

PROLINNOVA

PROMOTING LOCAL INNOVATION IN ECOLOGICALLY-ORIENTED AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Report on
PROLINNOVA Country Programme Coordinators Meeting
5–7 June 2005, Entebbe, Uganda

compiled by

Ann Waters-Bayer and Marise Espineli

June 2005

Table of contents

Acronyms	iii
Introduction	1
Objectives	3
Participants	4
Day One: Sunday, 5 June 2005	5
A different perspective on local innovation and institutionalisation	5
PROLINNOVA visioning exercise	9
Experience sharing in the World Café	9
Preparation for FARA NGO meeting.....	13
Day 2: Monday, 6 June 2005 (afternoon)	14
Evaluation of the GFAR Global Partnership Programmes.....	14
Participatory monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E).....	15
Day 3: Tuesday, 7 June 2005 (afternoon)	17
The PROLINNOVA Oversight Group (POG)	17
Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (continued)	19
Feedback from NGO meeting	20
Financial management.....	21
Fund-raising.....	21
Training of PID facilitators	22
Participatory Video (PV).....	23
Open space (“braintrain”) on selected topics	24
International workshop in 2006	25
Action research on partnership building.....	25
Linkages with Participatory Research and Gender Analysis (PRGA).....	26
Workshop evaluation	27
Closing speech	28
Final word of thanks.....	28
 ANNEXES	
Annex 1	List of participants
Annex 2	Procedures proposed by the POG
Annex 3	PM&E framework
Annex 4	PROLINNOVA action plan as of 7 June 2005

Acronyms

AHI	African Highlands Initiative
ASARECA	Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CIAT	International Centre for Tropical Agriculture
CIFOR	Centre for International Forestry Research
COP	Code of Practice
CP	Country Programme
DGIS	Directorate General for International Cooperation (Netherlands)
EARO	Ethiopian Agricultural Research Organisation
FARA	Forum on Agricultural Research in Africa
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GFAR	Global Forum on Agricultural Research
GPP	Global Partnership Programme
GWG	Gender Working Group
ICRA	International Course for development-oriented Research in Agriculture
IIRR	International Institute of Rural Reconstruction
ILRI	International Livestock Research Institute
ISF	Innovation Support Fund
IST	International Support Team
ITDG	Intermediate Technology Development Group
IWMI	International Water Management Institute
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NARIs	National Agricultural Research Institutes
NARS	National Agricultural Research Systems
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NRM	Natural Resource Management
NSC	National Steering Committee
PCARRD	Philippines Council for Agriculture, Forestry and Natural Resources Research and Development
PID	Participatory Innovation Development
PM&E	Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation
POG	PROLINNOVA Oversight Group
PR	Public Relations
PRGA	Participatory Research and Gender Analysis
ProFEIS	Promoting Farmer Experimentation and Innovation in the Sahel
PROLINNOVA	Promoting Local Innovation
PTD	Participatory Technology Development
PV	Participatory Video
R4D	Research for Development
SSA-CP	Sub-Saharan Africa Challenge Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environmental Programme

PROLINNOVA Country Programme Coordinators' Meeting in Entebbe

Executive Summary

The Global Partnership Programme (GPP) PROLINNOVA met in Entebbe, Uganda, on 5–7 June 2005. The meeting showcased a participatory approach to designing a GPP through joint planning and review of country-level activities and using this as a basis for planning inter-country activities. The agenda for the meeting included: reviewing the progress of building country-level partnerships related to Participatory Innovation Development (PID), learning from the challenges and best practices in facilitating multi-stakeholder (primarily farmer-extension-research-education) partnerships, harmonising Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) within the global programme, exploring opportunities for mutual learning with other networks and agreeing on the operational plan for 2005–06. The meeting was scheduled to coincide with the Third General Assembly of the Forum on Agricultural Research in Africa (FARA) to give an opportunity to the Country Programme (CP) coordinators to attend the FARA pre-plenary meeting of NGOs to set up a consortium on agricultural research and development in Sub-Saharan Africa, and to take part in the FARA meeting itself.

One of the highlights of the PROLINNOVA meeting included a presentation of the experience of the African Highlands Initiative (AHI) in institutionalising participatory research in natural resource management. AHI shared a model that explicitly empowers and builds the capacity of resource managers and users, an approach that requires deliberate adaptations, paradigm shifts and conquering individual and institutional barriers between and among stakeholders.

An important achievement of the meeting was the formulation of the PROLINNOVA Vision:

a world in which farmers play decisive roles in agricultural research and development for sustainable livelihoods

and the PROLINNOVA Mission:

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

In small groups, eight priority themes were discussed by the participants using an innovative group-discussion methodology called “World Café”. The themes included: country mutual support, local innovation, documentation, farmer mobilisation, mobilisation of other stakeholders, participatory programme management, resource mobilisation and code of practice in PID. A new topic emerged out of the discussions of the priority themes: capacity building for partnership building. The participants discussed the themes as these relate to conceptual understanding, implications for PROLINNOVA CP operations, support needs of the CPs and potential action required from different groups within the GPP: CPs, PROLINNOVA Oversight Group (POG), and the International Support Team (IST).

The discussion on PM&E within PROLINNOVA flowed naturally from the formulated Vision and Mission and affirmed the overall goal of the programme. The M&E document prepared during the 2004 PROLINNOVA meeting in Yirgalem, Ethiopia, was reviewed for better articulation of desired results and indicators. Suggested indicators for various levels of results – output, outcomes and impact – were generated. The CPs agreed to identify PM&E focal persons to work with the IST focal person to continue sharpening the PROLINNOVA PM&E.

The participants also discussed various opportunities for mutual learning, resource mobilisation and capacity building. Potential activities and networks for mutual learning include the 2005 evaluation of the GFAR GPPs, of which PROLINNOVA is one, and working with the Participatory Research and Gender Analysis (PRGA) System-Wide Initiative of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) on enhancing awareness and appreciation of farmers' innovation and support to women innovators. Ideas for resource mobilisation include the IST inventory of funding sources, the Innovation Support Fund proposal, sharing by CPs of specific fundraising efforts and tapping human resources through volunteer groups such as the VSO and DED. The Training of PID Facilitators course in the Philippines will be postponed to consider offering the course in early 2006 in collaboration with one or two CPs in Africa. Several CPs agreed to pursue a participatory video initiative proposal with the IST and to explore possibilities for acquiring funds for a joint project.

The three-day meeting in Entebbe was attended by the coordinators or technical advisors of the PROLINNOVA CPs in Cambodia, Ethiopia, Nepal, South Africa, Sudan, Tanzania and Uganda, the Chair and two members of the National Steering Committee of Ghana and a representative from a new country programme in Kenya led by the Intermediate Technology Development Group (ITDG)-Eastern Africa. Others in attendance included IST and POG members.

The Entebbe meeting was hosted by the Steering Committee of the PROLINNOVA-Uganda CP, coordinated by the Ugandan NGO Environmental Alert.

Introduction

The Global Partnership Programme PROLINNOVA (Promoting Local Innovation in Ecologically-Oriented Agriculture and Natural Resource Management) was initiated under the umbrella of the Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR) by the stakeholder group of non-governmental organisations (NGOs). It is taking a participatory approach to designing a Global Partnership Programme (GPP) from the bottom up, through joint planning by multiple stakeholder groups in different countries, who then define what activities are required at international level.

Central to PROLINNOVA is learning from its experiences in establishing partnerships in agricultural research and development (ARD) at all levels from the farmer-extension-research partnerships in Participatory Innovation Development (PID) at the grassroots level to national partnerships within the National Steering Committee of each Country Programme (CP). To be able to strengthen the partnerships and improve their functioning – and to improve how the GPP itself functions – Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) is key. At international level, the PROLINNOVA Secretariat facilitated an electronic PM&E exercise in December 2004. One suggestion that came out of this exercise was that all CP coordinators should meet face-to-face at least once a year. This should give an opportunity for more intensive PM&E and for mutual learning about farmer innovation, PID, PM&E and facilitating multistakeholder processes.

PROLINNOVA therefore organised a CP coordinators meeting in early June 2005, to coincide with the Third General Assembly of the Forum on Agricultural Research in Africa (FARA). This gave an opportunity for the CP coordinators to attend also the FARA pre-plenary meeting of NGOs to set up a consortium on ARD. The Co-Chairs of the PROLINNOVA Oversight Group (POG) decided to hold a POG meeting in Entebbe immediately before the meeting of CP coordinators, so that they could get to know the coordinators and could gain a better understanding of how the PROLINNOVA programme is functioning and progressing.

The CP coordinators meeting and the POG meeting in Entebbe were hosted by the Steering Committee of the PROLINNOVA-Uganda programme, which is coordinated by the Ugandan NGO Environmental Alert, located in Kampala.

Objectives

The main objectives of the CP coordinators meeting were to:

- ◇ to review progress in building and managing multistakeholder PROLINNOVA partnerships at national and subnational level
- ◇ to recognise the roles and challenges of NGO facilitation of multistakeholder partnerships for ARD and to learn from best practices
- ◇ to harmonise approaches to PM&E within the PROLINNOVA programme
- ◇ to agree on further steps concerning joint activities of several CPs
- ◇ to identify mechanisms for better linkages and mutual learning between the PROLINNOVA GPP and other related/complementary networks, including the proposed NGO consortium in Sub-Saharan Africa
- ◇ to agree on the operational plan for the PROLINNOVA GPP in 2005–06.

The objectives were addressed in three blocks:

- 1) Sharing experiences and learning from each other (Day 1)
- 2) PM&E (Day 2 afternoon)
- 3) Management and planning of international activities (Day 3 afternoon)

Participants

The meeting was attended by the coordinators or technical advisors from the PROLINNOVA CPs in Cambodia, Ethiopia, Nepal, South Africa, Sudan, Tanzania and Uganda: Loek Sothea, Amanuel Assefa, Pratap Shrestha, Monique Salomon, Ahmed Hanafi, Patrick Lameck and Ronald Lutalo. A second person from the Tanzania core team, Innocent Babili, was invited to join the group in order to strengthen links with the other programme partners, after the death of Yves Marché, the first coordinator of PROLINNOVA-Tanzania. Ghana was represented by the Chair of the National Steering Committee: Adomako Osei-Frimpong from the Ghanaian Ministry of Food and Agriculture. Malex Alebikiya and Lydia Sasu, both members of the PROLINNOVA Ghana Steering Committee, also took active part in the meeting. The CP coordinator from Niger could not attend because of difficulties in scheduling other meetings. As the Intermediate Technology Development Group (ITDG) East Africa had just completed a comprehensive proposal for setting up a PROLINNOVA programme in Kenya, a representative from ITDG – Pat Lanyasunya – was also invited to attend.

Two members of the PROLINNOVA International Secretariat in ETC EcoCulture (Laurens van Veldhuizen and Ann Waters-Bayer) took part, as well as one International Support Team (IST) member from the International Institute of Rural Reconstruction (IIRR), Scott Killough, who is also a member of the POG. In view of the central importance of PM&E in this meeting, the member of the IST who is coordinating the PM&E activities within PROLINNOVA – Marise Espineli from IIRR – also participated.

Besides the CP and IST members of the POG, also the Chair Betty del Rosario (PCARRD) and another POG member, Anna Tengberg (UNEP/GEF) managed to make her way to Entebbe. Reiner Woytek of the World Bank sent his apologies.

Guests on the morning of Day 1 were Ann Stroud, Coordinator of the African Highlands Initiative (AHI); Roger Kirkby, a member of the Uganda National Steering Committee (NSC); Nathalie Beaulieu from CIAT's Rural Innovation Institute; and Rupert Best from the GFAR Secretariat in Rome. Later that day and/or on subsequent days, other guests who joined for at least part of the programme were Assétou Kanouté from an NGO which has proposed to coordinate activities of ProFEIS (Promoting Farmer Experimentation and Innovation in the Sahel) in Mali, Monica Kapiriri, Vice-Chair and NGO voice in the GFAR Steering Committee; and Oliver Oliveros from the GFAR Secretariat. The list of participants is given in Annex 1.

Day One: Sunday, 5 June 2005

Facilitator: Laurens van Veldhuizen

Laurens opened the meeting, welcomed the participants, explained the objectives of the meeting and outlined the programme. The participants introduced themselves with name, organisation and country and – in the cases of those people who were not PROLINNOVA CP representatives – briefly explained their link with the programme. Pratap, Adomako and Lydia volunteered to join the planning group for the workshop.

A different perspective on local innovation and institutionalisation

Ann Stroud, coordinator of the African Highlands Initiative (AHI) presented experiences of AHI in trying to institutionalise participatory research in National Agricultural Research Institutes (NARIs) in eastern and central Africa:

Participation of the owner, stakeholder or end user is still recognised as both central and critical; however, INRM has added dimensions beyond the farmer:

to **explicitly empower and build the capacity of resource managers and users** recognising that change and development required specific adaptations that are under their control:

- to **increase the level of dialogue and deliberation among stakeholders**, improving interactions between research and ‘clients’
- to **deal with high levels of uncertainty, non-linearity, and time lags**, involving multiple scales of interaction and response, with multiple stakeholders with contrasting objectives and activities
- to **incorporate and facilitate social learning processes** for various actors and their organisations, including community and research entities
- to **facilitate trade-off analyses, exchange and negotiation** among stakeholders having different stakes / perspectives to resolve conflicting interests and promote benefit sharing
- to **use systems and multiple level perspectives** through scenario analyses and use of other participatory, analytical tools or models to improve decision making and selection of options
- to **generate and integrate complementary policy, technological and institutional alternatives** that have a direct bearing on the problem or opportunity.
- to empower relevant stakeholders, **applying organisational development and change principles, to strengthen collective and individual decision making**, analysis, planning and implementation, lobbying, negotiation and conflict management
- to **recognise and take into account that activities, the actors and their relationships link across various scales** (farm-landscape-watershed) and levels (households-community-district-national).



Areas for paradigm shifts:

- Interdisciplinary, integrated research by teams.
- Use of partnerships and involvement of multiple stakeholders early in the research for development process – includes negotiation and conflict resolution
- Managing collaborative (adaptive) learning, Participatory Learning and Action Research (PLAR), PM&E, by teams, in action research, with communities and other stakeholders, learning focussed on process not on technology
- policy and advocacy dimensions and political dimensions – gender, power relationships, governance and its processes, co-opting by powerful, managing and building capacity of robust local structures taking these processes into account.
- Managing innovation processes – inclusion of indigenous technical knowledge (ITK) and other sources and fostering adaptive management and experimentation
- Building capacity to enable good demand-led processes
- Dealing with complexity and systems / scales and levels (watersheds and farms (nested) and understanding markets and value chains – understanding important interactions across scales and levels and within systems and associated stakeholders including management of collective action) different tools for visualisation and systems thinking
- Institutions – Organisational arrangements, dynamics and managing change
- Scaling up – what to start with, strategy, scale to start with and move towards, in terms of stakeholders and systems to involve, sustainability and keeping interest on the way.
- Evolving development strategy – (how to link NRM and economic growth? what are we heading for in R4D, what are the foundation ingredients? – technology or people?), understanding of development theory? use of the livelihood framework? poverty focus? how to manage donors?)

Individual barriers:

- limited appreciation of other views and realities
- Science culture – different ways of constructing knowledge
- Are those setting norms at ‘cutting edge’ or ‘dated’ thinkers?
- nature and definition of rigour and quality indicators of science.

- PR and development work is too messy and not rigorous
- Few have/ share personal values that are impact and development oriented
- New skills required but not supported by institutions and managers
- Limited value and use of ITK
- Attitude and fear of new approaches
- Lack confidence to work with others
- Need to allocate more time to field work

Generally, researchers not able to consider issues related to inclusion and equality, social norms, local institutions, ITK, power relationships, among others that are required for a quality participatory action process.

Institutional barriers:

- Peers and organisation take more traditional view of science – the way of doing it, and research topics – this is related to promotion and publishing – so incentive to do participatory research is small
- Incompatible visions of partners
- bureaucracy and protocols
- Those in position to make partnerships are not empowered to do so
- Experience in managing and sustaining partnerships
- Teamwork not rewarded or supported
- Institutional values encompass participatory research and what is needed to do it well
- Don't support new and needed skill set – need champions;
- Need for leadership to express idea that a wider context is needed for research as well as appreciation for innovation systems approach to problem solving
- Change often driven from the outside and by outsiders – rather than by self felt need to do things differently
- Change requires institutional learning and knowledge management approach which is usually not there
- Limited use of feedback culture and personal development
- Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) systems not designed to foster learning and change

Components of institutional change and support process (two cases: Uganda & Ethiopia):

- Developed an assessment frame with performance indicators for assessing effectiveness of research → assessed real examples and looked for success factors and practices → many related to PR → Feedback results to managers → jointly analysed implementation challenges → and linked to overall organisational objectives which became substance of future institutional change work and competence development
- Set up institutional learning mechanisms – ‘horizontal’ – between field cases and – ‘vertical’ – between hierarchical levels in organisation
- Engaged leadership – very important – helps formulate, directs, and participates in change process; makes people feel accountable to the process
- Set up ‘theory – practical (through assignments) – sharing’ sessions with leadership – iterative and regular and inclusive; ownership and self-management important
- Set up peer learning teams, mentoring of field teams during practical implementation
- Training of managers and researchers – work with system systemically
- Institutional analysis to improve institutional support – align incentives, strategies, planning, M&E, other change processes, information exchange, etc.

- Install feedback and personal mastery cultures
- Engage professional organisational development and change management facilitator
- Back up with process documentation
- Alternative journals/events for publications and wider sharing of information to encourage write up and peer review

Discussion

Further explanations by Ann Stroud: After initial support through the Rockefeller Foundation, which came to an end in 2001, EU funds were made available through ASARECA (Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa) and allowed a re-start in 2004. Change facilitators in National Agricultural Research Systems (NARS) are being trained. The institutional work is designed so that the NARIs are controlling their own change processes. Process documentation is one of the mechanisms for internal learning. The AHI work in southern Uganda revealed how important it is to do policy work at the local level: by-laws, local policy taskforces.

Amanuel: How to deal with top-down government policy, such as government asking the NARI to “shop” for technologies outside the country?

Ann Stroud: In response to the push toward top-down transfer of technology, the scientists are encouraged to document the problems with the imported technologies and to consider the consequences for agricultural development

Lydia: How do you work with farmer organisations?

Ann Stroud: There is a problem with regard to the rapid change of personnel and lack of capacity in farmer organisations. Work is needed to strengthen the capacities of community-based organisations.

Adomako: There is a problem of political will and sectorisation, which does not favour partnerships. Each organisation has its own agenda and its own culture. They all need to become more flexible to enable research to improve the livelihood of farmers. There is a need to lobby for policy change, so that researchers who are involved in PID are given recognition. The M&E system that reveals an impact on development should be aligned with the incentive system.

Ann Stroud: The World Bank is pushing for a pluralistic research system in Tanzania, Kenya, Uganda and Ethiopia and introducing competitive grants. In Uganda, a “Plan for the Modernisation of Agriculture has been agreed, and all Ministries are supposed to plan within this framework. However, different Ministries are progressing at different speeds.

Scott: There is a need for capacity building in establishing and maintaining partnerships. ICRA (International Course for development-oriented Research in Agriculture) and several international agricultural research institutes, such as CIFOR (Centre for International Forestry Research), ILRI (International Livestock Research Institute), IWMI (International Water Management Institute), are all looking at partnership issues.

Ann Stroud: A common performance assessment framework was used to evaluate the different participatory approaches. The two main questions asked of the researchers were:

- What should farmer organisations be doing if all is going well?
- What should researchers be doing to support this?

Some signs of institutional change are being seen, e.g. in Tanzania the minutes of meetings in which farmers endorse the research are to be attached to the research proposal, and in Ethiopia the Ethiopian Agricultural Research Organisation (EARO) has changed its M&E system and is considering how to change its incentive structure.

PROLINNOVA visioning exercise

Monique led the group through an exercise to help clarify the vision of PROLINNOVA, now that some of the CPs have been engaged in promoting local innovation for some time while new CPs are joining the international programme. She used a tool from organisational development called Guided Meditation for Visioning. After “dreaming” about being awarded a prestigious award for the PROLINNOVA programme, each participant wrote down key words about how the programme was praised. In small groups, they tried to formulate a vision statement by combining their key words. The mission statements were presented to the plenary, and the similarities and differences between them were discussed. One volunteer from each group then formed a working group to make a common vision and mission statement out of the groups’ results. These formed the starting point for the M&E session the next day:

Vision

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

Mission

Foster a culture of mutual learning and synergy in local innovation processes in agriculture and natural resource management

Experience sharing in the World Café

Over the past year and in preparation for the meeting in Uganda, CP coordinators had raised several questions or topics that they wanted to discuss with each other. The workshop organisers had selected eight of these topics to be handled in the “World Café” format:

- How can countries better support each other?
- How do we understand the concept of “local innovation” and how do we handle the discussion about this?
- Documentation of experiences at all levels?
- Mobilisation of farmers to interact with other stakeholders? in PID?
- Mobilisation of other stakeholders to take active part in the partnership
- Participatory programme management, towards an active NSC
- Resource mobilisation for planned activities
- Code of practice in PID

In the morning session, one topic was handled at each of five tables, where one person introduced and facilitated the discussion. Three to four other participants joined the facilitator and discussed the topic for 15–20 minutes, jotting down ideas and making drawings on the sheets of flipchart paper on each table. Then they moved to another table to discuss another topic, adding onto the ideas that had been written down by the previous group of discussants. The facilitator and/or one or more participants who were keenly interested in the topic then summarised the main points on cards either as “hot topics” for further consideration or as “key points” for making concrete plans.

Five topics were discussed in this way in the morning, and one of these topics (“Local innovation”) was continued under the heading of “Documentation of local innovation” in the afternoon, when the other two topics and yet another topic added after the morning session (“Capacity building for partnership building”) were discussed.

The flipchart sheets and cards with hot topics and key points were hung on the walls of the room as part of the “marketplace”. These were the main ideas captured:

a) Country mutual support

Hot topics

- ◇ The role of the IST: should it be neutral or an active catalytic one?
- ◇ Care has to be taken to prevent dependency – how should we strike a balance?
- ◇ Do we need mutual support in the form of mentoring, coaching or facilitation?
- ◇ Can we think of having “knowledge management” as a function of the IST at the international level?
- ◇ Financial support?

Points for planning

- ◇ Identification of strengths and weakness by CPs
- ◇ Putting information about this on the web
- ◇ CPs have to express their needs and seek support
- ◇ Plan and budget for country cross-visits
- ◇ Make arrangements for inter-CP collaboration via email

b) Local innovation and its documentation

Hot topics

- ◇ Need for documentation but be clear on why to document (conserve innovations, share them for scaling-up, basis for improvement, adaptation, create farmer confidence/enthusiasm)
- ◇ What are effective incentive mechanisms to compensate farmer knowledge/ innovation in terms of cash and non-cash?
- ◇ Continue examination of Intellectual Property Rights issues
- ◇ What are incentives for information sharing?
- ◇ Encourage sharing of information on local innovation with youth/children/schools?

Points for planning

- ◇ Further specify areas, what to document (the innovation itself, the process of innovation, success and failures, the validation process if applicable).
- ◇ Further identify appropriate ways for information sharing and documentation:
 - document, then publish, then share
 - invite innovators to share at fora, workshops, training
 - farmer exchange visits; extension materials such as posters, brochures, radio, farmer magazines
- ◇ Study the dynamics of intergenerational information sharing as part of local learning processes

c) Farmer mobilisation

Hot topics

- ◇ Challenge to promote genuine effective farmer organisations that work for local interests

Points for planning

- ◇ Stratify and target farmers in interest groups such as women and disadvantaged groups
- ◇ Supporting local innovation is part of farmer mobilisation
- ◇ Use methodologies for diagnosis of problems and opportunities and work around these to attract local interests: need capacity building
- ◇ Work with innovative farmers and encourage farmer-to-farmer mobilisation through exchanges
- ◇ Select appropriate way of communication: need for capacity building

d) Mobilisation of other stakeholders

Hot topics

- ◇ Mobilise stakeholders using different approaches (Appreciative Inquiry, using entry point, Stakeholder Analysis, Rapid Appraisal of Agricultural Knowledge Systems)
- ◇ Engaging researchers:

- scale/capacity
- different roles/participation
- institute's investment???

- ◇ Different donors, different requirements
- ◇ Use "neutral" message in mobilising stakeholders focusing on farmer innovation rather than PROLINNOVA: organising around farmer innovators

e) Participatory programme management

Solutions/suggestions

- ◇ Focus on local fundraising
- ◇ Capacity building in communication skills in multistakeholder partnership through inter-CP experience sharing
- ◇ More information flow between programme management and NSC at beginning
- ◇ At least 50% programme assistant
- ◇ Lobbying institutional support
- ◇ Clear structure of CP governance

Hot topics

- ◇ Communication skills in partnership building
- ◇ Interaction between decision-making body/NSC and management/ implementation structures
- ◇ Mainstreaming into national system happens through the multistakeholder NSC
- ◇ Effectiveness of the partnership? Conflict of interest?
- ◇ Funding constraints

Points for planning

- ◇ Organise more information sharing between programme management and NSC at beginning of the program
- ◇ Capacity building in communication skills in partnership building through inter-CP experiences sharing: specific attention at next international meeting/workshop?
- ◇ Involve chairs/members of NSC in international PROLINNOVA events to increase understanding
- ◇ Provide for at least a 50% PROLINNOVA programme assistant
- ◇ Lobby for institutional support
- ◇ Clear structure of governance

f) Resource mobilisation

Hot topics

- ◇ "Lack of resources" is a mind-set that needs changing, both at CP and international level
- ◇ Positive dimension of resource scarcity: it encourages looking for partners, possibilities for resource sharing and tapping into existing structures and channels, thus leading to mainstreaming and longer-term sustainability
- ◇ "Own" PROLINNOVA resources used strategically to complement existing programmes and channels, e.g. by focusing on developing examples/cases of PID, on documentation and making visible these positive examples, as basis for awareness raising and advocacy

Points for planning

- ◇ Need to strategise seeking for partners in terms of resource-sharing opportunities
- ◇ Prioritise fund-raising at country level, rather than at international level, with specific attention for opportunities at the local/district level.

g) Code of practice (COP)

Hot topics

- ◇ For whom is the COP? Those supporting farmer innovation, facilitating PID
- ◇ Can we develop from the list 5 critical requirements for good PID as a basis for peer review?
- ◇ The role of the facilitator to access new knowledge / information for decision-making

- ◇ Prevent the situation where the “blind” lead the “blind”

Improved formulations

- ◇ Start by discovering what local people are doing and exploring to solve local problems or pursue new opportunities, local innovation and initiatives
- ◇ Orient research toward development action that will enhance the wellbeing of the local people
- ◇ Respect knowledge and expertise of all partners and apply appropriately as the situation demands
- ◇ Disseminate findings by publishing and sharing through appropriate media and language
- ◇ Address institutional change at community and higher levels to sustain the PID process, including structures for decision-making that are socially equitable.
- ◇ Engage in PID in such a way that local capacities are enhanced
- ◇ Do not ask of others what you would not like to be asked yourself
- ◇ Prevent adverse effects of PID on others
- ◇ Share power equally among partners and decision-making over topic and methods of PID, including credit and dissemination of findings
- ◇ Discuss, verify and confirm results and findings of PID by farmers and other partners before sharing more widely

Points for planning

- ◇ Current draft of COP to be posted on website, and later revised version
- ◇ Current draft of COP to be shared via the PROLINNOVA e-list and discussed
- ◇ CP coordinators to discuss COP with their partners – to internalise and improve
- ◇ IST to propose five key quality parameters of PID for peer review based on current COP

h) Capacity building for partnership building

Hot topics

- ◇ Competences required include accommodation of diverse interests, negotiation of own organisation's interest, facilitation of development of common vision, communication to particular audiences
- ◇ How to manage different norms, values and procedures in partnerships?
- ◇ Is competitive bidding a threat to partnerships?
- ◇ Ways to address gaps in partnership development
- ◇ The need to deliberately learn from partnership experiences, also within the partnership itself

Points for planning

- ◇ Draw from training in conflict management, team building, transforming conflict and include in partnership-building course in sustainable agriculture/NRM/PID
- ◇ Share PROLINNOVA values with other partners and make them explicit
- ◇ Form consortia for project bidding
- ◇ Incorporate managing partnership in PID facilitators course
- ◇ Include learning from partnership building in M&E

Further suggestions

During the plenary discussions, further suggestions for emphasis and action were made:

- ◇ Give high priority to incorporating farmer-innovation and PID approaches into curricula in universities, colleges and schools
- ◇ Share inventories of farmer innovation
- ◇ Share PID training manuals: the CPs from Cambodia, Ethiopia, South Africa, Nepal and Uganda brought manuals to display in the marketplace: all manuals should be given or sent to IIRR, which will share the ideas and consider possibilities of compiling them into a generic PID training manual.
- ◇ Share once again the information about the new book on Participatory Research and Development and, in the workshop report, give the address where the book can be ordered
- ◇ Explore link with the McCauley Institute (Scotland) on the use of participatory video in research

priority setting.

Participatory Research and Development for Sustainable Agriculture and Natural Resource Management: A Sourcebook

edited by

Julian Gonsalves, Thomas Becker, Ann Braun, Dindo Campilan, Hidelisa de Chavez, Elizabeth Fajber, Monica Kapiriri, Joy Rivaca-Caminade and Ronnie Vernooy

Each set of three volumes and CD costs US\$30; a discounted rate of US\$20 is offered to national/local organisations in the South. Price excludes delivery charge, which varies by destination and mode of delivery.

To purchase a copy or request additional information, contact:

CIP-UPWARD

c/o IRRI DAPO 7777

Metro Manila, Philippines

Tel: (63-49) 536-8185 Fax: (63-49) 536-1662

E-mail: cip-manila@cgiar.org Website: www.eseap.cipotato.org/upward

Preparation for FARA NGO meeting

Assétou Kanouté gave some brief information about the NGO meeting to be held over the following two mornings (Monday and Tuesday) with the purpose of building a consortium of African NGOs concerned with ARD. Similar consortia are to be established at subregional and national levels. Linkages will be sought with PROLINNOVA in those countries where the programme is present.

Assétou sees some similarities between PROLINNOVA and the approach being taken in FARA's Sub-Saharan Africa Challenge Programme (SSA-CP) and thinks that the institutional set-ups should be linked.

The SSA-CP has identified three pilot learning sites: Nigeria and Niger in West Africa; Malawi, Rwanda and Democratic Republic of Congo (around Lake Kivu) in Central/Eastern Africa; and Zambia and Zimbabwe in Southern Africa. Activities have not yet started on the ground. The intention is to work together with scientists, private-sector entities and NGOs that are active in the pilot sites. Efforts will have to be made to avoid duplication in those areas where PROLINNOVA is operating (e.g. Niger).

Former, African members of the NGO Committee of the CGIAR (Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research) are facilitating the process of setting up an NGO consortium in Africa, in order to increase NGO influence at national, subregional and regional levels. There will be one seat for an NGO in each subregional forum. FARA has one combined seat for NGOs and foundations; this is currently held by a representative from a foundation. An attempt will be made to build up a constituency behind the individuals in these seats. The NGO consortium could provide an African platform to discuss PROLINNOVA and other experiences in ARD.

Day 2: Monday, 6 June 2005 (afternoon)

Evaluation of the GFAR Global Partnership Programmes

Rupert Best, GFAR Secretariat, explained the background, objectives and design of the planned evaluation of the Global Partnership Programmes (GPP) that have emerged under the umbrella of GFAR, including PROLINNOVA:

Why are there GPPs?

- Complexity of the challenges that we face in achieving multiple objectives
- The need for systems perspectives to problem solving
- The recognition that no one institution or organisation has all the skills or capacity to achieve the impact required
- GPPs are a GFAR strategy for promoting and learning about research partnerships among different stakeholders

There are 3 generations of GPPs:

- On-going initiatives that were used as first models
 - PROMUSA (International Network for the Improvement of Banana and Plantain) and PROCORD (Global Coconut Research for Development Programme)
- Programmes arising out of expressed stakeholder priorities
 - DMC (Direct sowing, Mulch-based systems and Conservation tillage), PROLINNOVA (PROMoting Local INNOVAtion in ecologically-oriented agriculture and natural resource management) and UUS (Under-Utilised crop Species)
- Pipeline GPPs
 - ICM4ARD (Information and Communication Management for Agricultural Research for Development) and GPhI (Global Post-harvest Initiative)
- New ideas under consideration
 - Non-Timber Forest Products and Putting Knowledge to Work

Some observations about GPPs:

- All distinct in their identification, design and execution
- Most have not relied on heavy sources of external funds
- Not all have been that successful: we can learn from these cases
- Transaction costs are high: is there a way of reducing these?
- GFAR-Secretariat role in post-initiation period not clearly defined

GFAR Business Plan 2004–06 includes an internal review of the GPP mechanism:

- Are they cost effective?
 - What is the added-value of a GPP?
 - Present and potential impact?
- What makes a GPP different or unique?
- Should GFAR continue to promote GPP?
 - Are the underlying conditions still relevant?
 - Does the GFAR-Secretariat have a comparative advantage in promoting them?
- If so, what are the concepts and operational principles that should guide their identification, design and subsequent execution?

Desired outcomes of the review:

- Clarity on the way forward for GFAR and the GFAR Secretariat
- The GPP design and implementation process becomes more robust
- The results are of use to present GPP partners
- Lessons learned and experiences are shared among those involved
- Input to the overall GFAR Evaluation in 2006

What the evaluation is not:

- It is not – or should not be – an evaluation of the technical merits, orientation or content of any particular GPP
- However, the evaluators will want to get a clear understanding of the different types of impact that GPP processes have achieved or are likely to achieve in the future

Proposed timetable:

- Development of Terms of Reference: June 2005
- Formation of review team: July 2005
- Preparation phase: September 2005
- Site visit: September–October 2005
- Evaluation workshop: 13–14 October 2005
- Drafting and circulation of report: November 2005
- Presentation to GFAR Steering Committee: December 2005

Discussion

During the evaluation, the team is likely to visit one or more of the CPs. This should include a more advanced CPs but perhaps also a newer one to see what it takes to put partnerships in place. Ann will keep the CP coordinators informed about plans and progress regarding the GPP evaluation, also with regard to deciding who will attend the GPP evaluation workshop currently scheduled to take place in October 2005 in Rome, Italy. Rupert is pointed to the process documentation related to partnership building that has already been realised within PROLINNOVA.

Participatory monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E)

Facilitator: Marise Espineli

Using a PowerPoint presentation, Marise presented the proposed vision and mission formulated out of the group discussion outputs in the previous exercise by a small group consisting of one member from each of the groups. She also lifted from the logframe the goal (overall objective) of PROLINNOVA. The final output is presented the box below.

<p style="text-align: center;">Vision <i>A WORLD WHERE FARMERS PLAY DECISIVE ROLES IN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FOR SUSTAINABLE LIVELIHOODS</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Mission <i>FOSTER A CULTURE OF MUTUAL LEARNING AND SYNERGY IN LOCAL INNOVATION PROCESSES IN AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Goal <i>TO DEVELOP AND INSTITUTIONALISE PARTNERSHIPS AND METHODOLOGIES THAT PROMOTE PROCESSES OF LOCAL INNOVATION FOR ENVIRONMENTALLY SOUND USE OF NATURAL RESOURCES (logframe)</i></p>

She proceeded to explain three levels of results that we might want to consider in developing the indicators for the work of PROLINNOVA. The PowerPoint presentation included definitions of each of the three levels of results and corresponding examples.

Three levels of results:

- 1st level: Outputs
- 2nd level: Outcomes
- 3rd level: Impacts

Definitions

Outputs are deliverables in knowledge, technology, policies, materials or services with an expected date of delivery. They measure results at activity level of the logframe and are relatively simple to measure, very straightforward.

Examples:

- Concrete technologies: screens for identifying diseased seeds, harvest storage devices
- New procedures in detecting seed infection.
- Practices: crop management practices, research practices, inventory of local innovations,
- Information to support the policy on local farmers to avail of loans at affordable rates
- Number and types of people trained in PID training of facilitators

Outcomes are the changes resulting from the uses of outputs by stakeholders. They refer to improved functionality and/or behavioural change. They normally take longer to realise compared to outputs.

Examples:

- Increased agricultural production
- Number of researchers using participatory action research with local people
- Farmers actively identifying focus of experiments

Impacts are the longer range social, environmental and economic benefits that are consistent with PROLINNOVA's mission and goals. They refer to the combined effects of outputs and outcomes.

Examples:

- Reduced prevalence of child malnutrition
- Households with improved household assets
- Reduced incidence of infectious disease
- Improved literacy ratio between females and males

Marise then asked the group to review the document developed in March 2004 in Yirgalem, Ethiopia, on the M&E of PROLINNOVA, in which eight objectives of PROLINNOVA and the possible indicators for achieving them were listed. This document was the one referred to and not the logframe, because it was already a result of a collective discussion and agreement among the partners in 2004 and therefore supersedes the logframe prepared for the original proposal sent to DGIS (Netherlands Directorate General for International Cooperation) in 2003.

Three groups were formed to review the objectives and indicators drawn up during the Yirgalem workshop. One group reviewed the objectives of the international component and two groups reviewed four objectives each of the eight listed for the CPs. One group was able to review and came up with suggested changes on all four objectives assigned to them, while one group was able to focus on only one. The CP representatives were asked to review the list and identify the priorities of each of the CPs (reviewed list of indicators in Annex 3). The participants agreed to assign unfinished review and the continuation of the polishing and prioritising of the indicators through the M&E focal persons.

Referring to the vision and mission formulated in the earlier session and the goal (overall objective) in the project logframe, participants identified potential impact indicators along three key components: 1) poverty alleviation/sustainable livelihoods, 2) improved natural resource management; and 3) agricultural research, development and education systems. The result of this discussion are also included in Annex 3. It still includes a combination of output, outcomes and impact indicators. Considerable work still has to be done. Again, it was suggested that the M&E focal points continue to work on this initial output, using a working document prepared by Marise on the basis of this list, and that they agree on some key parameters that all countries will monitor. A detailed action plan on M&E was agreed upon during Day 3.

Day 3: Tuesday, 7 June 2005 (afternoon)

Facilitator: Scott Killough

The PROLINNOVA Oversight Group (POG)

Betty del Rosario, Chair of the POG, presented a number of main developments in the POG and shared the issues it has addressed the past year and their outcome:

Members of the POG:

- Mr Ahmed Hanafi, Intermediate Technology Development Group, Sudan CP
- Mr Amanuel Assefa, Agri-Service Ethiopia, Ethiopia CP – POG Co-Chair
- Ms Monique Salomon, Farmer Support Group, South Africa CP
- Mr Scott Killough, International Institute for Rural Reconstruction, Philippines (IST)
- Ms Anna Tengberg, United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) / Global Environmental Facility (GEF), Kenya
- Ms Beatriz del Rosario, Philippines Council for Agriculture, Forestry and Natural Resources Research and Development (PCARRD) – POG Chair
- Mr Reinhard Woytek, World Bank, USA
- Ms Ann Waters-Bayer, ex-officio member, ETC EcoCulture (PROLINNOVA Secretariat)

Meetings conducted:

- Inaugural meeting: 17–18 February 2005, Pietermaritzburg, South Africa
- Second meeting: 4 June 2005, Entebbe, Uganda

Terms of reference:

- Overall guidance on main issues and directions
- Oversight on behalf of CPs and donors
- Develop programme strategy, policies and principles in consultation with CPs, and oversee adherence
- Arbitrate in conflicts between CPs and IST
- Ensure that adequate M&E being applied
- Ensure that advocacy activities are conducted effectively at international level

Issues and concerns:

- Many CPs seem to grapple with the concept of local innovation. It was recognised that confusion is part of change. However, it was felt that it could be given conscious attention and recognition as part of a process of change that CP stakeholders are going through.
- It was proposed to engage CPs in discussing what strategies they employ to clarify and deepen understanding of the concept, including examples of what innovation is, and what not. “Confusion is the beginning of understanding.” “Chaos creates order.”
- The IST to ask CPs to write a story (about 2 pages) on how they manage the confusion around the concept of local innovation; these experiences will be discussed at the June meeting of CP coordinators.

Observations on 2004 Annual Report:

- Most CPs still need to submit financial reports that also reflect their own contributions.
- The list of outstanding achievements is good and will be accepted for 2004, but next year's report should show each CP's progress and achievements against workplans.
- At the same time, it is recognised that each CP is responding flexibly to opportunities and, therefore, some achievements may grow out of unplanned activities

Criteria for new activities in PROLINNOVA:

- Both the CPs and the IST can initiate new activities, as long as these support the principles and objectives of PROLINNOVA and do not deviate from the overall plan and strategy.
- POG to oversee that the initiatives are in line with overall mission.
- CPs are responsible for decision making, priority setting, leadership and communication within their countries. Reflections within CPs on new activities should be recorded in the minutes of their meetings/discussions, so that their "ownership" is evident to IST and POG.
- The following criteria were identified for new areas:
 - Based on need and interests of the CPs
 - Borne by at least two CPs that are actively involved in developing the idea
 - In line with the vision of the CPs and the international programme

Funding sources, sharing experiences, databases:

- IST to complete the inventory of funding sources and make it available to all CPs
- Monique to share South African experience by giving a presentation on the Farmer Support Group's pilot with Farmer Life Schools at the meeting of CP coordinators in June 2005.
- The Secretariat to make a compilation of existing databases on IK and local innovation and post it on the website (to be included in *PTD/PID Circular 15*).
- The Secretariat to share with all PROLINNOVA partners the procedure of and criteria for selecting persons to attend international meetings, by mid-March 2005.

M&E:

- Each CP to appoint an M&E focal point within one month's time, with authorisation from the CP's Steering Committee; this person should:
- Maintain a running list of PROLINNOVA activities in the country which indicates M&E components/sub-activities agreed upon and who is responsible for them
- Make a list of objectives of the CP, add indicators for M&E for each objective from the list (or add others), and indicate who is doing what in terms of M&E of these objectives.
- Marise and focal persons to identify approaches and tools for M&E on different levels and prepare materials for discussion, to be circulated two weeks before the June 2005 meeting

Conflict mediation:

The following principles were agreed upon:

- CPs are responsible for internal organisation and management.
- The Chair of a CP's Steering Committee can be asked to intervene in a conflict.
- ETC is responsible for ensuring that CPs meet legal (contract) obligations
- If CPs cannot resolve a conflict, they and/or the IST and/or Secretariat can ask for assistance from the POG, which will decide on an intervention appropriate to the context, while protecting the integrity and image of the programme as a whole.
- All backstoppers from the IST are encouraged to provide written reports about progress and issues identified in CPs, including any recommendations they may have made, particularly with respect to issues of conflict

Issues carried forward to June 2005 POG meeting:

- Criteria and procedure for including new countries in the PROLINNOVA “family”
- Mechanisms for financial transparency and accountability
- Approach to fair recognition of partners’ contribution, e.g. in publications/IPR issues
- Ethical issues and standards in PID (code of practice)

The Secretariat prepared draft texts on each of these issues; the revised versions prepared during the POG meeting on 4 June 2005 can be found in Annex 2.

Criteria for new CPs:

- Advocates and implements an approach to ARD that involves farmers and development agents, formal researchers and other stakeholders in planning, implementing, evaluating and monitoring joint investigations and trials and in sharing the process and results, including farmer-to-farmer sharing
- Uses identification of local innovations and initiatives as entry point for planning participatory R&D
- Seeks to scale up and integrate the PID approach into major institutions of agricultural/NRM research, extension and education
- Is proposed at country level involving working relationships between governmental and non-governmental stakeholders in research, development and education related to ARD
- Is facilitated/coordinated by an NGO with proven programme and financial management capacities and systems.

Discussion

According to the Terms of Reference for the POG, in the case of the members from CPs, the membership of one member may be extended for a third year, but the other two CP members should be replaced after two years. As the POG was elected in 2004, two new CP representatives should be elected in 2006. The POG and its secretariat will prepare an election procedure running up to the 2006 international PROLINNOVA workshop.

The question was raised whether the POG should be responsible for designing a PROLINNOVA logo and house style. The POG has already given this task to IIRR.

Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (continued)

Marise distributed a draft document on the PM&E framework with all the indicators that were listed during the brainstorming session the previous afternoon (see Annex 3). This will be the working document with which the M&E focal points in each country will work. The format at the end of the document is the suggested format for consolidating the M&E data coming out of the CPs. The CPs should refer to this and check whether they have captured the essential elements in the monitoring in their countries. It is clear that, within the timeframe of the DGIS-funded part of the PROLINNOVA programme, we can speak only of “potential impacts”.

On the request of participants, Monique briefly explained how the balanced scorecard can be used as a tool in planning and M&E. She declared herself prepared to give further explanations to CP coordinators during the remainder of the week. The balanced scorecard could help in working out a country strategy and could support the CP coordinators in their planning. It will be up to each CP to decide whether it wants to use this tool. No M&E format will be imposed upon each country. Marise could try to develop a simple hybrid of the format in the paper and the balanced scorecard format, but this would merely be to give the CPs some guidelines and would not be prescriptive.

As soon as possible, the M&E focal point persons in each country will have to be brought on board regarding the discussions on the methods, tools and formats to be used. It was stressed that M&E will require much interaction at country level. The task is not to be left to one focal-point person.

Next steps in M&E:

- Those CP coordinators who have not identified M&E focal points to send names and contact details of focal points to Marise by end of June 2005
- Marise to draw up and share Terms of Reference for M&E focal points
- Each CP coordinator should review the list of indicators and indicate which ones would be key indicators from the country's perspective, and should inform Marise about this so that the many indicators in the list can be prioritised.
- After their return to their countries, the CP coordinators should discuss the M&E document and balanced scorecard with the M&E focal-point person.
- Marise will take up email contact with the focal points to discuss the M&E procedures further and to refine the M&E framework. It was suggested that Marise facilitate an electronic conference with all M&E focal points in July in order to clarify their tasks and agree on procedures.
- M&E focal points to continue to work on impact indicators
- CPs to consider how to create space and momentum for the M&E focal point to play its important role, e.g. by setting aside time and/or other resources.

Feedback from NGO meeting

In the NGO meeting, two persons each were elected to represent NGOs in Western, Central, Eastern and Southern Africa. Hanafi was one of the persons elected from Eastern Africa. These people elected, in turn, two representatives to the regional (Africa) level. Consortia of NGOs are also supposed to be built up at national level. The persons elected to represent NGOs in the subregional and regional fora are serving in an interim capacity, while they are working towards building up constituencies of NGOs concerned with ARD. Their task will include stimulating the establishment of national NGO consortia within their subregions.

The NGO meeting gave PROLINNOVA an opportunity to share our values on local innovation in the vision, mission and objectives of the Consortium. The GFAR is more interested in working through NGO networks such as PELUM than through individual NGOs.

There were mixed views on the relationship between PROLINNOVA and this initiative to build up NGO consortia on ARD. Of the one hand, it may be good for the PROLINNOVA CPs to become involved in mobilising such consortia, because the coordinating NGO is already in contact with NGOs interested in ARD and have already starting building partnerships with other stakeholder groups. Interaction in these consortia could help in scaling up PROLINNOVA, bringing the approach into other initiatives on the ground.

On the other hand, there is a potential for conflict of roles between NGOs active in PROLINNOVA if they become involved in the NGO consortium. The latter role may require a more confrontational activist position, while the NGOs working in the PROLINNOVA context are more interested in engaging in partnerships with formal agricultural research. This could endanger the PROLINNOVA process, after the involved NGOs have built up good links with research, if they need to change role and/or become identified with other, confrontational NGOs. It is therefore necessary to proceed cautiously.

Financial management

Recording own contribution in kind and cash, also from other donors. Lydia pointed out that the voluntary work done by people in civil-society organisations is often worth more than what they are receiving from donors for implementing the projects. PROLINNOVA partners agree that the “own contribution” originally requested by the donors is a useful concept because it encourages us to look for synergies. Some PROLINNOVA CPs, however, have not yet developed a systematic way of accounting for own contributions. PROLINNOVA-SA is using a timesheet for this purpose. The partners report the hours they spend on PROLINNOVA activities, then hourly rates are filled in to calculate own contribution. They also keep records of other contributions they make, e.g. by paying their own way to attend workshops. Each team member is asked to write a letter stipulating what the own contribution was and to trace through the organisation’s own financial system what was paid for by another project or by the organisation. If this is recorded on a monthly or quarterly basis, it is fairly easy to reflect the own contribution in the financial report.

The CPs are encouraged to report to the NSC and the IST what they are doing in other programmes related to promoting local innovation and PID, and to regard this as part of the PROLINNOVA work and include it under “own contribution if it links directly with the PROLINNOVA agenda and workplan agreed at country level. This will also make clearer how their activities are linked and are contributing to institutionalising PROLINNOVA-type approaches.

Financial reporting. ETC EcoCulture has prepared a simple format for financial reporting: budget, expenditures, own contribution, DGIS funds, to be expressed in both Euros and national currency. In the annual financial report, use the average between the exchange rates that were valid at the time of the two advances of funds. In the budget, include the underlying assumptions.

Auditing. The funds for PROLINNOVA coming through ETC EcoCulture are audited annually. It would be helpful if all NGOs coordinating CPs could send a copy of its annual auditing report to ETC; there is no need for a separate audit of PROLINNOVA. The Nepal audit has already been done and can be sent. The financial year in South Africa ends in March; the audit report can be sent as soon as it has been completed. None of the coordinating NGOs has a problem in sending its overall audit to ETC EcoCulture if it can be done at the time it becomes available according to the NGO’s own auditing schedule.

In Tanzania, financial reporting will be handled by PELUM-Tz, the coordinating organisation that is accountable to the donor. For this reason, the position of Country Coordinator is officially with PELUM-Tz. Patrick, from INADES-Tz, has been given the designation of National Technical Advisor, but has all other responsibilities of the Country Coordinator. In such cases, the roles of the host/coordinating organisation and the person from another organisation need to be well defined.

Fund-raising

Innovation Support Fund (ISF) proposal. PROLINNOVA-SA is the lead agency; the other CPs in the proposal to DURAS are Cambodia, Sudan and Uganda. Ethiopia and Nepal will join the group, using funds for similar projects already planned or underway. In pilot areas, a small local innovation fund will be made available to farmers for innovation processes. The project will start with a study of what has been done along these lines in various countries; then the pilots will be implemented in particular sites. The partners will reflect on the process and draw lessons within and across countries. The proposal to DURAS will be reviewed by the committee in mid-June. A meeting on Wednesday morning was arranged with all the participating countries, plus Laurens, to plan for quick action if and when the project is approved.

NUFFIC (Netherlands Organisation for International Cooperation in Higher Education). Some capacity-building activities of the CPs can be funded through this Dutch source, e.g. tailor-made

training in the country and/or sending people to courses in the Netherlands. The request needs to be linked to Dutch institutions or experts. It is tendered for competition among Dutch institutions. Their proposals are screened by three people, including the requesting local organisation, which has the right of veto. The person responsible for managing the fund in Uganda has encouraged PROLINNOVA-Uganda to make a proposal for tailor-made training. The results of this example in Uganda will be shared with the other PROLINNOVA CPs.

University collaboration. The Farmer Support Group in South Africa has had good experience in working through university collaboration, e.g. with Wageningen University and Free University Amsterdam. Students from these universities can play a role in various activities, e.g. in studying local innovation. It depends on the country whether difficulties arise with local dialects and the need to hire translators with a good understanding of concepts related to local innovation.

Human resources through VSO and DED. Generally, these volunteers are young, eager, willing to work and often prepared to learn a local language. Volunteer Services Overseas (VSO) focuses on learning and reflection processes, which fit well with the PROLINNOVA approach. Because the procedure is decentralised at country level and is demand-driven, the country has to take the initiative; the PROLINNOVA Secretariat cannot organise this on the international level. Countries can negotiate to lower the counterpart costs that are usually demanded. The CP would need to identify the skills that it wants in a volunteer, and make the application to the Embassy.

The German Exchange Services (DED) sends German volunteers or pays for the salary of local staff for a period of 4–5 years; the local organisation is expected to contribute increasingly to the salary. Each DED office has own priorities. Before making an application, find out what these priorities are and make sure that the proposal fits into them.

Other fund raising opportunities and initiatives

Possibilities of gaining funds through the commercial and private sector could also be explored.

Wherever possible, see linkages with other projects being carried out by partner organisations in the PROLINNOVA CP. For example, in Tanzania, there is an opportunity to link up with a new project on local innovation in crop protection, in collaboration with NRI, funded through the UK Department for International Development (DFID). Tanzania has been successful in gaining substantial funding for PROLINNOVA from the Church Development Services (EED) in Germany.

PROLINNOVA-Uganda is linking up with a project supported by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and in collaboration with CIAT to work on local innovation systems through the National Agricultural Research Organisation, including inter-university partnership with Makerere University, the University of Nairobi and Florida University. The PROLINNOVA programme will provide expertise to this project.

In Ethiopia, the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) has shown interest in funding PROLINNOVA activities, if the project goes through one of the government organisations in the NSC. Different institutions in the NSC may be responsible for different components of the programme.

Adomako suggested that such proposals for collaboration with the government be discussed with the agricultural administrations at district level.

Training of PID facilitators

Scott reported on positive feedback after the training course for PID facilitators last year in the Philippines and during the electronic evaluation last December. The follow-up action in several countries was also an indicator of success. IIRR planned to run a second course in July–August 2005, although there are no funds in the DGIS budget for this. It set a rate of USD 2000 per person. It received 15–20 enquiries; usually an international course generates 2–3 times that. Only

three persons are willing to pay the fee. It is no longer realistic to plan the course for this period. It may not be offered until early next year. IIRR is considering the possibility of offering the course in Africa, through the IIRR office in Uganda or Kenya. Possibly people from “older” countries, who have already been trained in PID, could be involved as trainers in the next course.

The PROLINNOVA-SA programme found that the PID training course helped to stimulate the programme, to forge links, to raise understanding of concepts and to increase skills. The course would be important not only for newly emerging CPs but also for the “older” CPs, where trained people have moved on to other organisations. Several of the CPs are interested in sending participants to the course, but have not been able to mobilise funds for this.

Training on building and managing partnerships should be incorporated into the next PID course.

Participatory Video (PV)

After the discussion on PV in Yirgalem in March 2004 and the pilot PV experience in Ghana in November–December 2004, several members of the IST, together with Chris Lunch, made a major effort in January 2005 to formulate a proposal for a PV project involving several PROLINNOVA CPs. During the POG meeting in February, the CP representatives felt that the IST was pushing the CPs too quickly into this new activity. Miranda Verburg and Chesha Wettasinha, the two IST members who are coordinating the PV initiative, sent an email to all CP coordinators suggesting that each country take up this initiative at its own pace. They offered to send the full proposal to any CP that expressed an interest. They did not receive any requests for the proposal.

During this June meeting, the following verbal expressions of interest were made:

- Nepal programme would like to join hands with other countries to work on the proposal. IDRC is a potential donor: it has already funded this type of activity in the subregion and may be prepared to scale it up;
- In Tanzania, video was used in interventions on crop protection and was evaluated as one of the best tools in communicating among farmers; two INADES staff members have been given training in video and radio production;
- Uganda is likewise interested in PV; the Uganda National Council of Science and Technology has encouraged PROLINNOVA-Uganda to follow this up for use in community-to-community exchange; a woman in the Council is specialised in PV;
- Some stakeholder organisations in Sudan have shown interest in PV;
- Some members of the Ethiopian NSC would like to explore the possibilities of PV, although they have some questions about the utility for farmers of video-documenting their innovations, the rationale of focusing only on farmers rather than having teachers or extension agents making the video films, and the sustainability of providing farmers with video equipment and editing facilities;
- The South African CP is interested in principle but does not have enough capacity. During the PID training workshop in September, a participant in the Ghana pilot will give the South African participants a one-day training in PV in order to expose the participants to this form of documentation. Hopefully, some people will express interest to take this further.

Pratap pointed out that there could be different procedures in different countries, as long as farmers are given a chance to present their scenario from their own perspective in their own ways. Although each interested country could and should try to develop its own proposal and seek funding for it, an attempt should still be made to draw up a proposal that allows some sharing between the countries.

Next steps:

- The Secretariat to send the current proposal in its full length to all the CP coordinators.
- Those CPs interested in starting PV to send by email a confirmation of their interest and comments on the proposal by the end of June 2005.
- The IST to insert any changes needed and tighten up the proposal by end of August 2005.
- Each country can use the proposal and adapt it to their needs for fund-raising.
- At the same time, the IST should explore possibilities of acquiring funds for a joint project involving several or all interested countries.

Open space (“braintrain”) on selected topics

In an open-space session, four topics that participants wanted to discuss in more depth were posted on flipchart sheets and participants circulated freely from space to space, jotting down and discussing ideas in small, changing groups. The ideas written on the four topics are given below, and the major action points were transferred to the action plan (Annex 4).

Capacity building in PID

- Organise PID training of trainers for research and extension/development workers and policymakers at district level by CP Tanzania, by December 2005 in target districts
- Organise field days for stakeholders in PID sites for awareness raising and learning (CPs and IST, by December 2006)
- Revise PID training of facilitators (international course) by fourth quarter of 2005.
- Offer revised course in Africa (Uganda or Ethiopia) in first quarter of 2006, by IIRR with at least one CP as part of continuing capacity development
- Refresher training workshop (feedback) as follow-up workshop at CP level and, if possible, also for those facilitators trained last year in the Philippines.

University curriculum development

- PID (Partnering in Innovation Development) integrated into under- and postgraduate programme in university
- Partnership building and management and gender integrated into university curriculum
- Field visits for lecturers to farmers
- Invite farmer experimenters to present to the students
- Training course/exposure for team (lecturers and others) – Ghana final year
- Encourage students to do experiments together with farmers for their diploma
- Exchange curriculum among interested partners.

Next steps:

- Monique to contact CPs by email to exchange information by end of June: Malex and Adomako in Ghana, Sothea in Cambodia, Ronald in Uganda, Pratap in Nepal, Babili in Tanzania and Amanuel in Ethiopia

Mutual learning and support:

- CPs and IST to identify strengths and weaknesses of CPs, coordinated by Amanuel, by September 2005
- IIRR to put information about strengths of CPs on the web, by November 2005

- CPs to present needs/requests to the IST and corresponding CPs, in the period November–December 2005
- IST and CPs to plan and budget for country cross-visits, by January 2006
- South Africa and Uganda mentoring agreement by end of July 2005.

Learning and sharing, including documentation and website

- IIRR to develop “PROLINNOVA style” for materials/publications, by July 2005
- All countries to share relevant innovations in simple Word file, 6-monthly, annexed to progress report (coordination ETC EcoCulture)
- IIRR to build capacities of CPs in D-group discussion on website, by July 2005
- Communications and information management: CPs to appoint media and public-relations (PR) person responsible for publications, PR materials, house style, updating country page and updating contact list (stakeholders, Steering Committee etc) – as soon as possible! (coordination by IST partner still to be decided)

International workshop in 2006

The most suitable timing would be March 2006. This should be tied in with the review of PROLINNOVA implementation which is scheduled for the mid-term of the DGIS contract (late 2005/early 2006). The CPs in both Cambodia and Nepal would be prepared to host the workshop. If the ProFEIS project has started by then, the workshop might offer a possibility for communication between the sister programmes, in which case it would be better to hold it in West Africa. The Secretariat will communicate with the ProFEIS programme members to see if they are interested in joining. Further planning will be done by email.

Action research on partnership building

This would involve PhD candidates from the PROLINNOVA countries, possibly the coordinator or someone from the core team, working together with the University of Wageningen and a university in the home country. It may be possible to converge with the Convergence of Science collaboration involving Wageningen, Ghana and Benin. People in Ghana and Ethiopia are interested. In Tanzania, Babili is personally developing a proposal along these lines; he has admission to Wageningen University and is seeking funding.

In South Africa, there is a PhD programme linking with Tanzania SA on farmer/systems innovation in watershed management, looking at the interface between farmers and scientists.

Betty: Action research is needed on partnerships on the ground, as this is the heart of the PROLINNOVA work. This work at grassroots level should be linked to research on partnership building at the national and international levels, looking at how to bring together actors with different value systems. There is widespread interest in partnerships but a lack of clarity about how to go about it.

Mallex: The multistakeholder platform in northern Ghana has done lot of work on local innovation and PID/PTD, including much stakeholder mobilisation and management, but there has been little documentation of the processes. The question as to how to institutionalise the partnerships still remains. Elements of local innovation and PID have been incorporated into the university curriculum and the teaching process, but partnership building and institutional aspects have not yet been given much attention. It would be good to have someone focus on analysing the dynamics, looking at the constraints and synthesising the lessons. This type of research would also give us a possibility to learn from the experiences of others.

The participants generally agreed with Malex about the importance of further pursuing this activity. While individual PhD opportunities can and should be sought by the persons concerns, the IST needs to continue to look for opportunities to realise a joint action-research activity that enables sharing and learning across countries.

Linkages with Participatory Research and Gender Analysis (PRGA)

The PRGA is a system-wide initiative of the CGIAR. Hilary Sims Feldstein, the new facilitator of the Gender Working Group (GWG) posed the following questions to PROLINNOVA:

- 1) How might PRGA and PROLINNOVA work together to enhance awareness and appreciation of farmers' innovation and deepen understanding of innovation as a process among ARD actors?
- 2) How can PRGA and PROLINNOVA work together to provide more support to rural women as innovators?

Some initial ideas were:

- Create opportunities for people from both networks meet and initiate work together:
 - Attend each others' workshops, e.g. attend the PRGA Impact Assessment Workshop on 19–21 October 2005 at CIMMYT Headquarters in Mexico and present the approach being taken by PROLINNOVA: Marise could submit an abstract and possibly attend as PM&E coordinator
 - Jointly organise "Dare-to-Share Fair" at CGIAR Annual General Meeting in Morocco and/or at next PRGA meeting (end of 2005)
- Examine how gender is incorporated into the PID training of facilitators; receive advisory support from PRGA network members
- Use PV to promote local innovation by women (and conduct action research on this); as a preparation to stimulate joint work on this:
 - Special features in both networks about potentials of PV
 - Part of Dare-to-Share Fair
 - Workshop on PV at upcoming international PRGA workshop (end of 2005)

Remarks by CP coordinators

Perhaps the key questions should be: *How does the innovation process influence gender relations, and how to gender relations influence the innovation process?*

PROLINNOVA should stimulate women's participation. In Tanzania, during the Promoting Farmer Innovation (PFI) project, a study was made of gender and innovation. Women do not have decision-making power. The male household head often gives the impression that he is the innovator, whereas it was really the wife. We should look more for family innovations.

PRGA has been trying to promote participatory and gender approaches for many years but these are still not widely implemented within the CGIAR system. Programmes need to partner with other stakeholders in research and show that it "pays" to apply gender approaches. It would be a good opportunity for PROLINNOVA and PRGA to work together. This would help us to engender the PROLINNOVA initiative, to become more gender-balanced in identifying innovations and innovators, to see who contributes to innovation and how – and also to look for women-specific innovations, such as in growing beans or dealing with storage pests. Thus far, we are too one-sided; we have been ignoring women's innovations, which tend to be more hidden to outsiders than men's.

It would also be useful to work together with Hilary and her Gender Working Group in reviewing university curricula and improving the gender component in the PID courses we would like to integrate into them.

Next steps:

- Marise to prepare abstract for PRGA workshop on impact assessment and send to organisers by 10 June 2005
- Monique, who is coordinating the PROLINNOVA working group on curriculum development, to link up with Hilary about initiatives to incorporate gender issues into courses on participatory research and development.
- The IST to explore further the possibilities of closer collaboration with PRGA, especially the gender working group.
- All PROLINNOVA partners who want to be included in the PRGAinfo listserve and the Gender Working Group listserve to contact the coordinators directly – Guy Manners (g.r.manners@cgiar.org; prga_comms@yahoo.co.uk) and Hilary Feldstein (hsfeldstein@earthlink.net), respectively – and ask to be added to the list(s).

Workshop evaluation

At the end of a very long day, Marise asked all participants to write on cards their ideas about what we should continue to do in international PROLINNOVA workshops like this one, and what we should change, improve or add. The cards were posted on pinboards for all to read.

Things to continue:

- Participatory lesson learning
- Revising program implementation
- Involving CP coordinator at certain level
- Involving all CP coordinators in international workshop
- Keep presentation by someone outside the PROLINNOVA (2)
- Having the meetings rotating in different countries (2)
- Continue strengthening CP linkages/ continuous communication
- Mutual sharing
- Using creative methodologies for facilitation
- Creativity and fun in sessions
- Action planning (who, what, when)
- Small group workshops
- Identifying non-technical innovations for differentiating PTD from PID
- Continuing to be efficient with the use of time.

Things to change, improve and add:

- CPs taking responsibility for agenda and co-facilitation
- When drawing up budgets, include one international PROLINNOVA meeting in your country
- Introduce concept of PV to CP members
- More sharing from CP experiences
- Recap of previous discussions
- More materials to market
- Invite more participants from host country
- Evaluation of meeting required to help improve subsequent meetings
- Have more time for management meetings like this
- Be sure to include field visit as part of programme (2)
- Field trip and joint analysis builds team

- Involve outside resource persons
- Highlight activities and planning of CP for starting up
- Include an IST visit to CPs at least once a year
- Keep time during the programme
- Share personal stories/experiences in small groups
- Less plenary sessions, more group/active/interactive work
- Produce international meeting reports for participants at the end of the exercise
- Give out contact list of addresses for all participants with mini photos where possible

Closing speech

Betty thanked all participants for their commitment and hard work. The workshop was useful for POG members and NSC members to help them internalise what PROLINNOVA is all about. She particularly liked the style of work that was adopted in the meeting, and learnt much from the innovations in ways of conducting workshops. Fund raising will remain a challenge for the IST and the CPs, but some islands of success are already there. An important output of the meeting is that the mission is very clear: ***to foster a culture of mutual learning and synergy in local innovation processes in agriculture and natural resource management.***

Final word of thanks

On behalf of all participants, Scott thanked Ronald Lutalo as the PROLINNOVA-Uganda coordinator, for his great work in organising, communicating and mobilising to make this workshop happen. He also thanked Fred Kafeero, Director of Environmental Alert, in providing leadership and support in these efforts.