

# PROLINNOVA

PRoMoting Local INNOVation  
in ecologically-oriented agriculture and natural resource management

## **AFRICAN CPS' MEETING: Proli-FaNS partners workshop and regionalisation meeting**



**Methodist Resort and Conference Centre  
Nairobi, Kenya  
22–24 May 2018**

## Table of contents

<b>LIST OF TABLES .....</b>	<b>I</b>
<b>ACRONYMS.....</b>	<b>II</b>
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES .....	1
1.2 OPENING SESSION .....	2
<b>2.0 PROLI-FANS MEETING.....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1 PROLI-FANS OVERVIEW REPORT.....	3
2.2 PROLI-FANS CPS' PROGRESS REPORTS FROM MAY 2017 TO APRIL 2018 .....	4
2.3 SHARING PID EXPERIENCES .....	7
2.4 INTEGRATING GENDER INTO PID.....	10
2.5 MONITORING AND EVALUATION FRAMEWORK .....	11
2.6 LIBRARY FOR FOOD SOVEREIGNTY .....	13
<b>3.0 REGIONALISATION PROCESS .....</b>	<b>14</b>
3.1 INTRODUCTION.....	14
3.2 OVERVIEW OF REGIONALISATION PROCESS .....	14
3.2.1 <i>West &amp; Central Africa sub-region report by Georges Djohy</i> .....	14
3.2.2 <i>Eastern and Southern Africa sub-region report by Amanuel Assefa</i> .....	15
3.3 REVIEW AND AMENDMENTS OF THE SUB-REGIONAL CHARTERS .....	15
3.4 REGIONALISATION ROADMAP .....	16
<b>4.0 CLOSING SESSION .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>APPENDIXES .....</b>	<b>19</b>
APPENDIX 1: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS.....	19
APPENDIX 2: AGENDA .....	20
APPENDIX 3: POWERPOINT PRESENTATIONS BY CPS .....	22
APPENDIX 4: GUIDELINES FOR MONITORING AND EVALUATION .....	22
APPENDIX 5: GUIDELINES FOR GENDER-RESPONSIVE FARMER-LED INNOVATION AND RESEARCH.....	22
APPENDIX 6: DRAFT SUB-REGIONAL CHARTERS .....	22

## List of tables

TABLE 1: OVERALL PROLI-FANS ACHIEVEMENTS .....	3
TABLE 2: PROLI-FANS REPORT FROM BURKINA FASO .....	4
TABLE 3: PROLI-FANS REPORT FROM ETHIOPIA .....	4
TABLE 4: PROLI-FANS REPORT FROM KENYA.....	5
TABLE 5: PROLI-FANS REPORT FROM GHANA.....	5
TABLE 6: NETWORKS TO APPROACH IN EASTERN AND SOUTHERN AFRICA.....	17
TABLE 7: KEY ACTIVITIES IN THE REGIONALISATION PROCESS.....	17
TABLE 8: KEY ACTION POINTS FOR THE REGIONALISATION PROCESS .....	17

## Acronyms

ACDEP	Association of Church-Based Development Projects
AFAAS	African Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services
AFRONET	African Organic Network
ARD	Agricultural Research and Development
AU	African Union
CCRP	Collaborative Crop Research Program
CEDEAO/ECOWAS	<i>Communauté Économique des États de l'Afrique de l'Ouest</i> /Economic Community of West African States
COPAGEN	<i>Coalition pour le Protection du Patrimoine Génétique Africain</i> / Coalition for the Protection of African Genetic Heritage
CORAF/WECARD	<i>Conseil Ouest et Centre Africain pour la Recherche et le Développement Agricoles</i> /West and Central African Council for Agricultural Research and Development
CP	Country Platform
ESAFF	Eastern and Southern Africa Farmers' Forum
ESAPP	Eastern and Southern Africa ProInnova Platform
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations
FARA	Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa
FaReNe	Farmer-led Research Networks
GFRAS	Global Forum for Rural Advisory Services
GIZ	<i>Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit</i> / German Agency for International Cooperation
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
IIRR	International Institute of Rural Reconstruction
IPR	Intellectual Property Rights
IPW	International Partners Workshop
IST	International Support Team
JE	Joint Experimentation
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
KIT	Royal Tropical Institute
LFS	Library for Food Sovereignty
LI	Local Innovation
LISF	Local Innovation Support Facility
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MSP	Multi-Stakeholder Platform
NRM	Natural Resource Management
NSC	National Steering Committee
PAEPARD	Platform for African–European Partnership on Agricultural Research for Development
PID	Participatory Innovation Development
POG	PROLINNOVA Oversight Group
Prolif-FaNS	Promoting local innovation for Food and Nutrition Security
PROLINNOVA	Promoting local innovation in ecologically oriented agriculture and NRM
ROPFA	<i>Réseau des Organisations Paysannes et de Producteurs de l'Afrique de l'Ouest</i> /Network of Farmer and Producer Organizations of West Africa
RUFORUM	Regional Universities Forum for Capacity Building in Agriculture
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
SIDA	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
SRC	Sub-Regional Coordinator
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WN	World Neighbors

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background and objectives

A meeting of PROLINNOVA Country Platforms (CPs) in Africa was held on 22–24 May 2018 at the Methodist Resort and Conference Centre in Nairobi, Kenya. It was attended by representatives of all but one of the active CPs in Africa as well as by members of the PROLINNOVA Oversight Group (POG) and the International Support Team (IST). The meeting was hosted by World Neighbors (WN), a member of PROLINNOVA–Kenya.

The main purposes of the meeting were to discuss the progress of the Promoting local innovation for Food and Nutrition Security (Proli-FaNS) project and to review and discuss the process of regionalising the PROLINNOVA network in Africa. The three-day meeting was partially funded through the Proli-FaNS project, with additional direct funding from Misereor. Proli-FaNS is a three-year project (August 2016 to July 2019) hosted by the Association of Church-Based Development Projects (ACDEP) in Northern Ghana and implemented by five CPs in Africa: in Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Ghana and Kenya with a total of eight learning sites. Proli-FaNS is funded by Misereor/Catholic Central Agency for Development Aid.

The meeting consisted of two parts: two days (22–23 May) dedicated to sharing and learning within Proli-FaNS and with other CPs, and the third day (24 May) to address regional issues. On 25 May, the POG held its annual face-to-face meeting; this is covered in a separate report.

#### **a. The two-day annual Proli-FaNS meeting**

The objectives of this part of the African CPs' meeting were to:

- i. Review progress and identify and address project implementation and technical challenges in order to achieve project objectives.
- ii. Share and learn from each other's experiences in Participatory Innovation Development (PID) and Local Innovation (LI) processes and outcomes in Proli-FaNS CPs and other CPs
- iii. Prioritise and plan key project activities for the final year of Proli-FaNS in order to achieve the set targets and objectives
- iv. Brainstorm on possible next phase of the project and activities to be included in a proposal.

#### **b. The one-day meeting on the African regionalisation process**

In this part of the meeting, the progress of the regionalisation process in Africa was discussed and a plan was developed to guide the process.

The specific objectives for this section were to:

- i. Understand the regionalisation process and how it is conceptualised
- ii. Share experiences on the regionalisation process in Africa
- iii. Draft the sub-regional charters
- iv. Develop a roadmap to guide actions towards forming PROLINNOVA–Africa.

## Day 1: 22 May 2018

### 1.2 Opening session

Makonge Righa from WN and PROLINNOVA–Kenya welcomed all the participants to the meeting. He stated that WN was delighted to host the meeting and added that the meeting provided a good opportunity for CPs to share and learn from each other. The participants then introduced themselves and Joe Ouko, farmer representative in the POG, said an opening prayer.

#### ***Opening remarks by Chris Macoloo, POG Co-chair***

On behalf of the POG, Chris Macoloo – African Regional Director of WN and Co-Chair of the POG – conveyed apologies of POG members who were not able to attend the meeting. He stated that PROLINNOVA has had a tradition of holding an International Partners Workshop (IPW) hosted by different countries every year. For example, in 2013, it was held in Kenya, 2014 in Cambodia, 2015 in Ethiopia, 2016 in Senegal and 2017 in Ghana. In the last IPW, Prolinnova–Philippines offered to host the 2018 IPW, but was not able to do so because of funding challenges. In addition, in the Ghana IPW, it was concluded that the processes of Southernisation (relocation of the International Secretariat from North to South) and regionalisation (strengthening of regional PROLINNOVA networks) were to commence in 2017. The regionalisation process was to start in Africa, as funds for this were available through the Proli-FaNS project. Two Sub-regional Coordinators (SRCs) have been recruited for the Eastern and Southern Africa and the Western and Central Africa sub-regions. The eventual outcome is to have three regional networks: in Asia, Africa and the Andes. As part of the Southernisation process, the International Institute of Rural Reconstruction (IIRR) in the Philippines expressed interest in hosting the International Secretariat, which is currently hosted by the Royal Tropical Institute (KIT) in the Netherlands. However, IIRR has faced funding and human resource challenges and has not been able to take up the role. Chris informed the group that PROLINNOVA CPs have been revitalised in the Andes, specifically in Bolivia and Peru, and Lionel Vigil from PROLINNOVA–Peru was named to be their representative in the POG.

Chris requested the participants to deliberate during the 3-day meeting on these questions:

1. *The PROLINNOVA Secretariat*: Should PROLINNOVA identify another organisation to host the Secretariat, or continue to follow up with IIRR to take up the role?
2. *Southernisation*: Should PROLINNOVA have focal points in each region, i.e. one in Asia, one in Africa and one in the Andes?
3. *Proli-FaNS progress*: One year is left, and there are objectives that need to be achieved within this remaining year; are we on track as we enter the final year in August 2018?
4. *Promoting local innovation*: Does food security automatically lead to nutrition security? Do the innovations we are reporting on look at the connection between access to food, on the one hand, and human nutrition, on the other?
5. *Gender*: To what extent is gender being addressed?
6. *Monitoring and evaluation (M&E)*: Do we have robust project indicators that will help track project progress over time? Do the CPs' M&E focal persons know each other? Are they tracking the progress of the project?
7. *Joint experimentation (JE)*: How many innovations have reached the JE stage? How many of these are on innovations by women?
8. *Project continuation*: Do you think Misereor will be enthusiastic to extend the current project or even to proceed to another phase?

## 2.0 Proli-FaNS MEETING

### Chair – Amanuel Assefa

#### 2.1 Proli-FaNS overview report

The Proli-FaNS coordinator, Joe Nchor, gave an overview report on the project, highlighting the current status of project activities, key achievements and lessons learnt. The achievements of Proli-FaNS in Year 1 and Year 2 (ongoing) are outlined in Table 1.

**Table 1: Overall Proli-FaNS achievements**

Year 1	Year 2 (period Aug 2017–Apr 2018)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>i.</i> Launching of the project at national and local levels, creating public awareness and supporting policy influencing</li> <li><i>ii.</i> 109 innovations (68% of target) selected and profiled (62 innovations by women; 47 by men)</li> <li><i>iii.</i> Six PROLINNOVA/project guidelines developed, shared and posted on website</li> <li><i>iv.</i> Local Multi-Stakeholder Platforms (MSPs) formed at all action-learning sites for learning, implementation and institutionalisation</li> <li><i>v.</i> PID trainings conducted at sub-regional, national and project-site levels for National Steering Committees (NSCs), technical teams, MSPs and innovators</li> <li><i>vi.</i> PID and JE started on 24 innovations (10 by women): Ghana 6, Burkina Faso 5, Ethiopia 6, Kenya 5, Cameroon 2</li> <li><i>vii.</i> Selected innovations disseminated to 357 men and women</li> <li><i>viii.</i> NSCs and national platforms reactivated and strengthened to improve CPs' governance and project implementation</li> <li><i>ix.</i> IPW 2017/project partners meeting in May in Ghana for experience sharing, policy influencing and capacity building</li> <li><i>x.</i> Two part-time Sub-Regional Coordinators (SRCs) recruited in April to lead establishment and operationalisation of sub-regional platforms</li> <li><i>xi.</i> South–South backstopping in Cameroon by Djibril &amp; Joe in February; and in Burkina Faso and Senegal by Georges in July</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>i.</i> 44 new innovations selected and profiled for development or documentation and dissemination; cumulative total: 153 (96% of target)</li> <li><i>ii.</i> 30 PID/JE cases are at different stages: Ghana 6, Burkina Faso 5, Cameroon 2, Kenya 11, Ethiopia 6 – 75% of target</li> <li><i>iii.</i> 124 selected innovations (71 by women) disseminated with communities and other stakeholders through community sessions, field days, exchange visits, radio, farmer fairs and farmer days</li> <li><i>iv.</i> Documentation: 4 new guidelines developed for Local Innovation Support Facilities (LISFs), reporting, PID process documentation and M&amp;E</li> <li><i>v.</i> 45 women innovators recognised by being given awards and certificates: Burkina Faso 15, Ghana 10, Cameroon 10, Kenya 10</li> </ul>

#### Lessons learnt

- i.* Though there has been increased awareness on LI and PID among target communities and other stakeholders, there is limited scaling up of innovations and of the PID approach.
- ii.* There is increased interest and participation of Agricultural Research and Development (ARD) stakeholders in LI/PID activities. Policy-dialogue initiatives need to be enhanced to strengthen collaboration.
- iii.* The focus on women by the CPs implementing the project is still fairly low.
- iv.* Staff changes in coordination affected project implementation in Kenya and Ethiopia.
- v.* PID/farmer-led joint research is understood differently by different stakeholders; thus, need to intensify sharing and learning to facilitate common understanding of the concept.
- vi.* There is need to put emphasis on use of the M&E framework, as workplans and progress reports are not strongly guided by M&E indicators.

- vii. Late submission of reports is negatively affecting timely disbursement of funds; changes in the implementation and reporting periods were suggested.

## 2.2 Proli-FaNS CPs' progress reports from May 2017 to April 2018

The CPs<sup>1</sup> implementing Proli-FaNS presented progress reports covering the key activities implemented, outputs and targets achieved, challenges experienced and lessons learnt (see Appendix 3 for PowerPoint presentations). Below are summaries of the CPs' presentations.

**Table 2: Proli-FaNS report from Burkina Faso**

BURKINA FASO		
Key activities	Achievements	Challenges
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Five joint experiments led by farmers</li> <li>Meeting organised for different organisations to share their experiences</li> <li>Innovators participated in farmer innovation day and tomato fair</li> <li>Meetings held with local municipality to share project details and achievements; this helped change their view of ARD</li> <li>Documentation at local committee level; expected also to be undertaken at national level</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>20 local innovations selected and being documented; joint experimentation ongoing</li> <li>Innovators organised community sessions to share their innovations</li> <li>Involvement of agricultural institutions to help improve quality of local innovations</li> <li>Organised capacity building at regional level</li> <li>60 women involved in joint experimentation processes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitoring the learning process with the groups is a bit difficult</li> <li>Learning sites are very far</li> <li>High rates of illiteracy among the women</li> <li>Inadequate resources for external experts to evaluate suitability of innovations</li> </ul>

**Table 3: Proli-FaNS report from Ethiopia**

ETHIOPIA		
Key activities	Summary of farmer experiments	Challenges & opportunities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Training in PID (37 participants)</li> <li>Youth groups cascading training</li> <li>Conducted a sharing and learning visit</li> <li>PID/IE with Axum University</li> <li>Monitoring and backstopping</li> </ul>	<p><i>a. Axum site</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifying better economic return from two types of chicken breed (local and exotic)</li> <li>Comparing chicken feeds for egg production</li> <li>Intercropping of tomato with other crops, especially with <i>tef</i></li> <li>Planting of <i>gesho</i> (hops) to protect farm terraces and increase income</li> <li>Controlling insect and pest infestation on fruit trees through natural ways</li> </ul> <p><i>b. Alemnberhan site</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intercropping of tomato with other crops, especially with <i>tef</i> crop</li> <li>Planting of <i>gesho</i> (hops) to protect farm terraces and increase income</li> <li>Crop diversification through planting coffee, cassava, tomato, papaya, vegetables, spices etc</li> </ul>	<p><u>Opportunities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Axum and Bahirdar Universities interested in supporting farmers</li> </ul> <p><u>Challenges</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fund disbursement and implementation period is too short (3 months)</li> <li>Misunderstanding about principles of Best Practice Association (BPA), PROLINNOVA and CP coordinator</li> <li>Researchers expect financial incentives while the project has no provision for this</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup>Prolinnova–Cameroon did not present its progress report because the arrival of its representative was delayed. However, the report prepared for presentation is included in the appendices.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local soap production</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

**Table 4: Proli-FaNS report from Kenya**

KENYA		
Key achievements	Lessons learnt	Challenges
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>31 local innovations identified from the two sites; Kisumu County: 19 women’s innovations; 8 men’s innovations and 2 group innovations; Makueni County: 5 women’s innovations and 7 men’s innovations</li> <li>PID training done at national and local level</li> <li>Farmer innovation day held on 23Feb 2018 in Makueni County; 20 innovations showcased; certificates of participation awarded to all innovators</li> <li>Documentation of the innovations ongoing; 12 innovations currently being documented</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Involvement of various partners in JE constrained by funding as staff request high costs to take part</li> <li>There are innovations by women but more effort needed to reach out directly to women innovators</li> <li>Adoption rate of local innovations by other community members is low even though their level of recognition and appreciation of the innovations is high</li> <li>Government leaders/departments appreciate LIs and PID but make limited efforts to integrate them into policy and priorities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High staff turnover rate</li> <li>General presidential elections interfered with fieldwork</li> <li>Delays in disbursement of funds</li> <li>High expectations from other partners requested to take part in LI and PID activities</li> </ul>

**Table 5: Proli-FaNS report from Ghana**

GHANA	
Achievements	Lessons learnt and challenges
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>19 innovations documented in detail with photos and innovation processes (12 by women including 2 women’s groups; 7 by men), selection based on nutritional enhancement, environmental sustainability and improvement of women’s incomes</li> <li>6 innovations subjected to PID: 4 led by women including 2 women’s groups, 2 led by men including 1 social innovation); 5 completed and 1 ongoing; university co-researcher already using outcomes of one PID case in her academic work</li> <li>25 innovations (18 by women/7 by men) shared with about 5000 people including radio listeners</li> <li>Field visits and capacity training conducted</li> <li>LISF guidelines and application and vetting forms developed; stakeholders oriented on these</li> <li>Initiated collaboration with University of Basel in Switzerland to identify promising small-scale farmer innovations in animal health and conduct laboratory analysis to validate and then integrate with formal veterinary practices</li> <li>Hosted IPW in May 2017 in Tamale Project launched in two districts involving chiefs, ARD heads, MSPs and media</li> <li>Sensitisation of District Assembly Authorities on project activities</li> <li>Department of Agriculture awarded certificates, small-scale processing equipment and farm inputs to 10 outstanding women innovators at annual National Farmers Day in Yendi and Bongo Districts in December 2017</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Women’s experimentation skills and innovation revealed but need further support from men and ARD partners to achieve sustainable food and nutrition security</li> <li>Fieldstaff need training in integrating gender into PID, but local expertise is limited as most gender specialists have no knowledge in PID</li> <li>There is renewed interest and partnerships between local ARD practitioners and communities on farmer-led research and local innovation</li> <li>More policy-dialogue activities required to achieve institutionalisation of PID by ARD institutions</li> </ul>



Key issues and suggestions raised during the discussion on the reports were:

1. Should PROLINNOVA consider using scientific process/inputs to approve local innovations for PID? This was based on the presentation from Burkina Faso, where local innovations are presented to universities, which then approved those to be taken further in JE. It was agreed that the local MSP should be involved in identifying innovations for JE, with the farmers taking the lead and considering the issues/questions that the innovator wants to address.
2. There is need to increase involvement of students in the PID process, as this will enhance sustainability.
3. The reports should aggregate how many women and men were involved in the PID process. This is key, as the project targets women.
4. Recognition of women innovators should be given by external bodies that are not part of the project in order to avoid conflict of interest.
5. What criteria are used to select innovation for JE? The criteria used to select the innovations for JE should be clear and understood by all partners.
6. Local Innovation Support Facilities (LISFs), which constitute a key element in the Proli-FaNS project proposal, are not being widely used to support LI and PID.
7. The reporting should focus on objectively verifiable indicators. This will facilitate effective monitoring of the project's outputs and outcomes.
8. Careful considerations should be taken when developing the JE design and analysis of the data so that the research can have reliable data and information that can make a good case to support policy influencing.
9. There is need to identify and work with several innovations and not focus on one innovation for several years. For example, the PID on determining the sex of chicken eggs in Ethiopia has been ongoing for several years.
10. The outcome of the PID process should be clearly documented.
11. Incorporation of gender issues should not be taken to imply that it is only referring to women. Gender refers to both sexes and the roles they play in the innovation process.
12. It is important to distinguish between documentation of innovations and documentation of the participatory processes. All aspects should be documented for purposes of supporting the scaling up and out of the innovations and of the innovation processes. The documentation should be at various levels and entail supporting the innovators to improve their innovations as well as getting people to adopt the innovations and the PID approach.
13. How can local innovators be recognised? The innovations may end up benefiting industries; is simply giving certificate to farmer innovators enough? If someone makes millions out of another person's innovation, then the innovator should benefit. Innovations should be viewed as intellectual property; this will protect the local innovators' rights. PROLINNOVA should find ways of protecting farmers' innovations through Intellectual Property Rights (IPR). However, not all innovations have what is required to be intellectual property and therefore it is important to have assistance in identifying innovations that qualify as intellectual property, e.g. consulting relevant government departments. In addition, Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) and other agreements can be made between companies (and other partners) and local innovators to ensure that farmers (innovators) benefit. Loren Cardeli stated that it is hard to track down the exact innovator or originator of the innovation. Furthermore, the differentiation of "commercial" is not valid, as any farmer

farming in any capacity for market is taking part in commercial activities. Therefore, use of PID that expands on knowledge frameworks and encourages a free flow of information is more conducive to igniting innovation potential. Discussions on protecting farmers' intellectual property should probe: How much do local IPR laws actually govern the areas in which we are working? What is the cost to patent farmer knowledge? However, documenting the innovation will lead to protecting it from being patented in future and will ensure it is in the public domain and other farmers can innovate and expand off the innovation, ultimately creating a greater impact.

14. Copyleft – the practice of offering people the right to freely share information with the stipulation that the same rights be preserved in derivative works down the line – is important and PROLINNOVA should continue to encourage it. But without documentation, it will be difficult to determine who came up with the innovation.
15. Points 10, 11 and 12 above were also key important aspects in documentation of LI and supporting the farmer-led documentation process. It was agreed that the documentation guidelines be reviewed to reflect the discussions above, i.e. emphasis on the LI process and not just the innovation; documenting as a way of recognising the innovators as the originators of the innovations; and documenting to facilitate participatory learning and development of the innovations. In addition, the documentation guidelines should also focus on obtaining relevant and valid data (through using appropriate tools) that can support policy influencing. Gender aspects should also be incorporated in documentation of i) local innovations and ii) the process of developing them.

### **2.3 Sharing PID experiences**

The CPs implementing the Proli-FaNS and Farmer-led Research Networks (FaReNe)<sup>2</sup> projects shared their experiences on their ongoing or completed PID cases. The cases presented were:

#### ***a. Burkina Faso: Use of micro-organisms to improve bio-fertilizer production***

Brief description of the innovation: Vegetable residue is mixed with millet, sorghum straw and leaves and specific quantities of sugar, honey, cattle milk and manure are added. Afterwards, micro-organisms, harvested from a specific tree, are added to accelerate the decomposition process. The mixture in liquid form is then poured into a non-transparent bottle and left for a month. Then the liquid fertilizer is ready for use for crop topdressing.

#### Research questions:

- i. Can the micro-organisms improve the quality of organic compost produced?
- ii. Can the micro-organisms on their own be used as fertilizer?
- iii. Could the micro-organisms help fight pests?
- iv. What would be the form of micro-organisms suited for use by the women in Niesege area?

#### ***b. Cameroon: Use of natron to reduce bitterness in cocoa***

Brief description of the innovation: Bitterness in cocoa leads to low consumption of cocoa products, especially chocolate. This bitterness is due to the presence of polyphenols (flavonoids: catechine and epicatechin) and theobromine in cocoa. A couple, Mr and Mrs Ekani Noah, is reducing this bitterness in cocoa using natron ( $\text{Na}_2\text{CO}_3, 10\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ), which can be obtained locally.

---

<sup>2</sup>The Farmer-led Research Networks (FaReNe) project is funded by the McKnight Foundation and implemented in Burkina Faso and Mali. FaReNe aims to establish a network to encourage farmers to engage in JE through a small fund provided to them.

### Research objectives:

- To determine how natron actson the bitter components of cocoa
- To find outthe proportion of natron required to effectively reduce the bitterness
- To find out the proportion of natron that can improve the nutritive value of chocolate.

The key partners involved in the experimentation are the University of Marouaproviding technical support, the University of Yaoundé supporting the laboratoryanalysis,and the farmer Ekani Noah.

### **c. Ghana: Use of “Tree Chief”to protect trees**

Brief description of the innovation:Indiscriminate cutting of trees affects the availability of tree products such as shea nuts, baobab fruits, *dawadawa* and firewood for women. The lead innovator is a 65-year-old farmer with great interest in growing and protecting trees in his farm and in the community. He isalso called the “Tree Chief”of the Kabre community. The Tree Chief leads in monitoring trees, ensuring no indiscriminate cutting and reporting culprits to the Community Chief for sanctions. The Tree Chief in collaboration with Forestry Commission grants approval for cutting or felling trees in the community.

The Tree Chief has powers and authority from the community and Paramount Chief, with support from theForestry Commission and the District Assembly, to caution anyone who faults government laws with regards to trees. The Tree Chief does his work with the assistance of youth volunteers, who help monitor trees and report inappropriate cases to him.

Thus, the innovation addresses two key challenges:

- i. Low involvement and interest of communities and traditional authorities to protect trees and support efforts of the District Assembly authorities and government institutions to protect and conserve trees
- ii. Lack of appropriate locally made by-laws and their enforcement by community.

### Objectives of the PID:

- To support the community in developingby-laws to govern and protect trees of economic value through enforcement by the Tree Chief
- To involve relevant stakeholders and institutions to support and recognise theTree Chief concept and its integration into the formal rules and laws
- To increase community involvement and support for the work of the Tree Chief.

### Outcomes of the PID:

- Clear by-laws developed to guide the operations of the Tree Chief
- Increased community respect for the authority of the Tree Chief
- Recognition of the Tree Chiefby local authorities: District Assembly, Paramount Chief, Forestry Commission and Department of Agriculture
- Tree Chief provided with a bicycle for effective monitoring, giving support in educating community members and identifying youth volunteers to help him
- Women empowered to report cases of indiscriminate cutting of trees (previously, women were culturally barred from reporting such cases).

### **d. Kenya: Hanging gardens**

Brief description of the innovation: The innovation entails growing vegetables in containers that are hungon the roofs or trees or other modified structures.This is to protect the vegetables from pests such as livestock, chickens and ants. The innovation is efficient in use of water, as water losses are minimised.

Research questions: The innovator seeks to know:

- i. How does productivity (yield) compare with the normal open-field garden?
- ii. How do labour intensity and other production factors compare with the open-field garden?
- iii. How does the botanical maturity span in the hanging garden compare with that in the open-field garden?

**e. Mali: Intercropping peanut with sorghum**

Brief description of the innovation: The innovation is by a group called Benkadi, consisting of 60 members, 56 being women. The innovation is intercropping peanut and sorghum.

Objectives:

- i. To assess grain and sorghum straw suitable for intercropping
- ii. To assess the production of peanuts in the intercropping system
- iii. To assess the profitability using the intercropping system.

Outcomes:

- i. The yields of sorghum were low because of waterlogging and because the women did not apply the right quantity of manure required for favourable plant growth
- ii. The sorghum–peanut intercropping system provided better results in terms of yields, increasing by 46% and 42% for sorghum and peanut, respectively.

**Discussion on the PID experiences**

Several gaps were identified and the participants were in consensus that the PID process should take the following questions into consideration:

1. To what extent is there an impact on food and nutrition security?
2. To what extent are these processes driven by women?
3. To what extent has the knowledge from outsiders contributed to the local innovations?
4. What is the process that farmers (local innovators) use to come up with the research questions? How were the questions from women different from those of men, and how did they decide which were of priority?
5. What issues go into the PID? Who makes the decisions: the farmers (local innovators) or other stakeholders?
6. Which stakeholders should be included in the PID? How are they identified? What is the contribution of external actors in strengthening the PID process? What tools are used to involve stakeholders and to share the results of the PID?
7. What data-collection tools are used and what is the experience in using the tools? Tools used by the researchers to collect the data should also be included in the documentation.
8. What tools were used by the farmers to document the PID process?
9. Is there a control? What is the control? The control should be clearly identified for comparisons to be made.
10. Should there be clear differentiation between joint experimentation and joint innovation?
11. If a Local Innovation Support Facility (LISF) grant is given, the process used to issue this grant and undertake the JE should be well documented.

## Day 2: 23 May 2018

### Morning session: Chair – Djibril Thiam

#### 2.4 Integrating gender into PID

CheshaWettasinha (IST) shared guidelines for gender-responsive farmer-led innovation and research developed by herself and a colleague at KIT (see Appendix5). The guidelines are still work in progress and will be refined further. Gender issues should be integrated right from the identification and documentation of the innovation through to the design and conducting of the experimentation. Chesha said that case studies suggest that few people had undergone gender training and there are limited data on how gender affects local innovation development and how an innovation affects both women and men.

To support the understanding and recognition of ways to integrate gender in LI development processes, participants discussed in two groups focusing on two innovations: the Kenyan case of hanging gardens and the Mali case of using a local solution<sup>3</sup>(*potokolonimbo*; *Physalis minima*) to control tomato pests. The groups discussed:

- i. What were the gender aspects addressed?
- ii. What should /could have been looked at with respect to gender issues?

#### **Group 1: Hanging garden**

##### What were the gender aspects addressed?

- i. Agriculture is considered a women's affair and is therefore dominated by women.
- ii. The innovation is by a man, though cultivation of vegetables within households is mainly done by women.

##### What should /could have been looked at with respect to gender issues?

- i. Gender division of labour; defined roles for men and women in the PID process.
- ii. The reasons why a man came up with an innovation considered to be in the domain of women. To what extent was the wife involved in developing the innovation?
- iii. To what extent were men and women involved in developing and designing the JE?
- iv. To what extent are women (and men) adopting or adapting the innovation?
- v. Who determines the vegetables to be cultivated? Who owns the harvests?
- vi. Who makes decision on the use of income/extra yields produced (or any other benefits) as a result of the innovation?
- vii. Who waters the gardens? Who fetches the water?
- viii. How can the youth be involved in adapting the innovation?
- ix. How does dissemination of information target women (and men)?
- x. What are the women's (and men's) perceptions about the innovation? Is it assisting them and, if so, how?
- xi. Is the issue the innovator addresses in the JE a priority for both men and women?
- xii. How does the design of the experimentation affect the two sexes? e.g. where to hang the bucket? who hangs the bucket?
- xiii. What are the roles of men and women in the experimentation?

---

<sup>3</sup>The innovation is by Diarra Aminata Dembele, who made a pesticide from a local plant *potokolonimbo* (*Physalis minima*) to control tomato pests. She pounded the plant and mixed it with water. She then sieved the mixture to remove plant fragments. She sprays the liquid on the tomato plants.

- xiv. Do what extent do members of the MSP understand gender issues?
- xv. Who have adopted or adapted the innovation? How many men and women? What are the different reasons for men and women to adopt or adapt the innovation?

### **Group 2: Local tomato pesticide**

#### What were the gender aspects addressed?

- Both men and women were involved in conducting the PID.
- Screening of the innovations was done by a group with six members, two being women.
- During a general assembly to discuss innovations, both men and women were involved.
- It started with 8 people involved in the experiment (7 women and 1 man); however, the man dropped out during the second phase of the experiment.
- Men have been adopting the innovation.

#### What should/could have been looked at with respect to gender issues?

- The level of interaction between men and women during the PID process.
- In the first trial, there was 1 man and 7 women; in the second trial, no man was involved. There is need to understand why the man withdrew from the experiment.
- What is the role of young men in the PID?
- Why are men adopting the innovation more than women are?

### **Afternoon session: Chair – Joshua Zake**

#### **2.5 Monitoring and Evaluation framework**

Joe and Chesha led this session. They stated that M&E not only shows commitment to the donor but also helps in identifying gaps that, when addressed, will support the achievement of objectives. In addition, a good M&E system will aid in effective and efficient planning of project activities. Joe then made a presentation on the topic covering the following areas.

#### **Reporting requirements by ACDEP and Misereor**

- i. Brief quarterly progress report on activities and outputs based on the key project thematic areas: farmer-led research, advocacy, documentation, M&E etc (2–4 pp)
- ii. Detailed annual (12-month) report focused on achievement of project activities (10–15 pp)
- iii. Final narrative report at the end of the project with an M&E section (2–3 pp)

The project has developed measures to ensure good reporting by:

- i. Sharing reporting templates (some developed by the donor)
- ii. Developing quarterly and annual progress reporting guidelines
- iii. Sharing final reports to all CPs and relevant partners by email
- iv. Requesting for feedback from CPs during compilation of reports
- v. Availability of focal M&E persons in CPs to provide support in compiling data and information

#### **Identified gaps in reporting**

- i. Detailed description given of activities implemented, but clear project outputs not provided
- ii. No reference to the project indicators and targets; also, the activity plans are not taking into account the M&E indicators
- iii. Not reporting on the progress of activities from start to completion; there is no continuation or update of activities highlighted in previous reports
- iv. No gender equality and gender-disaggregated output

- v. Activity plans are not reflecting a strong focus on women as required by the project
- vi. Repetition of some activities and achievements in subsequent reports
- vii. Reports not based on M&E data; hence, inconsistency in figures being reported
- viii. Delay in reporting, which leads to delays in disbursing funds and implementing activities.

### **Way forward**

#### **a. What are the challenges CPs face in reporting?**

- i. The steering committees and implementing partners are not keen on M&E, and some reports are compiled in a hurry to beat deadlines.
- ii. The Burkina Fasoteam stated that they lack an M&E budget. It was explained that they are to include the M&E budget in their budgeting and planning.
- iii. Some of the project sites are very far; hence, the need to hire staff to conduct M&E.
- iv. The implementation and reporting time is short.

#### **b. How do we improve quarterly and annual reporting?**

- i. The CPs should re-align implementation actions with the M&E framework.
- ii. The M&E focal persons should meet and discuss the M&E structure and share experiences.
- iii. The CPs should make use of the reporting and M&E guidelines especially for data collection; this will make it easier and quicker to submit the final report.
- iv. Incorporate the data-collection process as part of other activities to be done and not regard it as an independent activity. It is expensive when it is done independently.
- v. If possible, the reporting period should be changed to six months (two quarters) instead of three months.

## **2.6 Priority focus and activities in the final year (Year 3)**

This session was done in three groups: two anglophone groups and one francophone group. The plenary presentations highlighted the following points:

- i. Participatory Innovation Development:
  - The CPs to increase the number of PID cases to enable the project to realise its target.
  - Involve students from institutions of higher learning in the joint experiments.
  - Few CPs are following the LISF process in identifying local innovations and in the PID process.
- ii. Documentation: Preparation of an inventory of LI and PID cases documented and not documented in order to measure progress.
- iii. Report writing: Reports should be prepared in good time and submitted on time.
- iv. Recognition of women: Enhance the recognition of women by involving them in agricultural/farmer fairs or events organised by the government and/or other stakeholders; involve them in radio shows; and facilitate local authorities to award them with certificates or other awards, as part of the policy-dialogue activities.
- v. Policy dialogue: Map the various policymakers/influencers to have an inventory of whom to address with respect to policy issues.
- vi. M&E:
  - Improve M&E and focus on reporting on the project indicators; the M&E system needs to be strengthened and the M&E guidelines adhered to.
  - Build the capacity of implementing partners and innovators in data collection and recording and, where possible, involve students in data collection.

- The CPs’ focal M&E persons should take their role more seriously.
- vii. Fundraising:
  - Take advantage of the regionalisation process and develop multi-country proposals for funding.
  - Utilise the available local funding opportunities in the CPs.
- viii. The CPs to take advantage of external support such as backstopping and capacity building by the IST and ACDEP.

## **2.7 Key focus areas to be addressed, should there be another phase of the project**

The participants brainstormed in small groups of three persons each, capturing their points on cards. The cards were then grouped on the wall according to similarity of ideas and themes:

- i. Consolidate achievements with respect to integrating gender in PID
- ii. Strengthen the documentation of LI and PID
- iii. Strengthen policy dialogue focusing on the links between nutrition and agriculture
- iv. Strengthen policy influencing and advocacy with respect to PID
- v. Support the validation of local innovations
- vi. Strengthen the use of LISF to identify innovations and PID
- vii. Scale out to other countries currently not involved in the project and also within the current project countries
- viii. Network at national, sub-national and international levels to promote LI and PID
- ix. Build capacity of PROLINNOVA platforms to support regionalisation process
- x. Incorporate climate change resilience and adaptation into food and nutrition security
- xi. Support the commercialisation of promising innovations
- xii. Include ethno-vet innovations – broaden innovation beyond cropping.

The participants decided that a small team made up of Ann, Chesha, Georges, Amanuel and Zacharia Malley would develop a concept note on the ideas and issues presented and share the draft with the wider group for feedback and inputs.

## **2.6 Library for Food Sovereignty**

Loren Cardeli and Ruth Nabagalla gave a brief presentation of the Library for Food Sovereignty (LFS), which is hosted by the Participatory Ecological Land Use Management (PELUM) Association in Uganda. Its aim is to create a digital space for communities to exchange, build upon and celebrate the knowledge and stories of the world’s farmers. The LFS concept is community-led and community-governed. The LFS is a meeting point for agroecology movements that believe in the untapped potential of grassroots knowledge and participatory development.

Through the library, farmers will be able to post their innovations and anyone in the world will be able to see the innovations through the LFS website. This will amplify the work done in the field as well as open up channels for collaboration and funding.

The goals of the LFS are to:

- i. Support farmer-to-farmer knowledge exchange
- ii. Promote community-based and participatory development programmes
- iii. Identify opportunities for PID training
- iv. Reduce the barriers between communities and development workers
- v. Align big world problems with local realities



- vi. Revolutionise the way we create and improve knowledge
- vii. Strengthen knowledge systems by incorporating local knowledge
- viii. Illustrate the interconnectedness of agricultural systems.

PELUMUganda, the host/content manager of the LFS, will manage digital content (organise the library, review and edit content, ensure efficient flow, translation etc); support partners in generating content for the LFS; assist partner organisations in developing proposals for documentation projects; and be the focal point for inquiries around the LFS.

The website will be officially launched on 1 June 2018. From 2–8 June, feedback from partners will be received and from 8–15 June necessary changes will be made. Between 15 June and 17 August, the LFS Community will review the website, receive feedback and share this with Intelligent Technologies, which is developing the website. Between 17 August and 7 September, changes will be made based on the feedback and on 7 September the final LFS will be released.

### **Day 3: 24 May 2018**

#### **Early morning session: Chair – Chris Macoloo**

### **3.0 REGIONALISATION PROCESS**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

Chris Macoloo gave some opening remarks, stating that the CPs in Africa have started the process of regionalisation supported through the Proli-FaNS project. He explained the role of the POG and its current membership. Ann, Chris, Djibril and Juergen Anthofer were supposed to step down in May 2018 but the others in the POG would like them to stay on until the IPW in 2019 in order to maintain continuity for supporting the regionalisation process. The workshop participants supported this suggestion.

The two SRCs then gave brief presentations on the regionalisation progress and the achievements so far in their respective sub-regions.

#### **3.2 Overview of regionalisation process**

##### **3.2.1 West & Central Africa sub-region report by Georges Djohy**

###### Duties and responsibilities of SRC:

- i. Facilitate the process of building a sub-regional platform
- ii. Compile information and report on regionalisation progress
- iii. Map the status of the CPs with respect to their activities and operations
- iv. Provide technical backstopping to CPs
- v. Provide a hub for capacity building and stimulate mutual learning
- vi. Formulate and implement sub-regional strategies
- vii. Facilitate networking and cross-learning within sub-region, with other African sub-region (Eastern & Southern Africa) and other PROLINNOVA regional platforms.

###### Achievements:

- i. Supported policy dialogue through participation in 5 national, regional and international meetings/training events
- ii. Publication of 6 blogs and sharing them on the website and social media (Twitter, Facebook)

- iii. Documentation: developing and translating documents (joint documentation with the IST and ACDEP) and sharing about 20 documents
- iv. M&E: through email, Skype and phone, gave technical support to improve M&E processes
- v. Facilitated South–South backstopping and fundraising.

Challenges and way forward:

- i. Poor motivation and many dynamics in emerging CPs
- ii. Improve on time management and prioritisation of activities
- iii. Changing of the main contact person in Mali.

**3.2.2 Eastern and Southern Africa sub-region report by Amanuel Assefa**

Achievements:

- i. Backstopping visits to CPs in Tanzania, Sudan and Mozambique that led to their reactivation
- ii. Extensive time spent to prepare project proposals for funding; although funds are not yet secured, the effort is commendable
- iii. Supported the improved governance of CPs by contributing to guidelines, drafting the sub-regional charter and improving the management of the Ethiopian CP.

Challenges:

- i. Unable to win funding competitions
- ii. Unable to build tangible networks with regional forums
- iii. Poor interaction and communication with members; the taskforce seems not to be functional.

Key lessons:

- i. Eastern and Southern Africa PROLINNOVA Platform (ESAPP) needs to make more efforts to mobilise resources; because of inadequate funding, CPs' participation in ESAPP is limited.
- ii. The sub-regional taskforce is inactive, not taking the lead, and strategic actions need to be taken to make it active and functional.
- iii. An institution to host ESAPP needs to be considered. Donors might be less interested to support a network without a known host.
- iv. More systematic engagement with CPs is needed to enhance sharing of information and knowledge.
- v. More efforts are needed to encourage CPs to develop articles and stories and to take part in conferences and workshops.

Challenges and way forward:

- i. The sub-regional taskforce has done little and needs to be revitalised. Chris, who facilitated the process of forming the taskforce, will guide the process of revitalising it.
- ii. It is very important that the CPs identify opportunities for multi-country funding and come together to develop proposals, as the CPs have not reached their target of raising €50,000 per year – one of the key outputs of the Proli-FaNS project.
- iii. CPs should support each other, those with more experience and capacity supporting new/weak CPs.

**Mid-morning session: Chair – Djibril Thiam**

**3.3 Review and amendments of the sub-regional charters**

The SRCs gave highlights of the draft charters of the two sub-regions. Participants then formed sub-regional groups to review the respective draft charters and make comments and improvements to

them. This was followed by a plenary discussion on the results of the groupwork and general comments on the way forward. It was suggested that the charters for each sub-region should have a similar structure, with adaptations for specificities of each sub-region. As PROLINNOVA is a movement, the sub-regions should not have fundamentally different sub-regional guidelines. The following were recommended:

- i. The charter should use a less formal format, i.e. decrease the use of legal terms.
- ii. Change the names of the sub-regions, clearly stating that they are sub-regional platforms of the PROLINNOVA international network.
- iii. The operational language to be used in Eastern & Southern Africa is English and in West & Central Africa both English and French.
- iv. The sub-regions should focus on countries within their respective sub-regions. Other regions such as North Africa can be incorporated later, if people in these countries show interest.
- v. Members of the sub-regional platforms should not be individuals but CPs. Individuals can be involved through the Yahoo group and other means such as having "Friends of PROLINNOVA" in the sub-regions.
- vi. Guidelines are to be developed on how to operationalise the sub-regional management and oversight groups, and clear roles and responsibilities of the different structures are to be defined.
- vii. Where there are similar structures in both the PROLINNOVA international network and sub-regional structures, their respective roles and functions should be clearly differentiated.
- viii. Multiple strategies are to be developed to mobilise funds for the sub-regional secretariats.
- ix. A detailed plan is to be outlined on how PROLINNOVA–Africa will be setup.
- x. Conflicts are to be resolved at sub-regional level; the POG is to be involved only when no solution can be reached at sub-regional level.
- xi. The management structure at the sub-regional level should include at least 3 representatives of CPs, 1 person from research and 2 representatives of farmers (1 man and 1 woman).

The two SRCs were tasked to integrate the proposed changes.

## **Afternoon session: Chair – Makonge Righa**

### **3.4 Regionalisation roadmap**

- a. Communication/documentation: Strategies proposed were to develop policy briefs, working papers, catalogues and to post documents on PROLINNOVA and LSF websites and social media.
- b. Strengthening the sub-regional taskforces: The sub-regional taskforces are to be revitalised; the CPs are to identify suitable representatives to facilitate rejuvenation of the taskforces.
- c. Advocacy: To target organisations such as FARA, RUFORUM, GFRAS and PAEPARD; key issues to include are food sovereignty/rights, seed security/rights/management systems; contribution of farmer innovation to resilience; recognition of farmer innovation and PID; and contribution of farmer innovation to food and nutrition security and NRM.
- d. Networking: The sub-regions are to intensify networking, specifically:
  - *West and Central Africa*: Networks to be approached include AgriProFocus, Alliance contre la Faim et la Malnutrition (Alliance Against Hunger and Malnutrition), FARA, ROPPA, COPAGEN, and AFRONET
  - *Eastern and Southern Africa*: Proposed networks to be approached (see Table 6).

**Table 6: Networks to approach in Eastern and Southern Africa**

Organisation	Person(s) to followup
AFAAS (African Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services)	Brigid Letty
Collaborative Crop Research Program (CCRP) – McKnight	Brigid Letty
Eastern and Southern Africa Farmers’ Forum (ESAFF)	Zacharia Malley
Regional Universities Forum for Capacity Building in Agriculture (RUFORUM)	Joshua Zake
Biovision Africa	Chris Macoloo

e. **Fundraising:** Repackage unsuccessful proposals and build existing connections for fundraising. Also, there is need to enhance PROLINNOVA image and visibility; the LSF provides a good opportunity for this. Another opportunity is the International Decade of Family Farming that offers opportunities to support farmer-led research. **A fundraising team was proposed composed of Brigid, Joshua, Loren, Georges, Amanuel, Zacharia, Mawahib and Djibril.** Potential donors to approach include:

- *Eastern & Southern Africa:* Mo Ibrahim, European Union (EU) calls, African Union (AU) calls, IGAD, Global Innovation Fund, SDC (Switzerland), McKnight Foundation, USAID, IFAD, IDRC, Allan Gray and Ford Foundation.
- *West & Central Africa:* CEDEAO, UEMOA/CEMAC, GIZ, FAO, JICA, SDC, UNDP, CORAF/WECARD and SIDA.

### Key regionalisation activities to undertake

The following activities were identified to be undertaken in the short, medium and long term.

**Table 7: Key activities in the regionalisation process**

Short term (< 3 months)	Medium term (3–6 months)	Long term (within 1 year)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finalise sub-regional charters</li> <li>• Reformulate sub-regional taskforces</li> <li>• Contact LSF and establish formal working relationship</li> <li>• Set regionalisation objectives</li> <li>• Set up fundraising team</li> <li>• Develop proposals for funding</li> <li>• Strengthen links between CPs, ACDEP &amp; PROLINNOVA International Secretariat</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mobilise resources</li> <li>• Engage in networking</li> <li>• Identify suitable organisations to host sub-regional secretariats</li> <li>• Develop a taskforce to draft and finalise sub-regional charters</li> <li>• Strengthen fundraising mechanisms</li> <li>• Strengthen documentation and information sharing within the sub-regions</li> <li>• Strengthen membership of CPs and sub-regional platform</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operationalisation of sub-regional platforms</li> <li>• Set up sub-regional oversight groups</li> <li>• Develop African regional structures, especially the taskforce</li> <li>• Convene a regional meeting</li> <li>• Strengthen the secretariat and the SRCs</li> </ul>

### Summary of the regionalisation process – key action points

**Table 8: Key action points for the regionalisation process**

No.	Activity/output	Who?	By when?
1	Harmonisation of sub-regional charters’ format	SRCs (Amanuel & Georges)	30 June 2018
2	Finalise sub-regional charters	SRCs (Amanuel & Georges)	31 August 2018
3	Reconstitute sub-regional taskforces (broken down into four steps below)	Chris & Djibril	

	<i>i.</i> CPs submit names of representatives to sub-regional taskforce (Tanzania by 8 June; Sudan by 30 June; Ethiopia by 8 June)	Chris & Djibril and respective CPs	30 June 2018
	<i>ii.</i> New members incorporated into the sub-regional taskforces	Chris & Djibril	13 July 2018
	<i>iii.</i> Chairs of each sub-regional taskforce elected	Chris & Djibril	31 July 2018
	<i>iv.</i> Submission of 2 names from each sub-regional taskforce for the regional taskforce	Chairpersons of sub-regional taskforces; SRCs (Amanuel & Georges)	17 August 2018
4	Share guidelines for selecting host organisation for CP, to be used by CPs to select host organisations for sub-regional platforms	SRCs (Amanuel & Georges)	31 May 2018
5	Identify sub-regional hosts	SRCs (Amanuel & Georges); chairs of sub-regional taskforces	31 January 2019
6	Mobilise resources	SRCs (Amanuel & Georges); CPs	continuous
7	Set up fundraising team (proposed names: Brigid, Joshua, Loren; Team leaders: Georges & Amanuel)	Chesha	30 June 2018
8	Revise and share PID documentation guidelines	Brigid & Ann	15 June 2018

#### 4.0 CLOSING SESSION

Righthanked all participants for taking time to participate in the three-day meeting. He put emphasis on having the agreedaction pointsto be followed up byconcrete actions.

Joe Nchorthanked WN for hosting the meeting and gave special thanksto Georges for translating throughout the entire meeting.

Joe Ouko said the closing prayer.

## Appendixes

### Appendix 1: List of participants

No.	Name	Organisation	Country
1	Siaka Bangali	Diobass	Burkina Faso
2	Jean Bosco Etoa	COSADER	Cameroon
3	(Ms) Beza Kifle	Best Practice Association (BPA)	Ethiopia
4	Joseph Nchor	ACDEP	Ghana
5	Amanuel Assefa	Eastern & Southern Africa sub-region	Ethiopia
6	Georges Djohy	West & Central Africa sub-region	Benin
7	(Ms) Chesha Wettasinha	IST/KIT	Netherlands
8	(Ms) Ann Waters-Bayer	IST/KIT	Germany
9	Chris Macoloo	World Neighbors	Kenya
10	Vincent Mariadho	PROLINNOVA–Kenya	Kenya
11	Makonge Righa	World Neighbors	Kenya
12	Geoffrey Kamau	Kenya Agricultural and Livestock Research Organization (KALRO)	Kenya
13	(Ms) Elske van de Fliert	University of Queensland	Australia
14	Dominic Avea Aniah	Navrongo-Bolgatanga Catholic Diocese Development Office (NABOCADO)	Ghana
15	Djibril Thiam	Agrecol–Afrique	Senegal
16	Joe Ouko	Farmer-led Innovators Association (FALIA)–Kenya	Kenya
17	Souleymane Diarra	Association des Organisations Professionnelles Paysannes (AOPP)	Mali
18	Samba Traore	Institut d'Économie Rurale (IER).	Mali
19	Bourama Diakite	ADAF-Gallè	Mali
20	Zacharia Malley	Selian Agricultural Research Institute	Tanzania
21	Joshua Zake	Environmental Alert	Uganda
22	(Ms) Mawahib Eltayeb Ahmed	National Centre for Research	Sudan
23	(Ms) Brigid Letty	Institute of Natural Resources	South Africa
24	Owegi Hannington	INADES Formation	Kenya
25	Do Christophe Ouattara	World Neighbors	Burkina Faso
26	Loren Cardeli	A Growing Culture	USA
27	(Ms) Ruth Nabagalla	A Growing Culture	Kenya

## Appendix 2: Agenda

Day 1: Tuesday, 22 May 2018			
Time	Activities	Presenters	Moderators
8:30–9.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Brief welcome by Host Country Coordinator</li> <li>– Opening remarks by POG Co-chair</li> <li>– Overview of the objectives of the 3-day meeting</li> <li>– Self-introduction of participants and invited guests</li> <li>– Information on logistics</li> </ul>	Righa Chris Macoloo Joe/SRCs  Vincent	Amanuel
9:00–9.20	<b>Overview report on Proli-FaNS</b> status, key achievements, lessons so far, by project coordinator; questions	Joe Nchor	“
9.20–10.00	<b>Proli-FaNS country reports</b> on achievement of project activities, targets and objectives: <i>Burkina Faso, Cameroon</i> – Questions and brief comments	Siaka, Etoa	“
10.00–10.30	Coffee / health break		
10.30–11.30	<b>Proli-FaNS country reports</b> on achievement of project activities, targets and objectives: <i>Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya</i> – Questions and brief comments	Hailu, Joe, Righa/Vincent	“
11.30–13.00	<b>General discussion on the reports focusing on:</b> – Progress of overall project implementation and achievements of targets and objectives – Key challenges faced and proposed solutions or actions	All	“
13.00–14.30	Lunch break		
14.30–16.30	<b>Sharing experiences on PID processes and outcomes</b> – Presentation of ongoing or completed Proli-FaNS PID cases – Presentation of <i>FaReNe</i> 's experience with supporting farmer groups and LISFs for local innovation and experimentation – Sharing experiences of other CPs to improve PID process in Proli-FaNS and other projects – Questions and discussion on the presentations	Proli-FaNS CPs FaReNe proj rep  Other CPs All	“
16:30–17.30	<b>Documentation of PID processes:</b> – Presentation on the principles, key steps and relevance of documenting the PID process – Discussions and sharing of experiences with PID process documentation	Brigid Letty/ Ann Waters	“
17.30–18.00	<b>Summary of Day 1 proceedings and outcomes</b> <b>Closure of Day 1</b> Logistical announcements	Day 1 afternoon moderator Vincent	“
Day 2: Wednesday, 23 May 2018			
Time	Activities	Presenters	Moderators
8:30–9.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Recap of Day 1, addressing emerging issues</li> <li>– Review of Day 2 agenda</li> <li>– Logistical issues</li> </ul>	Day 2 moderator Vincent	Djibril
9:00–9.15	<b>Integrating gender into PID activities</b> to address inequalities and enhance women's conditions under Proli-FaNS and other projects – Presentation and elaboration of the IST-KIT guideline on gender and PID	Chesha and Ann	“
9.15–10.00	<b>Group exercises</b> on how to ensure greater gender integration in ongoing projects under Prolinnova (3–4 groups including 1 francophone group)	Group leaders	“
10.00–10.30	Coffee / health break		

10.30–12.00	– <b>Plenary presentations</b> and discussion on group work on gender and PID – Sharing of experiences and way forward for Proli-FaNS		“
12.00–13.00	<b>Project management with the M&amp;E framework</b> – Review of the Proli-FaNS M&E framework and gaps in current project reporting – Sharing of CPs’ M&E systems for collecting data and tracking progress on indicators and targets, including challenges and lessons in working with the project M&E framework	Joe / Chesha Proli-FaNS CPs	«
13.00–14.30	Lunch break		
14.30–15.00	– General discussions on how to improve project monitoring, data collection, tracking progress and reporting based on the M&E framework	All	“
15:00–16:30	<b>Prioritising project focus and activities for final year (Yr 3)</b> – Group work to identify weak and underachieved areas of project and suggest strategies and activities to undertake: action plan	Ann / Chris / Joe / Chesha	“
16.30–17.00	Plenary presentations and discussions on way forward for final year		
17.00–17.15	Identifying key focus areas for proposal development for a possible project extension or new phase – brainstorming	Ann / Chesha/ SRCs	“
17:15–17.30	<b>Summary and conclusions of Days 1 &amp; 2</b> <b>Closure of Day 2</b>	Joe	
<b>Day 3: Thursday 24 May 2018</b>			
<b>Time</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Presentation</b>	<b>Facilitation</b>
8:30–8:45	Overview on regionalisation of PROLINNOVA( <i>background, objectives and other relevant information</i> )	POG	Chris
8:45–9:00	Brief overview, key achievements, challenges and lessons on regionalisation process in West & Central Africa	Georges Djohy	Chris
9:00–9:15	Brief overview, key achievements, challenges and lessons on regionalisation process in Eastern & Southern Africa	Amanuel Assefa	Chris
9:15-10:00	Plenary: Questions and debates based on presentations of the SRCs		Chris
<b>10:00–10:30</b>	<b>Coffee break</b>		
10:30–11:00	Presentation on draft sub-regional charters	Georges & Amanuel	Djibril/anyone from WCA
11:00–12:00	WGs: Review and amendment of charters of the sub-regional platforms	Georges & Amanuel	Djibril/anyone from WCA
12:00–13:00	Plenary: Feedback from WGs, discussion and agreement on next steps toward a regional platform	WG leaders	Georges & Amanuel
<b>13:00–14:30</b>	<b>Lunch break</b>		
14:30–15:45	Working groups (WGs): Networking, advocacy and fundraising at sub-regional level	Georges/Amanuel	Righa
15:45–16:30	Reports from WGs: Presentation and discussion	WG leaders	Righa
<b>16:30–16:45</b>	<b>Coffee break</b>		
16:45–17:00	Roadmap towards setting up PROLINNOVA–Africa	Georges/Amanuel	Righa
17:00–17:15	Concluding remarks & words of farewell		Righa



### **Appendix 3: PowerPoint presentations by CPs**

<https://www.dropbox.com/sh/ujy68lfty7y7sa8/AAA4EAsfvY2uikopv1f8P4n7a?dl=0>

### **Appendix 4: Guidelines for monitoring and evaluation**

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/nig16mpfge2trrm/Guidelines%20on%20monitoring%20and%20evaluation%20for%20ProliFaNS%20version%20May%202017.docx?dl=0>

### **Appendix 5: Guidelines for gender-responsive farmer-led innovation and research**

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/85s6xyy6mz3zyqg/Guidelines%20for%20gender%20responsive%20farmer-led%20innovation%20and%20research%2020122017.pdf?dl=0>

### **Appendix 6: Draft sub-regional charters**

[https://www.dropbox.com/sh/av9h44yde2a5vk0/AABY\\_aLt7l0i3sGrzAhXMYGga?dl=0](https://www.dropbox.com/sh/av9h44yde2a5vk0/AABY_aLt7l0i3sGrzAhXMYGga?dl=0)