Issue Papers: <http://www.iied.org/pubs/search.php?s=DIP&x=Y>.
French Version (PDF file: size : 842 KB)

PROLINNOVA at Work: Highlights in 2004 - 2006. Brochure printed by IIRR, May 2007. (PDF file: size : 208 KB)

Natural mineral licks to enhance livestock growth. Article in March 2007 issue of *Appropriate Technology* (pp. 46 - 48). N. Karbo, CSIR-Animal Research Institute, Nyankpala Station, Tamale, Ghana. Reproduced with permission of Research Information Ltd from "Appropriate Technology" Vol. 34, No. 1 (2007); see www.appropriate-technology.org. (PDF file: size : 175 KB)

Facilitating Multi-stakeholder Partnerships: Lessons from Prolinnova. A publication in the series on Promoting Local Innovation. Critchley, Will; Verburg, Miranda & Veldhuizen, Laurens van (eds). Silang, Cavite, Philippines: IIRR / Leusden: PROLINNOVA International Secretariat, ETC EcoCulture. December 2006. ISBN 1-930261-15-2.