

Proli-FaNs Annual Partners Meeting and International Partners Workshop (IPW)

13–17 May 2019

Sahel Vert Agroecology Training Centre

in Centre Mampuya

Toubab Dialaw, Senegal



Most of the workshop participants in Centre Mampuya (Photo: Siaka Bangali)

Compiled by Papa Makha Saar, Brigid Letty & Ann Waters-Bayer

July 2019

Table of contents

List of annexes	ii
List of acronyms	iii
Day 1: Monday 13 May – Proli-FaNS annual partners meeting	1
Welcome, overview and introduction	1
Overview report on Proli-FaNS	1
Proli-FaNS Country Platform reports	1
End-of-project external evaluation report.....	3
Day 2: Tuesday 14 May – Proli-FaNS annual partners meeting	5
Recap and review of Day 2 agenda	5
Project M&E and preparation of project reports.....	5
Action planning for Proli-FaNS until end of project	7
Draft proposal for follow-on project “SuP-FaNS”	7
Main conclusions and closure of the Proli-FaNS meeting.....	10
Social evening	11
Day 3: Wednesday 15 May – International Partners Workshop (IPW)	12
Organisation of Prolinnova marketplace	12
Official opening of International Partners Workshop (IPW)	12
Introductions of the different CPs	12
Farmer-led joint research and local innovation for food & nutrition security: examples	13
Final remarks for the day	
Day 4: Thursday 16 May – International Partners Workshop (IPW)	14
Feedback from POG to IPW	15
Regionalisation and Southernisation	15
UK network: Farmer-Led Innovation Network (FLIN)	17
Developing the next Prolinnova strategic plan.....	17
Fundraising for Prolinnova activities.....	17
Action planning and IPW wrap-up	20
Preparation for the fieldtrip.....	20
Day 5: Friday 17 May – Field trip	20
Annexes	21

List of annexes

- Annex 1: List of participants
- Annex 2: Programme for Proli-FaNS annual meeting and IPW 2019
- Annex 3: Overview report on Proli-FaNS
- Annex 4: Proli-FaNS presentation from Burkina Faso
- Annex 5: Proli-FaNS presentation from Cameroon
- Annex 6: Proli-FaNS presentation from Ethiopia
- Annex 7: Proli-FaNS presentation from Ghana
- Annex 8: Proli-FaNS presentation from Kenya
- Annex 9: Main finding of external evaluation of Proli-FaNS
- Annex 10: M&E framework for Proli-FaNS project
- Annex 11: Main questions from Misereor on achievements in Proli-FaNS
- Annex 12: Action plan for remainder of Proli-FaNS project
- Annex 13: Brief overview of follow-on proposal (SuP-FaNS)
- Annex 14: Presentation by Burkina Faso CP to IPW2019
- Annex 15: Presentation by Ethiopia CP to IPW2019
- Annex 16: Presentation by Ghana CP to IPW2019
- Annex 17: Presentation by Kenya CP to IPW2019
- Annex 18: Presentation by Philippines CP to IPW2019
- Annex 19: Presentation by Sudan CP to IPW2019
- Annex 20: Presentation by Tanzania CP to IPW2019
- Annex 21: FaReNe: Contribution of LISF in improving group income in Burkina Faso & Mali
- Annex 22: IIRR experiences with gender issues
- Annex 23: Gender and PID training in Kenya
- Annex 24: Feedback from POG to IPW
- Annex 25: SRC's report on Prolinnova regionalisation process in WCA
- Annex 26: Farmer-Led Innovation Network, UK (PPT with transcript)
- Annex 27: Action planning for the Prolinnova network

List of acronyms

ACDEP	Association of Church-based Development Projects
AOPP	<i>Association des Organisations Professionnelles Paysannes</i> (Association of Professional Farmer Organisations)
APAARI	Asia-Pacific Association of Agricultural Research Institutions
ARD	agricultural research and development
CCA	climate-change adaptation
CP	Country Platform
ESA	Eastern and Southern Africa
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FaReNe	Farmer-led Research Networks
FGD	focus-group discussion
FLIN	Farmer-Led Innovation Network
GIZ	Germany Agency for International Cooperation
ICT	information and communications technology
IIRR	International Institution of Rural Reconstruction
IPRs	intellectual property rights
IPW	International Partners Workshop
IST	International Support Team
KIT	Royal Tropical Institute
KZE	<i>Katholische Zentralstelle e.V.</i> (Catholic Central Agency for Development Aid)
LISF	Local Innovation Support Facility/Funds
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
MSP	multistakeholder platform
NGO	nongovernmental organisation
NSC	National Steering Committee
PID	participatory innovation development
POG	Prolinnova Oversight Group
Proli-FaNS	Promoting local innovation for Food and Nutrition Security
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SRC	subregional coordinator
SUDAC	Swiss Universities Development and Cooperation Network
Sup-FaNS	Scaling up the Promotion of local innovation for Food and Nutrition Security
UK	United Kingdom
WCA	West and Central Africa

Day 1: Monday 13 May – Proli-FaNS annual partners meeting

Welcome, overview and introduction

Chris Macoloo, the moderator for Day 1, gave the floor to Assane Gueye, the coordinator of the host organisation in Senegal, Agrecol–Afrique, who welcomed all participants (see Annex 1) to Senegal. Then the participants briefly introduced themselves and expressed their expectations from the meetings, referring to both the third annual meeting of partners in the Proli-FaNS (Promoting local innovation in Food and Nutrition Security) project on Days 1 and 2 as well as the Prolinnova International Partners Workshop (IPW) on Days 3 and 4. Ms Brigid Letty presented the programme (see Annex 2), which had been revised after Misereor sent comments on the proposal for a follow-on project to Proli-FaNS, because the meeting provided a good opportunity to discuss those comments.

Overview report on Proli-FaNS

The Proli-FaNS project coordinator Joe Nchor gave an overview report on the Proli-FaNS project (see Annex 3). The project includes on-the-ground work by Prolinnova Country Platforms (CPs) in five countries: Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Ghana and Kenya. Joe spoke about the status of the project, its key achievements and some lessons learnt. He went briefly through the project targets and indicators and pointed out the key challenges. The Association of Church-based Development Projects (ACDEP), a non-governmental organisation (NGO) in northern Ghana, is the project holder on behalf of the Prolinnova network, and Joe as project coordinator is based in ACDEP. He acknowledged the International Support Team (IST) that backstops the project; this includes people at the Royal Tropical Institute (KIT) in The Netherlands and at the International Institute of Rural Reconstruction (IIRR) in the Philippines. Within each CP, there is collaboration among local partners from NGOs and governmental organisations and, at each action-learning site, with local multistakeholder platforms (MSPs). Two subregional coordinators (SRCs) – one for West & Central Africa (WCA) and one for Eastern & Southern Africa (ESA) – facilitate and support project implementation in the CPs and also coordinate the activities within their respective subregional Prolinnova platforms.

The Proli-FaNS project has three main objectives:

- 1) Rural communities develop their innovative capacities to effectively improve food security, nutrition security and nutritional diversity.
- 2) Women are more widely recognised as innovators and are supported in further developing their innovations, from which they control the benefits.
- 3) Subregional Prolinnova platforms support national CPs to develop capacity for collective learning, mobilising resources and effective policy dialogue.

Proli-FaNS Country Platform reports

The coordinators of the five CPs involved in on-the-ground activities in Proli-FaNS each gave brief reports on the CP's activities and achievements: Do Christophe Ouattara for Burkina Faso, Jean Bosco Etoa for Cameroon, Ms Beza Kifle for Ethiopia, Vincent Mariadho for Kenya and Joe Nchor for Ghana. They brought several examples of local innovations related to food and nutrition security that had been identified in their countries, with a special focus on innovation by women and women's groups, e.g. in the realm of preparing and processing food. They described some of the cases of participatory innovation development (PID) and highlighted the key lessons learnt and some challenges they encountered during project implementation. The five presentations can be found in Annexes 4–8.

Etoa explained that some innovations are included in two or even three different types of document: in the catalogue of innovations, in the more detailed descriptions of the innovations and in the documentation of PID cases based on the innovations.

The other workshop participants posed some questions and raised some issues, which related to:

Registering CP as legal entity: Etoa raised this issue with reference to Prolinnova–Cameroon. Chris pointed to the negative experience in this respect in the case of Prolinnova–Kenya. Surely COSADER as host organisation in Cameroon – or indeed any other partner organisation in the CP in Cameroon – could submit concept notes and proposals on behalf of the CP.

Identifying local innovations: In some cases, there seemed to be uncertainty about how to identify local innovations that are relevant for Proli-FaNS. Ms Ann Waters-Bayer reminded the participants that there are guidelines for identifying innovations for the Proli-FaNS project, worked out by Joe Nchor in collaboration with project partners. These guidelines can be found on the Proli-FaNS page of the Prolinnova website (<http://www.prolinnova.net/fns>).

Link with food and nutrition security: Some participants pointed out that project implementation should not look merely at meeting targets in terms of number of local innovations or PID cases but should also give attention to the quality of the innovations and PID, particularly how they contribute to better food and nutrition security. The documentation should make this clear; the guidelines for this may need to be revised so that the relevant information is collected. We need to provide evidence that local innovation and PID are indeed contributing to food and nutrition security.

Link between identifying local innovations and advocacy: Good examples of local innovations and PID processes based on them can be used in advocacy to inform governments and NGOs about the PID approach. It is important that the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) data collected are of the type that would convince policymakers, e.g. related to productivity, nutrition & food security.

Intellectual property rights (IPRs): It needs to be considered in which cases it makes sense to seek legal protection of a local innovation, in view of the fact that most innovations identified by Prolinnova are meant to be spread as good ideas. Etoa explained that even someone like the farmer Ekani in Cameroon, who developed a way to decrease the bitterness in chocolate without using sugar, although he wanted to set up a small company, thought that it was better to have his innovation documented and be a subject of PID so as to improve it, rather than just “sitting on his innovation” and not improving it, so he agreed to have the innovation documented and shared.

Gender balance: It was striking that some CPs (e.g. in Ethiopia and Kenya) had documented relatively few innovations by women and less than 50% of the PID cases involved women. More attention will need to be paid to achieving a better balance, indeed giving much more attention to female than to male innovators. Hopefully, a follow-on project to Proli-FaNS will give an opportunity to pursue this.

Awarding women innovators: It was noted that the CP in Ghana had managed to gain recognition from government bodies for women innovators, to whom prizes were given. People from other CPs wanted to know what the “secret” for this is. Malex Alebikiya, Director of ACDEP, pointed out that the different stakeholders in the CP in Ghana have been collaborating since the 1980s, so there was already recognition in government circles and preparedness to give awards to innovators, both women and men. He stressed that this did not happen automatically. It is up to the CP to initiate activities to bring attention in the public domain to the achievements of women, such as proposing them for awards given normally for adopting introduced technologies or organising a farmer innovation fair where government authorities can give awards to the top female and male innovators. People from the Ministry of Agriculture are members of the MSPs at the action-learning sites in Ghana and are directly involved in selecting local innovations and innovators. It is important also to incorporate people from government agencies in the National Steering Committee (NSC) and

work through these people to create awards for women innovators. The focus of Proli-FaNS is on an area that coincides with government policy interests. In Ghana, local authorities give the awards for innovation important in their districts.

Links with universities: Joe Ouko, farmer representative in the Prolinnova Oversight Group (POG), suggested that more efforts be made to include university staff and students in documenting and assessing local innovations and engaging in PID, as this is so important for teaching younger generations. It is necessary that the university staff understand well the approach and values of the Prolinnova network. In one of the cases presented from Cameroon, university students and other researchers were using data and even photographs taken by a local innovator but were not acknowledging or feeding back results or papers/articles/theses to him: this matter needs to be taken up with them and their supervisors.

Links with other researchers: This is functioning well in countries like Ghana and Kenya, that have dedicated partners from formal research organisations in their CP, but continues to be difficult in some countries. In Ethiopia, for example, researchers want to be compensated for their involvement. It is important to find researchers who are motivated by the possibility to engage directly with small-scale farmers and with the dynamics of local knowledge. On the other hand, the Ministry of Innovation and Technology in Ethiopia is reportedly willing to support several cases of PID, so this activity could be seen as a part of the mandated work of the government staff and not requiring additional resources from Prolinnova.

Local Innovation Support Facility (LISF): Rather than merely using the LISF to support innovators involved in the project, the CPs should be looking at how the LISF mechanism could be sustained through links with the government, so that this approach will continue after the project ends.

Sharing information about local innovation and PID: It is easier to include all local innovations identified in one country in the framework of the Proli-FaNS project in a single document, such as the catalogue that was produced by Prolinnova–Kenya. Good experiences in sharing were made with radio broadcasts, especially when other farmers could call in to ask for more information or to draw attention to their own innovations. This channel could be pursued more deliberately by all CPs.

End-of-project external evaluation report

The lead evaluation, Rosaine Yegbemy, presented the main findings from the end-of-project external evaluation conducted in March–April 2019. His PPT presentation can be found in Annex 9. Some of the main issues and suggestions he raised were:

- Data are lacking about the number of farmers attending dissemination events and the number of farmers adopting local innovations.
- Were the innovations identified actually good ones according to the criteria (food and nutrition security, climate change)?
- The M&E system was weak: poor-quality data, late submission of data from CPs; impact assessment needs a baseline survey but this wasn't done due to resource constraints.
- Some stakeholders still focus on upscaling innovations rather than encouraging innovation.
- Lack of exchange visits.
- IP issues – some farmers want to profit/benefit from their innovations.
- PID activities need their own participatory M&E process so that the stakeholders can evaluate the involvement of the different stakeholders.
- How do we incentivise achievement of objectives? e.g. more budget for those doing best.
- Have M&E systems using smart phones.

Some comments and questions of workshop participants were:

- To what extent have the project objectives been achieved? The numbers of innovations are given but this reflects only achievement of targets, not achievement of objectives. The objectives can easily be linked with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which means that the results of Proli-FaNS could be used for advocacy in this regard.
- It would have been good to include some in-depth analyses of some local innovations and the extent to which they contribute to better food and nutrition security.
- Was the evaluation team able to assess whether the advocacy activities have been effective? Each country needs many champions for PID, and many more policymakers in each country need to be targeted.
- The CPs should be selecting good examples of local innovations that could make a convincing case for promoting local innovation to improve food and nutrition security.
- Not all CPs regard the Proli-FaNS support (which is relatively small) as seed money that can be combined with support from other sources to be able to achieve the network's overall aims.
- The M&E guidelines – although clear and relatively simple – appeared to be problematic for some CPs. It is true that no baseline was made and a sample of farmers was not followed through from the beginning to the end of the project. But in such an open-ended project where one does not know at the outset which farmers and innovations will be involved, it is not possible to take a conventional approach to M&E and one has to rely more on qualitative data.
- It would be interesting to know how the evaluators assess achievements on the institutional level, e.g. i) NSC and local MSPs. What are dynamics, experiences and lessons learnt at the level of the NSCs and the local MSP in the different countries? ii) Regionalisation (Objective 3 of the project): how far are we in terms of forming regional bodies in Africa, and how well are they structured and functioning?

The participants were divided into two groups (anglophone and francophone) to discuss the following two questions:

1. What are key concerns / opportunities / aspects (positive or negative) raised by the evaluators?
2. How could these be addressed?

The feedback from the two groups is combined in the table below.

Weaknesses	How to address them	When
Weak understanding of principles and guidelines of Prolinnova network	Strengthen capacities of all at CP level in a continuous way	Project phases 1 + 2
Frequent staff turnover	Strengthen capacities of all at CP level in a continuous way Provide more motivation	Project phases 1 + 2
Delay in sending reports and transferring funds	All parties (including donors) to respect their responsibilities	Project phases 1 + 2
Lack of flexibility in allocation of resources	Put in place a dynamic mechanism for allocating resources	Project phase 2
Insecurity in parts of some countries	Flexibility in choice of action-learning areas	Project phase 2
Weak involvement of formal researchers	Work with students / trainees that are supervised by formal researchers	Project phase 2
Weak capacity to mobilise financial resources	Diffusion of information about calls for project proposals Strengthening capacities in designing projects and elaborating project proposals Stronger lobbying and networking	Project phase 2

Day 2: Tuesday 14 May – Proli-FaNS annual partners meeting

Recap of Day 1 and review of Day 2 agenda

The second day started with a recap of Day 1. Malex, the moderator of Day 2, facilitated this session, in which he encouraged participants to recollect the emerging issues. These included:

- Identifying innovations by women is key for Proli-FaNS.
- Impressed by the diversity of innovations presented.
- Use of several different means to share / disseminate local innovations.
- Using third parties to recognise and give awards to local innovators is already a step towards scaling up Prolinnova's approach.
- We need to make clear how local innovations are linked to food and nutritional security but, on the other hand, we should not simply drop other cases, because it is important to encourage innovative behaviour that builds resilience even if not directly related to food and nutrition.
- Issues around recognising the legal status of the innovation network at country level.
- Experiences in working with formal researchers: they are still only weakly involved in most cases; we need to develop a better strategy to get them involved.
- Importance of linking with universities on the most convincing local innovations so that students can document and learn from them, but there is a need for close supervision of the students so that they work within Prolinnova's philosophy.
- Economic benefits in some local innovations: these are important for scaling up the innovations; it is not just about costs and benefits in terms of cash but also labour requirements; formal researchers could help farmers assess for what need in what areas the innovation fits; one of the criteria for selecting an innovation should be the number of people who could benefit from it.
- Farmers' innovations are very important for economising on the use of resources.
- Staff turnover has weakened some CPs; this needs to be addressed.
- Increased efforts are being made to develop concept notes and proposals, but the CPs and SRCs should follow the POG guidelines for this process in order to ensure good quality.
- The project, with its focus on food and nutrition security, is very relevant for both local people and policymakers and this will also be so in the future; we are working along the right lines. The work fits very well within the context of SEWOH (One World No Hunger).
- The achievements are specific to each CP, especially in awarding women innovators and policy engagement; there are good experiences for CPs to learn from each other. But much of the advocacy was not very strategic; it simply increased the visibility of innovators and the project.
- One way to strengthen the advocacy effort at regional (Africa) level would be to compile an attractive booklet on collaboration between innovative farmers and formal researchers. Cases could include biopesticide against fall armyworm in Ethiopia, developing an enriched traditional food (*wasawasa*) together with a nutrition specialist in Ghana, biopesticides in Burkina Faso and Kenya, and reducing bitterness in chocolate in Cameroon. By the end of June, the CP coordinators should send their cases to the SRCs and Ann, who will make comments in July and complete a final draft of the booklet in August.

Project M&E and preparation of project reports

Joe Nchor facilitated the M&E and reporting session, which was structured in this way.

1. Review of project's M&E framework
2. Reporting: guidelines, reports to be submitted, deadlines
3. Discussion

Project's M&E framework: Joe presented the M&E framework (see Annex 10) with the key indicators to remind everyone what had been agreed at the outset.

Project M&E is supposed to be done at two levels:

- 1) Keeping track of progress (numbers)
- 2) Finding out whether promoting local innovation and PID contributes to development outcomes within the CP.

At Level 1, the first main outcome is innovation in rural communities to achieve greater food security, nutritional diversity and nutrition security. The second one is wider recognition of rural women as innovators and supporting them in further developing their innovations in ways that the women control the benefits.

At Level 2, the first main outcome is an increase in the capacity to innovate at the community/ local level. The second one is related to improved status of food and nutrition security in the community. The CPs have not given much attention to this in their reporting thus far.

The following issues arose during the discussion in plenary:

- Relatively poor use has been made of the M&E framework to date.
- It is important to report on the actions but even more important to report on the effects/ outcomes of the actions.
- On what basis can we say that the subregional platforms are functioning? What indicators/proof do we have for this?
- The development outcome of increased capacity to innovate would be indicated, among other things, by the number of new innovations or experiments – not only related to food and nutrition security – that farmers are doing on their own initiative and in collaboration with other stakeholders in agricultural research and development (ARD).
- The development outcome of improved nutritional status of the families/communities concerned would be indicated e.g. by increased number of meals per day and increased diversity in the diet. This is maybe too ambitious for a three-year project, but how could we explain that what we have achieved is going in the right direction towards this outcome? This could perhaps be achieved through narratives of farmers involved, describing their situation at the start and then whether their situation has become better or worse or remained the same over the three years of the project. This would need to take into account also other factors such as drought. These narratives could be based on individual interviews or focus-group discussions (FGDs).
- Perhaps the objective should be expressed rather in terms of increased capacity to access sufficient food. The project does not work directly on production, but one could look at how the project is supporting strategies to mitigate the lean/hungry period ("*soudure*"). Such issues could be explored in FGDs.
- It is also possible to use Venn diagrams in FGDs to capture the changes in number and quality of linkages of the farmers with other stakeholders/institutions in ARD.
- The external evaluator Rosaine noted that the responses of farmers and other stakeholders may even suggest a lower capacity to access sufficient and nutritious foods because, during the project, they have become much more aware of what good nutrition is.
- As there was no specific target population at the beginning of project (we did not know which innovators/families would be identified), it was not possible to collect "before" and "after" data.
- It was suggested that the SRCs should prepare a simple guide for FGDs and send this to the CP coordinators by mid-June, so that they can conduct FGDs before writing up their final reports.

Ann briefly presented the main questions from Misereor about achievements during the current project (see Annex 11). Discussion of these issues was incorporated into this session on planning for the final months of the project (see below).

Reporting guidelines: Joe then gave a brief description of how the annual report (1 August 2018 – 31 July 2019) and end of project report (1 August 2016 – 31 July 2019) should be structured: changes in the project context during the reporting period, implementing the project and achieving its objectives, and conclusion including key lessons and challenges. Among other reports/deliverables to accompany the annual report, the CPs could include:

- Responses to Sabine’s issues in Points 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7 (see Annex 11);
- Cumulative M&E data based on the objectives and indicators
- Case studies and success stories
- PID process reports/publications; and
- Local innovation profiles or catalogues by thematic area.

The final end-of-project report should contain information as in the annual reports and additionally cover the following items regarding internal and external stakeholders and actors:

- With what team did you implement the project activities?
- What other actors were involved in implementing the project?
- Describe who was involved in the M&E and how they assessed the outcomes and impacts.
- Include a section on outlook/ sustainability:
 - How sustainable are the positive effects overall?
 - How did you rate the structural sustainability?

Action planning for Proli-FaNS until end of project

For action planning up to project end on 31 July 2019, each participant was asked to suggest at least two actions that should be undertaken, the timeframe and who should be responsible. Some of these suggestions included:

- Assétou Kanouté suggested that a catalogue be produced in which information about innovations identified in all the five African countries involved in Proli-FaNS are combined. However, the general consensus was in favour of making catalogues per country, for uploading on the CP page of the website as well as the Proli-FaNS page and for sharing within each country.
- Mawahib Ahmed suggested, while writing up each innovation, it would be good to include a diagram to show the evolution of innovation.
- Assane suggested developing strategies to increase diversity in food sources so as to reduce or avoid periods of food shortage, and to look into innovation in food storage.
- Rosaine suggested making a series of questionnaires about the project, e.g. how people perceive the project; whether and how people use the new foods developed; what differences people see between the current food situation of their family/community in comparison with three years ago; what new innovations have been developed as a result of the stimulation by the project.

The action plan that was finalised during this session of the workshop can be found in Annex 12.

Draft proposal for follow-on project “SuP-FaNS”

Joe presented an overview of the draft proposal for a follow-on project (2019–22) with the working title “Scaling up the Promotion of local innovation for Food and Nutrition Security” (SuP-FaNS, see Annex 13). In most cases, the same action-learning sites have been proposed, but one site in Ghana will be replaced because the local NGO implementing the project in that site is not able to continue.

Chris expressed concern about how the work in the follow-on project can focus on scaling out if one site is new and therefore just starting the process, i.e. has nothing to scale out. Joe said that the new site already has experience in the PID approach, so it would not be a problem.

The focus in the follow-on project would be on scaling up the capacity to innovate by small-scale farmers through wider application of the ProInnova approach of promoting local innovation and PID. This will require policy dialogue with big and strong partners in each country.

For effective policy dialogue, each CP will need very strong examples of PID on the ground. If CPs can manage to build capacity at grassroots level, then a people's/farmers' movement would force government to institutionalise the approach.

Juergen Anthofer suggested that it would help in focusing the follow-on project if the CPs would first identify what the project wants to achieve in three years and then formulate the activities needed to reach these outputs and outcomes.

Donor's comments on the follow-on project proposal

Ann presented the comments sent by Sabine (Misereor) about the proposal for the follow-on project. Sabine started by giving her understanding of the main aims of the proposal:

- 1) to consolidate what has been started in terms of participatory research and innovation in the field of FaNS, especially with women farmers at local and CP level
- 2) to disseminate innovations at different scales (locally, nationally – and beyond?)
- 3) to advance institutionalisation of PID at local, research station (?) and national level
- 4) to consolidate the ProInnova organisational setups at all levels in order to install a functional mechanism of an Africa-wide network.

The main points raised by Sabine were:

- ***Objective 1 and indicators (Promoting local innovation):*** For the current phase, the target was 20 innovations per learning site; in the next phase, it is only 10. Why is it reduced?
- ***Dissemination of innovations:*** Should Point 9b) be formulated as an independent objective so as to come up with goal-oriented strategies and an operational dissemination strategy at CP level?
- ***Objective 2 and indicators (Capacity development among CP partners):*** Why so hesitant in formulating ambitious outcomes and impact? Boosting the number of people trained in PID methods is an important step, but the sheer number of people trained will have little effect on institutionalisation, if the training is not supported by other strategies. As international papers increasingly refer to co-creation of knowledge / co-production of research (e.g. EU–AU Task Force's Africa–Europe Agenda for Rural Transformation), it is important that especially the regional and subregional level try to identify opportunities to tap these opportunities to put PID forward in the debate. The annual meeting/IPW could help improve the underlying strategy.
- ***Objective 3 and indicators (Completing regionalisation in Africa):*** At least one indicator should state that: a) the roles of each level are clearly defined; b) mechanisms have been put in place between all levels to allow bottom-up information flows and vice versa; and c) areas for synergies are defined.
- ***Choice of learning sites:*** Some CP members have reliable core funding for their participatory innovation work. Avoid that learning sites under SuP-FaNS match with learning sites under core funding of the CP member organisations, especially Misereor/KZE partner organisations.

This presentation stimulated some discussion and questions:

- Should the focus of the follow-on project be on disseminating innovations or scaling up/ institutionalising PID?

- Assétou suggested that farmer pressure could result in more force for institutionalisation.
- Misereor does not want to see the same activities being supported by multiple funders.
- Indicators for completion of the regionalisation process in Africa could be that:
 - i) responsibilities and roles at the various levels are clearly defined;
 - ii) mechanisms for flow of information between the different levels are in place;
 - iii) synergies within and between the different levels are identified.
- In view of the reservation expressed by the SRCs on proceeding to an African regional network before the subregional networks are well established, should we really seek to form the regional network in the follow-on project, or should we focus on strengthening the subregional networks? Malex pointed out that we can choose to abandon certain strategic decisions we had made earlier if these prove to be unrealistic; Misereor would not hold us to the earlier strategy as long as we explain what has changed and why.

Addressing donor's comments on institutionalisation of PID

The participants divided up into two groups – anglophone and francophone – to reflect on the following two questions based on the comments from the donor:

- What are key strategies/activities to institutionalise PID?
- How can we tap into the opportunities of current interest in co-creation of knowledge?

Feedback from the anglophone group

Institutionalising PID: This means mainstreaming/internalisation in government extension, research, local governments and universities in terms of policies, job descriptions and programmes.

Key strategies/activities to institutionalise PID:

- Identify and recruit like-minded people in target organisations (research, extension, university)
- Draw on like-minded people in target organisations to have co-funded activities
- MSPs at national level and action-learning sites should include people from extension, research and universities to influence their work
- Farmer innovation fairs including participation of students, researchers and university staff
- Involve formal researchers in PID / invite them to training with view to joint farmer-led research
- Raise awareness through communication in research meetings: abstracts and conference papers
- Make scientific publications based on joint research (these would contribute to key performance indicators of research and university staff)
- Arrange practical attachment (less expensive) or scholarships (more expensive) for university students to engage in PID
- Through involvement of Masters students in PID, influence their supervisors in the university
- Audit (non-degree) course in PID for students
- Curriculum development in universities, including practical training
- Policy-dialogue activities to advocate for PID such as:
 - present papers on ProInnova approach / PID outcomes at policy workshops
 - Invite government and university people to national workshops
 - invite policymakers (e.g. District Directors) to workshops where farmers provide evidence of effectiveness of PID approach.

How to tap into opportunities of current interest in co-creation of knowledge:

- Make inputs about PID into conferences with topics related to co-creation of knowledge
- Respond to calls for proposals for co-creation of knowledge applying PID approach, e.g.:
 - Participatory plant breeding

- Land and water management
- Climate-smart agriculture
- Use the term “local co-creation” in proposals instead of using “PID”.

Feedback from the francophone group

Key strategies/activities to institutionalise PID:

- Choice of actors / allies – the choice of formal researchers is very important
- Highlight evidence of innovations and PID results
- Capacity building of teachers and formal researchers
- Field visits by formal research and university staff to see local innovations
- Ask researchers to validate posters or provide fact sheets to support local innovation
- Bring PID into conferences and debates at universities
- Find researchers who understand PID and who agree to change their ways of doing things
- Establish protocol/convention for student research/involvement in PID
- Introduce PID in training curricula
- Set up National Roundtable of Donors and funds to support local innovation
- The process takes a lot of time.

How to tap into opportunities of current interest in co-creation of knowledge:

- Document success stories and identify priority areas of interest
- Use local knowledge for joint knowledge creation (farmers and formal researchers)
- LISF facilitates co-creation of knowledge by funding applied research by small-scale farmers
- Closer interactions between CPs, SRCs and IST.

Main conclusions and closure of the Proli-FaNS meeting

In the final discussion on how to improve functioning of the follow-on project compared with Proli-FaNS, it was suggested to revise the communication guidelines to include feedback by the project management and IST (including the SRCs) on CP reports and other documents so that there is more mutual learning and improved quality of reporting/documentation. It will also be necessary to work out more clearly the roles of the subregional taskforce members.

The Proli-FaNS coordinator summarised the major conclusions of the Proli-FaNS annual partners meeting. Sharing of the progress reports at this workshop greatly helped the CP coordinators to learn from each other’s experiences, as well as from common and individual weaknesses and challenges faced in project implementation. Among the major weaknesses identified to be addressed in the remaining period and more systematically in a future follow-on project are: i) inadequate integration of gender into promoting local innovation and PID to effectively address women’s issues related to food and nutrition security, ii) not meeting the targets with respect to women innovators, and iii) limiting project reporting to achievement of targets rather than achievement of objectives. The review of the project reporting guidelines and requirements and of the M&E targets during the workshop will hopefully help address some of the current reporting challenges.

The findings of the end-of-project evaluation report shared by the evaluation consultant not only showed important achievements and successes made under Proli-FaNS, but also revealed the weaknesses and challenges at CP implementation level, as well as further opportunities to explore. These will serve as important lessons to focus the follow-on and other future projects to promote local innovation and PID to improve the food and nutrition security of rural women and men.

The Proli-FaNS meeting enabled the team of ACDEP, IST and SRCs to obtain additional inputs from the participants for the follow-on proposal. Participants also reviewed Misereor’s comments on the

draft proposal and provided advice to revise it for re-submission. Necessary actions and steps were also collectively adopted to address issues raised on performance (to be included in the proposal under lessons learnt) to be able to improve documentation and reporting on the current project.

ACDEP and IST/POG wish to thank Misereor for funding the end-of-project workshop through the Proli-FaNS project as well as the top-up funding for additional participants, as this greatly enhanced the mutual learning and capacity building among the project partners and the other Prolinnova CPs.

Social evening

A social evening with local food and music was organised by Aboubakrine Beye of the Centre Mampuya in the large exhibition area where the Prolinnova marketplace was set up the following morning.



Group photo at the marketplace (Photo: Armelle Sylvie Kaptchouang Ngambia)

Day 3: Wednesday 15 May – International Partners Workshop (IPW)

Organisation of Prolinnova marketplace

The CPs prepared their stands in the large exhibition area at the Centre Mampuya. This was also where the official opening of the IPW was held.

Official opening of International Partners Workshop (IPW)

Assane, as moderator, spoke some welcoming words and introduced the members of Agrecol–Afrique. He explained that the aim of the meeting was to interact and to exchange experiences in order to spread the idea of promoting local innovation among all participants.

As African co-chair of the Prolinnova Oversight Group (POG), Chris introduced the main concepts of the Prolinnova approach and the network. Babacar Gueye, the coordinator of the Resource Centre for Organic Farming and Social and Solidarity Economy (CRABES) in Thiès, spoke briefly about the importance of documenting local innovation. Alioune Fall, the representative of the mayor of Toubab Dialaw, also welcomed all the participants. Everyone was invited to enjoy the marketplace exhibits, where the various CPs had set up presentations of their activities and documents. Through discussion during the marketplace, participants could find out more details about how the CPs and the innovations function.



Interactions on the Prolinnova marketplace (Photos: Papa Madha Sarr)

Introductions of the different CPs

The rest of Day 3 was moderated by Zacharia Malley. After the tour of the marketplace had been completed, the following CPs had an opportunity to present their ongoing Prolinnova activities and their plans to advance the Prolinnova approach: Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Mali, Philippines, Senegal, South Africa, Sudan and Tanzania. The available presentations can be found in Annexes 14–20.

Ann also brought some brief news about the CPs in Bolivia and Peru, which currently do not have any external funding for their Prolinnova activities and therefore could not attend this IPW. However, they are carrying out relevant work with existing resources and are jointly seeking funding to collaborate in promoting local innovation and PID.

Some highlights from the presentations and discussions in this session are summarised here:

- **Ghana:** The governmental Research & Extension Liaison Committee (RELC) meets quarterly and is represented in the NSC; new technologies from research are shared during these meetings, which also provide opportunities to share local innovations and outcomes of PID processes.
- **Cameroon:** Although the CP works on the ground in only one district, the NSC has a broader coverage. The CP focuses on one site because it started fairly recently thanks to the Proli-FaNS project and wants to build a body of evidence that can help in scaling out. It plans to expand the network from Lekie Division to the nine other divisions in the Central Region, with a MSP in each division. The CP has already developed three concept notes to expand the PID work.
- **Philippines:** IIRR has mainstreamed the approach of farmer-led joint experimentation in its work with communities, calling it Participatory Action Research (PAR). Good results are being achieved with a variant on the LISF, called the Community Innovation Fund. The CP is partnering with research programmes in Southeast Asia so that they can learn about these concepts.
- **Senegal:** The coordinator has visited several of the over 15 organisations in the national platform to ask them to meet and collaborate although the CP has no external funding. The organisations are doing their own relevant work, but there is little networking between them.

Chris asked whether all the CPs are meeting the jointly developed minimum requirements. Two self-assessments made by CP representatives present were:

- **Burkina Faso:** There are no governmental organisations involved, only NGOs, because of insufficient external funding to be able to bring in people from governmental organisations.
- **South Africa:** Without external funding, activities of the CP are minimal; the members do not meet formally, but they communicate informally with each other. It should be considered whether to archive the CP on the website until there is more action in South Africa.

Farmer-led joint research & local innovation for food & nutrition security: examples

FaReNe: Contribution of LISF in improving group income in Burkina Faso and Mali

Siaka Bangali and Christophe Ouattara presented experiences of the Farmer-led Research Networks (FaReNe) project in Burkina Faso and Mali in using local innovation funds to support the process of agro-ecological intensification. The PPT can be found in Annex 21.

Some issues that were raised during the discussion included:

- Who was active from the national farmers' organisation (AOPP) at the regional level and who at the national level?
- Are farmers happy to use the funds to pay for institutional support? The response was that the funds were used for technical support.
- In one case, the LISF was used to buy small ruminants for women, who fed crop byproducts to the animals and used the manure to fertilise the crops. The livestock also generated income for the LISF. The men decided that the women should receive sheep through the LISF from the project and put this into their action plan.
- Who handled the funds? This was done by the NGO that received the funds and made them available to the farmer groups. The members of these groups disbursed the funds for specific activities. The funds were given to groups rather than to individuals as it allowed better control.

IIRR experiences with gender issues

Ms Maggie Rosimo, the coordinator of Prolinnova–Philippines, presented experiences in training and facilitating communities to use a participatory climate vulnerability assessment tool. It includes a 24-hour clock to help quantify the work of women and men. The tool considers gender aspects with respect to ownership of assets, access to information and decision-making. It was found that women

bear more of the consequences of climate change than men do in small-scale farming households. The tool uses the Women's Empowerment in Agriculture (WEIA) framework, which considers production, resources, income, leadership and time. The tool also makes use of the "Photo Voice" technique to capture impact and to facilitate participatory monitoring, evaluation and learning (PMEL). Maggie's PPT can be found in Annex 22.

Gender and PID training in Kenya

Vincent Mariadho, the coordinator of Prolinnova–Kenya, reported on the experience of the CP in working together with Chesha Wettasinha and Mona Dhamankar from KIT on a project funded by the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO) on gender analysis and PID (GALID). After analysing how gender aspects had been addressed in the Prolinnova work in Kenya and Nepal, Chesha and Mona had developed guidelines for gender-responsive farmer-led innovation development. These guidelines were tested in Kenya, starting with a workshop in October 2018 in Nairobi, in collaboration with World Neighbors Kenya, the host organisation of Prolinnova–Kenya.

The participants learned how to apply a "gender lens" in examining their work to promote farmer-led innovation processes. This lens provides insights into division of labour, access to and control over resources, decision-making within the household, and values and assumption/norms (which gender norms does the local innovation challenge?).

Vincent presented an example of backyard poultry-keeping, which is generally the domain of women, but some men are developing local innovations in backyard poultry-keeping that challenge the domination of women in this activity.

Vincent's PPT can be found in Annex 23.

Final remarks for the day

As final remarks of the day, Malex raised a concern that – with some notable exceptions – our network has not been able to influence donors so that promoting local innovation and PID are part of the development agenda that they support. When Prolinnova was initiated in 1999 as a Global Partnership Programme, there was a global discourse about alternative/participatory approaches to research and development and the Prolinnova initiators in NGOs had hoped to build national and global partnerships to implement and showcase PID as an alternative/participatory approach. However, the global discourse seems to have changed. Do we need to re-strategise now – 20 years down the line?

These remarks served to prepare the ground for the discussion the following day on a new Prolinnova strategy. It was decided to use the open space "World Café" session to consider how to reposition Prolinnova in the context of change.

Day 4: Thursday 16 May – International Partners Workshop (IPW)

Maggie moderated the morning session. Brigid presented the revised programme for the day.

Feedback from POG to IPW

Chris gave feedback from the POG meeting that had been held on Sunday, 12 May (see Annex 24). A lot has happened since the last face-to-face meeting of the POG in Nairobi in May 2018. Much attention was given to improving governance in the CPs, supported through South–South backstopping. There are two new applications of groups wanting to join the Prolinnova community of Practice: one from Kerala State in India and one from Zimbabwe, but some questions still need be clarified by the taskforces in Asia and ESA, which will make their recommendations to the POG for decision-making.

This year (end of June), there will be changes in the composition of the POG after the elections held earlier this year. Three members whose terms have come to an end are Djibril Thiam (WCA seat), Elske van de Fliert and Juergen Anthofer (both in independent seats). The incoming members as of 1 July 2019 will be: Samba Traoré, Lisa Williams van Dijk and Bernard Triomphe, respectively.

Regionalisation and Southernisation

It had originally been foreseen that the SRCs would make brief presentations on the progress in regionalisation in Africa. However, the SRC for ESA, Amanuel Assefa, resigned in March and the person who is replacing him, Brigid, has not yet been updated on developments. The SRC for WCA, Georges Djohy, had to cancel his participation in the IPW because of a sudden illness in his family. However, he sent a PPT about activities and progress of the subregional platform in WCA, which can be found in Annex 25.

The participants divided into subgroups – WCA, ESA and Asia – to discuss their (sub)regional plans. The feedback from these subgroups is summarised below:

Where are we with regionalisation of Prolinnova in West & Central Africa (WCA)?

- 5 CPs and 5 members in the taskforce for regionalisation
- Contact with groups in Togo, Benin, Niger and Nigeria
- Evaluation of the work of the subregional coordinator
- Monitoring of CP activities
- Communication and feedback / translation of documents
- Resource mobilisation
- Resource constraints

Plans / Action points

- Put in place the subregional platform
- Supervise the activities and operation of the CPs
- Develop an annual activity plan
- Organise regional fairs
- Create an expert file for South–South backstopping
- Build capacities of the CPs
- Mobilise resources

Where are we with regionalisation of Prolinnova in Eastern & Southern Africa (ESA)?

- 5 active CPs and 5 members in taskforce for regionalisation
- 1 CP not active (in Mozambique)
- Draft charter for subregional network

Plans / Action points

- Finalise the ESA charter and the ESA brochure
- Improve communication with the taskforce
- Engage with Prolinnova–Mozambique
- Follow up on interest of Zimbabwe to form a CP
- Supervise the activities and operation of the CPs
- Build capacities of the CPs
- Mobilise resources for country-level and regional activities

Where are we with regionalisation of Prolinnova in Asia?

- 4 CPs and 4 members of taskforce for regionalisation
- Group in southern India (Kerala) interested in forming CP at state level

Suggestions from POG to move the Asia regional platform forward

- If possible, conduct regional meetings virtually to make things happen
- Go back to APAARI and try to explore possibilities of better interaction
- IIRR can enhance the Asia platform working from countries where it has a presence.
- Ask Chesha for her contact in Myanmar, as she did PID training there.
- Start from that nucleus and involve the CP in Nepal, which has contacts for funding

Plans / Action points

- Review and make recommendation on the India (Kerala) application to Prolinnova
- Emily to take up correspondence with James of Peermade (Kerala)
- Emily or Chantheang to be Asian representative in working group to draft the next strategy (2021–25)

Some points raised during discussion of the feedback from the groups were:

- The taskforces should be helping to set up oversight groups in the subregions but, in the meantime, they could already start performing some functions on an oversight group, such as fundraising, reviewing proposals, reviewing applications to set up new CPs, etc. Their main work is to support the SRC. By the time of the IPW in 2021, it is expected that the SRCs and taskforces in Africa will have set up two functioning subregional platforms, each with an oversight group.
- As some members of the taskforce in ESA are not responding to emails from the taskforce leader (thus far Brigid but now Zacharia, because Brigid has taken over the SRC role), it was decided that Beza (Ethiopia), Mawahib (Sudan) and Vincent (Kenya) be co-opted to join the taskforce. They can then remind the other taskforce members in their respective countries.
- In the Proli-FaNS project, more funds will be needed for someone to manage the work of the CP in Ghana, as it is too much for Joe to be both project manager and CP coordinator.
- It is not realistic to expect Misereor to support full-time SRCs. Paying full-time coordinators would mean that too high a proportion of the project budget would be for staff and administration rather than for work with farmers and rural communities on the ground. It is more likely that 2 days a week can be covered. Time spent on writing proposals that would help to support the SRC's own salary (up to 3 more days per week) may be outside of these 2 days.
- It will be necessary to confirm with Georges if he is willing to continue as SRC. For the SRC in ESA, it may be necessary to advertise the position. Brigid could stay on for 1–2 months until a new person has been identified.

- We need to be prepared that there may be a gap in funding between Proli-FaNS and SuP-FaNS. We also need to be realistic about what one can do with limited resources. We should tap the experience and capacities of the Friends of Prolinnova in trying to move the regionalisation process forward.

The next key Prolinnova event will be the regional meetings (Africa, Asia, possibly also Andes) in 2020. The African meeting will be hosted by Prolinnova–Cameroon, which plans to hold a national farmer innovation fair just before the regional meeting. As one year is a short time to organise such an event, the CP in Cameroon will need to take quick action to secure funding for the fair. If the follow-on proposal to Misereor comes through, there will be funds for at least people from the CPs in Burkina Faso, Ghana and Kenya to join the meeting and fair. It still has to be decided who will host the next IPW, which will take place in 2021.

UK network: Farmer-led Innovation Network (FLIN)

Lisa Williams van Dijk from the Royal Agricultural University in Cirencester, UK, made a presentation via Skype on the Farmer-led Innovation Network (FLIN) in the UK. Ann introduced her briefly as a newly elected independent member of the POG. Lisa described her journey through experiences with participatory research and development, e.g. working with farmers in Pakistan and working with youth and health authorities in Cairo, Egypt, before returning to Europe to do her PhD. She then tried to apply what she had learnt in the South to the North, i.e. in the UK. She coordinated a project called “Hennovation” involving farmer-led innovation networks to improve poultry health and welfare. She recently set up FLIN, which is a community of practice made up of diverse organisations that jointly promote farmer-centred innovation and research in the UK. Its approach is very similar to that of Prolinnova. It is likewise trying to influence how funds for ARD are invested. Lisa sees a paradigm shift with some funding in Europe now going to farmer-led multistakeholder groups involved in research. Her PPT presentation and the accompanying text are in Annexes 26a and 26b.

Developing the next Prolinnova strategic plan



Ann presented a summary of the 2016–20 Prolinnova strategy, which comes to an end next year. Chris led the discussion for strategic planning: assessing what we have achieved in view of what we had planned in the 2016–20 strategy, and jumpstarting the planning of the next (2021–25) strategy. He posed two key sets of questions:

- How has the context changed in the agricultural development sector, and how do we ensure that our network is still relevant?
- What should be our focus in the new strategic plan: what will be the building blocks (content and structure) and who will move this process further?

A team needs to be set up to draft the strategy, but we have the opportunity now to collect ideas on what to include.

The workshop participants made a quick self-assessment of the network based on the main lines of the 2016–20 strategy. Some areas where the network needs to strengthen its efforts are:

- Creating an enabling policy environment
- Building capacity of other ARD stakeholders in promoting local innovation and PID
- Mainstreaming promotion of local innovation and PID into major stakeholder institutions
- Promoting innovation by youth in the agri-food sector
- Producing better evidence through improved M&E.

Chris asked what new trends or developments we should consider when developing the new strategic plan. Brainstorming by participants produced the following trends and developments that should form the context for Prolinnova's plan:

- Climate change: are farmers' innovations suitable for the future? for risk management?
- Land degradation & deforestation – more attention to natural resource management
- Global population growth – intensification of resource use
- Urbanisation
- Land grabbing (for commercial production)
- Rising rural poverty – Prolinnova's approach could contribute to achieving some of the SDGs
- Growing food and nutrition insecurity
- Migration
- Market-led development / value chains / marketing standards / improved quality for market
- Trade not aid
- Increased interest in agroecology – recognition of need for change in agriculture
- Growing interest in farmer-led multistakeholder approaches to ARD in Europe
- African Union (AU) – European Union (EU) collaboration in ARD (“co-creation of knowledge”)
- Opportunities brought by the United Nations Decade of Family Farming
- Greater use of information and communications technology (ICT) for development.

Many of these issues were already in the 2016–20 strategy. These trends should be included in the context section of the new strategy, and PID presented as one way to address some of these challenges. We need better evidence that this approach indeed contributes to addressing them.

Further points that were raised during the subsequent discussion were:

- PID could contribute to addressing many of the above-mentioned issues – proposals could focus on these topics in which PID is one component of a more comprehensive approach
- To what extent can PID be a complementary approach to dealing with all these challenges?
- Need to develop capacity of stakeholders
- Include urban dwellers (urban agriculture) as well as urban planners as stakeholders
- Give more emphasis to marketing products from innovation, as well as to identifying and supporting innovation in organising access to markets
- Youth involvement probably should include ICT use because this will attract them
- Facilitate North–South and South–South learning across platforms and regions
- Local innovation and PID can contribute to addressing land degradation and deforestation – but can also contribute to land degradation; attention should be given to this
- World Rural Forum (WRF), which promotes the United Nations Decade of Family Farming, has a group focused on farmer participatory research – should we seek closer links with this?
- Extent to which innovation is contributing to climate change adaptation (CCA) and mitigation: could we consolidate the previous work done by Prolinnova on CCA to have a body of evidence?

We need to go through a process to do a good self-evaluation of the Prolinnova network and, given the changing context, define where we want to go – and then develop our strategic plan. Who will facilitate this process and take forward the formulation of the new strategy?

- Suggestion: one person from each (sub)regional taskforce and from the POG to work on the strategy, using the taskforces as sounding boards
- Asia: Emily or Chantheang
- WCA: ask Karbo if he would be willing; otherwise, the taskforce will choose someone else, possibly a Friend of Prolinnova, but preferably someone who attended this IPW
- ESA: Joshua Zake (responsible for coordinating the group)
- Andes: Ann will send Lionel an email to ask
- POG: will nominate someone to participate in the strategy development process
- Both Chesha and Ann can comment on the draft.

Fundraising for Prolinnova activities

The fundraising session, which was facilitated by Joshua and Brigid, focused on how we could draw on the considerable work that has already done in preparing concept notes and proposals for funding. The questions asked were:

- What proposals failed?
- Where can we still use them?
- What proposals are going to be submitted?

Some of the CPs have taken initiatives in fundraising, for example, Prolinnova–Kenya sent a concept note on “Linking the local innovation concept into scientific research” for collaboration with Swiss universities through SUDAC (Swiss Universities Development and Cooperation Network). A concept from Prolinnova–Ghana on innovations in ethnoveterinary medicine, in collaboration with the Tropical and Public Health Institute (Swiss TPH) of the Swiss University of Basel, led to an invitation from Misereor to prepare a full proposal.

The concept notes / proposals that failed were:

- Concept note by Prolinnova–Kenya to SUDAC
- Proposal by Prolinnova–Kenya to National Research Fund (NRF) on speeding up productivity of indigenous chickens
- AFRIDIETS-Lab pre-proposal of city-centred food systems submitted to EU; involving the CPs in Kenya, Tanzania, South Africa & Uganda; coordinated on behalf of Prolinnova by Brigid; did not go through to the second round
- PATAE (Project to Support AgroEcological Transition in Africa), submitted by Agrecol–Afrique to ECOWAS (Economic Community of West African States) on behalf of the CP in Senegal; did not get through to the second round
- Concept notes submitted by Amanuel to FAO, ILRI (International Livestock Research Institute) and GIZ (German Agency for International Cooperation) for Prolinnova–Ethiopia; one submitted to the EU office in Ethiopia reached there too late, but may be considered in the next round
- Proposal by Prolinnova–Uganda to FAO benefit-sharing fund involving CPs in Ethiopia & Uganda.

What other opportunities are there? What proposals are waiting feedback and how likely are they to be successful?

- FaReNe II involving CPs in Burkina Faso & Mali; McKnight Foundation (80% probability of success)
- Prolin-WaFaSa (Promoting local innovation in Water Management by Family Farmers in the Sahel), involving CPs in Burkina Faso & Senegal; Misereor (50%)

- SuP-FANS involving CPs in Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Ghana & Kenya; Misereor (80%)
- Ethnovet involving CP in Ghana; Misereor (70%)
- Supporting PID, involving CP in Cameroon; EU (20%)
- Integrating local innovation into research, involving CP in Kenya; Swedish University Development (no estimate of probability of success)

The subregional/regional taskforces should work further on fundraising. Chris reminded the CPs about the existing guidelines for developing concept notes or proposals so that they meet an acceptable level of quality.

Action planning and IPW wrap-up

Action planning for the Prolinnova network activities was done collectively. The results are summarised in Annex 27.

Chris thanked Agrecol–Afrique and its partners in Senegal, especially Centre Mampuya, for hosting the Proli-FaNS annual meeting and the IPW, as well as Misereor, McKnight Foundation, FAO and other donors. Thanks were also extended to KIT for interim hosting of the Prolinnova International Secretariat; to Chesha and other members of the IST in KIT and IIRR; and to CP partners including farmer innovators.

Preparation for the fieldtrip

The logistics for the field visits, which were arranged by staff of Agrecol–Afrique and by Aboubakrine Beye from the Centre Mampuya, were discussed.

Friday 17 May: Field trip

A field visit was made to Keur Mangari Ka, a village located 38 km from Thiès. The participants interacted with a group of farmers (mainly women) who do market gardening in a 5-ha area that is fenced in and irrigated. The project is led by Agrecol–Afrique. The focus of the visit was on how the farmers use poultry manure in their garden plots, specifically two modes of use: i) simply spreading the manure and ii) mixing it with water before application. The farmers found that the second method is more efficient and gives better results in terms of rapid growth of the plants but also in terms of economising on use of the manure.

The second visit was to the urban farm of a Toubab Dialaw resident named Babacar Diop, who – on his own initiative – developed a highly diversified and intensive, integrated system combining market gardening, arboriculture, small ruminants, cattle, horses and poultry, taking advantage of a water spring on his property. He also innovated in making bread, starting with a traditional oven and developing it to run on biogas.

Annexes