

2012 PROLINNOVA E-Evaluation

Consolidated DRAFT AS OF FEBRUARY 14, 2013, AM

1. Governance	
Reasons for assessment	Suggestions/Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The POG had a very productive annual meeting in Mali in March 2012. The fact that thus overall governance of Prolinnova can be maintained in spite of limited funding is in itself very positive. Unfortunately there has been little time for interaction between POG and the secretariat after the meeting, the secretariat has not been able to “use” the POG as much in between as before, though it gave some guidance on new elections for the POG and a seat for farmer organizations. Lack of budget for time to facilitate the POG consultation process prevents the secretariat to be pro-active in linking with and generating views from the POG. Some basic information sharing to the POG on key developments continues. No score on 2 and 3 as the secretariat is not in the position to assess this, given its own role There has been less overall Prolinnova strategy development this year. Focussed “joint” planning processes took place around specific opportunities such as for CCAFS and RF. Inputs from CPs varied depending on own initiative to be involved. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secretariat to continue its efforts to mobilise at least minimum funding for basic network performance and governance activities, such as through GFAR, as project-based funds cannot cover this.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This has been the first year of India Country platform; the answers may reflect our own ignorance. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The lack of fund through project base funding and other funds, has limited to join in some regular events, could play significant roles in policy influences. The information flow also very limited in both directions (horizontal and vertical) because of limited funding. Despite this fact, the efforts and initiatives taken from ETC and others are encouraging. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The efforts and initiatives taken at International level, now squeezed by the fund, should increased and bring alternative funding mechanism to sustain country program at least viable level or more. In this context, ETC/or PROLINNOVA Oversight Group (POG) should organize the web based in regular basis on fund raising.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PROLINNOVA Cameroon participated on the fixation of the IFI day date. But, we do not attempt international meetings and received no fund. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> After the organization of the PID training, we lack resources and we do not receive any training proposal for the follow up. The suggestion is to increase the support for new countries which lack experience.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prolinnova oversight group hold an annual meeting in March 2012 and recommendation were shared in the network Prolinnova secretariat has good opportunity for decision making, often the Uganda Secretariat has 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prolinnova as network needs to intensify in resource mobilization. CP networks are supported to develop more regional proposals. Regional proposals stand more chances for funding than specific country proposals

<p>been consulted in decision making</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secretariat has been transparent in management of funds, budgets have been shared, funds are disbursed as agreed • Joint planning has been minimal 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Prolinnova network, including the POG, has been fairly quiet during 2012 except for feedback regarding the election of new members. • Decision-making opportunities mainly exist for those people who attend the IPW or are members of the POG. • Management of funds is generally efficient but only while in the POG, does one have a direct insight into management and spending of funds. • This is one opportunity for M&E but on the whole this year has seen Prolinnova very inactive in SA and thus not participating in joint development and planning – except for those who attended the IPW. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall I think that the lack of activity at a country level, which transpired when funds were no longer available to cover the coordinator's costs as well as provincial activities, has led to very little interaction with the secretariat or the POG.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The participation of the CP in the governance through the POG 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involve the participation of the farmers organisations in the governance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the CLICK-SR and LINEX projects there are lots of instances when partners meet and discuss and agree on strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have to find funds for POG attendance to meetings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Received information about funding, meeting reports opportunities for training and others 	

2. Learning, sharing of information among partners and country programmes

Reasons for this assessment	Suggestions/recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct country-to-country exchange seems to be limited to what happens during the IPW, at least as far as is known at the level of the secretariat. • Considerable sharing of info is happening through Yahoo and the website in spite of the fact that again no direct funds are available to facilitate this work. Unfortunately, the IST is doing a very large part of this, though several CPs are finding their way to use Yahoo and the website directly (e.g. some of the newer CPs). • IPW 2012 worked very well, very good discussions, also attention for regional initiatives and fund raising. Positive also that quite a few participants attended using own resources. • Cross visits did not happen as far as we know. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IST continues to encourage direct sharing between CPs. The recently developed regional programmes should provide opportunities and reasons for this.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience of one year. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved annual planning and commitment for sharing including cross country visits. More opportunity for people from country platforms to participate in international workshops and meetings and develop expertise in their areas of interest with sharing and guidance for group members.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of activities inter country and intra country was limited with the budget availability. The information sharing through web base was found effective but limited use because the information important only can be used to the work person involved. Many of person involved in the network in the past are in the job other than local innovation and participatory innovation development. To capitalize the essence of local innovation and PID, at least should have unrestricted fund, at level people realize the importance in different perspectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • POG or ETC should communicate with each CP and document their involvement and develop some strategies to integrate and mainstream on their current involvement. POG or ETC should pro active and take facilitation role in general as in past, when there was fund for each CP through PROLINNOVA International.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As we said, we do not attempt international meetings this year and we don't a partnership with a specific country. At the national level we have been involved in visits to Baka pygmies, and these help us to organise the IFI day. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need trainings to improve our performance.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information has been shared Direct country to country, especially if you request for the information • The international secretariat has done a good job through the yahoo group. Information has been shared • During the IPW, learning and sharing of information was good. Participants' interaction and discussions were good. New ideas for funding were 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct sharing of information be encouraged and continued. • Cross- country visits be encouraged

<p>generated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No visits were organised for Uganda and with Uganda due to lack of resources 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No country-to-country level sharing took place outside of the IPW and outside of the JOLISAA project which has allowed some sharing between Kenya and SA but not directly related to Prolinnova The website and yahoo group still provide interesting group. I had feedback from two sources that have made use of resources on the website when developing their organisations' programmes and activities which highlights that it is important to keep them updated. IPW is always useful – but often not for those who do not attend. No cross-country visits took place directly related to Prolinnova (only related to Jolisaa). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep the website updated and keep the yahoo group going as they allow for at least a minimum amount of sharing and learning. Face-to-face activities are always better but require substantial resources.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The language of the network (English) is the barrier 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add others languages in the network
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources has posed limitations to the other activities especially on ___country units, the website as a platform for sharing is maximized by members 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yahoo does not always work properly ; too slow to load a document 	

3. Capacity-building	
Reasons for this assessment	Suggestions /recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • . Less opportunities than before for attending international events; they were not there. When invitations did come, they were for specific individuals. • No international training events organized or facilitated by Prolinnova International in 2012. • Quite some backstopping visits to a limited number of countries where either project funds allowed for it (LINEX) or such visits could be combined with other assignments of IST members. Doing our best considering the limited budget for backstopping visits but less CPs than before benefited this year than in the past. • Except a few promising examples (e.g. Nepal advising Kenya about the Innovators Fair) we have little information on CPs backstopping each other. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CP members also to take opportunities of their visiting Netherlands, Germany or Philippines on other business to take the opportunity to tag on a visit to IST members for backstopping discussions. • CPs to request advice from other CPs with cc to IST so that we know what is happening – and could perhaps provide advice as well. • More backstopping by Skype.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited experience of a joint project and interaction with Prolinnova IST 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing the number of joint engagements.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited fund availability is the low rating in this part. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As stated earlier, apply equally here too.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our country platform do not benefit of this. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stimulation of activities in new countries to improve commitment.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No opportunity for international workshops or meeting • No course organized • Support was done during backstopping visits. IST member supported in facilitating workshops. • This has been limited 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Different communication channels be utilized for backstopping
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only the IPW and during 2012 there was only 1 representative from SA • There were no opportunities that SA participated in during 2012 • Ann provided input, but only to the previous coordinator, which took place in association with a Jolisaa workshop • No backstopping from other CPs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unless the network in active in a country, it is not really possible to provide backstopping support
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I suggest more capacity and change experience with the partners
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The limit of the interaction with Prolinnova IST 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing the training workshop
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very little work done in this area due to resource constraint. Minimum participants took place. I was at GFAR meeting in Manila only for 2 days. 	

4. Functioning of the IST and the Secretariat	
Reasons for this assessment	Suggestions/recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The secretariat does not respond to the questions under this as they concern its own role and functioning 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The IST, esp ETC staff appears to be doing its best in challenging circumstances. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The non ETC IST members could contribute more.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The secretariat does not respond to this question. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We regularly received information from the secretariat. Except that, we are not committed in any other activity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Something has to be done on this area to improve our integration in prolinnova family, the engagement during the 2011 IPW to translate in French can be extend to some documents where commitment of the network is requested.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information has been timely provided in regard to planning. Contracts and financial management Regular IST support has been adequate and timely Adequate support has been provided to M&E Advise, support and information has been done in fundraising 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IST continue to support fundraising initiatives
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the reduced funds available for the secretariat, they have played a satisfactory role – and have done as much as can be expected from them. They have kept the website and yahoo group going and have supported those countries that have managed to secure funding and still have active networks. Ann has continued to circulate information, though lack of funding as well as an inactive country network has prevented her from having active interaction M&E has been limited to reflection during the IPW and the current electronic exchange Due to a lack of initiative from SA, there has not been much support for fundraising outside of the IPW, where a number of funding opportunities were shared with the CP. Members of Prolinnova Kenya and some members from SA worked together on a call for proposals for Brazil/Africa Innovation Marketplace, but it was not successful. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The secretariat does not respond to this question. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The backstopping is doing by JMD and Bara 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a lot of effort done in regards to fundraising but not enough to cover costs of other country partners. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The secretariat does not respond to this question. 	

5. Increased international awareness on PID/Prolinnova	
Reasons for assessment	Suggestions/recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has been a strong increase in interest in the work and approach of Prolinnova internationally, leading to concrete agreements to cooperate (and fund) in several cases, e.g. CGIAR programmes (o/a WorldFish, CCAFS with the concrete co-funding now with CCAFS), ILRI, GCARD, World Bank, Wageningen University, McKnight Foundation, University of Hohenheim, Coady Institute in Canada, Misereor in the area of PID for CCA. • 2. Mixed score on the international publications. Some good publications appeared (LISF policy brief e.g. was well received); the MSP publication has been a challenge to put together and because of limited strength of basic documents not particularly strong content-wise; spread of hard copies of publications has been problematic. Website plays a strong role in spreading digital copies, which are also shared via other electronic networks. • 3. We continue to see references to Prolinnova in important international publications such as the recent STEPS Study on grassroots innovation; documents in the context of GCARD and the World Bank. • 4. Medium score on institutionalization of PID at international level because – although there are several good examples within organizations that Prolinnova is closer to (e.g. within CGIAR CCAFS, the McKnight Foundation workshop on local innovation approaches, PID for CCA within Misereor (not only in Asia but now also in Africa, with PROFEIS-Mali) – looking at the agricultural research and development scene more broadly, a top-down approach still prevails. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve the system of sending out of hard copies by IIRR with the secretariat
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation of prolinnova in international meetings, UN workshops 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use this advantage to •
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prolinnova is increasingly recognized that is why it has managed to win donor support for CLIC-SR and LINEX – CCA • Policy briefs, FAIR2 experience paper have been produced and shared in the network. The publication are reach in content and information • Prolinnova has been referred to in documents produced by other organisations like World Bank • Little has been done, organization still prefer the traditional method of research – provide information to farmers to implement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue with visibility through publication of good case studies; Participation and presentation of papers in international meetings

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was great effort to have prolinnova representation at the GCARD, which would have ensured continued influence • There were a number of new publications and presentations on the website for 2012 • Certainly at a national level, there is still awareness of the role that Prolinnova-supported approaches can make in agricultural development • There is a lack of awareness of what approaches are currently being supported by international partners, although it still feels like there is an appreciation of participatory approaches 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The facilitation in the partenariat with other donors CCAFS, Concern universal 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through the yahoo group discussions and exchanges showed by Ann, it seem these is good recognition of Prolinnova with the research organizations. In 2012, I know of at least 8 booklets published where IIRR was involved 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More partnership in the pipeline 	

6. Self-assessment	
Reasons for assessment	Suggestions/recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The country platform is running without external resources which are getting difficult as initial enthusiasm wanes and regular routine work begins. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Raising resources is a challenge and greater efforts need to be put in for this.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information has been shared with partners, Innovations have been identified and shared through partners, Prolinnova is increasingly recognised in research and extension organisations The National Steering Committee and Core team are providing adequate support to the Country programme The secretariat has adequately supported the Country Programme. Prolinnova has been mainstreamed under the Food and Security programme The NSC has provided adequate fundraising efforts The NSC has also supported fundraising efforts at international level whenever approached Communication have been done adequately through email, telephone, meetings and reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue working with the IST and partners in resources mobilisation Support to documentation of success stories for continued visibility of Prolinnova Uganda
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The results of the evaluation by misereor 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no collective networking taking place in SA currently although some of the members continue to make use of PID and other participatory approaches in their own work and some of the provinces (Limpopo especially) continues to make use of the provincial level networking that was initiated while Prolinnova-SA was still active. The previous coordinator is not able to provide effective networking coordination without a source of funding and the members are not collectively calling for structured sharing across organisations/provinces although it is definitely happening informally as the need arises. There is some involvement of Prolinnova members in other fora as a result of their prior involvement in Prolinnova (for example providing input into an Advisory Board for the Sustainable Agriculture in South Africa Project – NUFFIC/NICHE ZAF/118, which is being run from University of Stellenbosch. Jolisaa has allowed for continued sharing between some Prolinnova members. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I leave these to the country programme to respond. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time required for 2 languages 	

7. Other feedback

- It is clear that functioning of Prolinnova internationally and the involvement of CPs in this hinges much more than in the past on own initiative from CPs. There is very little capacity and budget at the level of the international secretariat to be pro-active in this.
- In this context, it is very positive that a number of concrete mechanisms have been put forward by the POG and approved by the IPW on functioning of the international network in the absence of core funding. Time will tell to what extent these can be put into practice. This E-evaluation is a promising sign of a key network activity being facilitated by IIRR without core funding!
- In the same context, we see it as positive that a number of CPs initiate fundraising and seek collaboration of the international secretariat in this. That this leads to funding on a regional basis is in line with the agreed longer-term strategy of Prolinnova.
- More joint effort is needed to take advantage of opportunities being created nationally and internationally.
- More documentation and publication of work of CPs and more systematic distribution is needed.
- Environmental Alert wants a summary of the conclusions from this self-assessment
- Quite often I have people contacting me who have interest in Prolinnova and tell me that they have made use of resources on the website. I think that we need to try to keep the network alive and allow for individuals within a country to more directly linked with the network given that the country-level networking is not happening effectively.
- I would like the small course the English in SA because in course in Mozambique is opportunity the speak in the country local language
- Develop more publications
- Translate some publications in others languages.