

2.1 Introduction

Before looking into partnership building in more detail, we need to reflect on the rationale and justification for partnerships. What are these, in theory and in practice? It must be recollected that the overall objective of PROLINNOVA is “to develop and institutionalise partnerships and methodologies that promote processes of local innovation”. This mainstreaming agenda influences its perspective on partnerships.



Defining roles (Jean-Marie Diop)

2.2 Cost-effectiveness, value addition and synergies

A central justification for building partnerships is, simply put, to do with making the best use of available resources, financial as well as human. When PROLINNOVA partners were asked to list what they saw as main benefits of partnerships after three years of experience, this issue featured prominently. Box 3 summarises the real-life experiences from the facilitators of the country partnerships. The box shows that the main benefits and costs/constraints can be grouped as follows:

Benefits

- *Sharing of expertise and (human and other) resources;*
- *Learning and sharing of knowledge;*
- *Creating opportunities for dialogue with policymakers;*
- *Creating platforms for coordination of approaches and conflict handling.*

Costs/constraints

- *Investments in time and money;*
- *Slow progress on the ground;*
- *Limitations related to accommodating diverging views and interests;*
- *Time taken to establish credibility of the facilitating organisations.*

Box 3: Overview of costs and benefits of PROLINNOVA country partnerships¹

Benefits

Cambodia

- Able to have better leverage in mainstreaming approaches and influencing policy. Now farmers, NGOs, government officials and academics are “sitting at the same table”.

Ethiopia

- Repeated engagement helps partners to develop shared vision, mission and values.
- Creating grounds for conflict resolution: platforms host conflicts of interest, but they also provide spaces to transform conflicts in a democratic way, through face-to-face dialogue.

Ghana

- Using a multi-disciplinary approach to solving problems brings better results.
- Mutual learning and sharing of knowledge and experiences has led to substantial improvement in individual capacities.

Nepal

- Benefited from establishing a critical mass of organisations and professionals appreciating, internalising and promoting PID in agriculture.
- Internalisation of PROLINNOVA into partner organisations’ programmes has also helped to reduce the cost of implementation of the PROLINNOVA activities.

Tanzania

- Complementarity and cost sharing among partners in programme implementation.
- Capacity building, knowledge sharing and opportunities to learn from other partner organisations.
- Improved information provision for farmers.

South Africa

- Expanding of networks inclusive of provincial and national researchers, their institutes and specific initiatives (e.g. in relation to indigenous plants).
- PID training, following mixed stakeholder PID sharing and learning workshops has brought greater impact on government R&D.

Sudan

- A major benefit is in sharing knowledge and experiences.

Uganda

- Partners have willingly contributed their time and financial resources because they see PROLINNOVA as a key strategic alliance for enhancement of their own agenda.
- Partnership with Makerere University has brought regular dialogue and sharing of field experiences on local innovations. This is a precursor to review of curricula.

Costs

Cambodia

- Incentives are needed for partners to conduct activities under “learning by doing”.

Ethiopia

- Reaching consensus about shared values between partners requires time. Striving for a win-win situation often means compromise.

Ghana

- Donor budgets at times have no room for activities related to promoting and building partnerships. Partners have their own programmes to implement and report.

¹Based on responses by country coordinators to email questionnaire, September 2006

- Accommodating different professional backgrounds, values, philosophy, interests, objectives and norms in a partnership is very difficult and can be frustrating.

Nepal

- The scattered locations of the partners adds to the management cost.
- It took a long time to bring interested partners together, create a common understanding and formalise the partnership: that implies a major cost.

South Africa

- Engaging with the different layers of management in Government for making our presence known; translating our vision and mission in forms acceptable to Government.

Tanzania

- It took time to define boundaries on “who will be doing what, and using which resources?”

Uganda

- The time taken to engage and involve the various stakeholders is a “cost”.
- High administration and coordination costs of keeping the various partners involved.

Conclusion: Benefits outweigh the costs

Cambodia

- The impact in change of attitude and perception among officials is invaluable; while the funds provided to each partner is relatively small.

Ethiopia

- The benefits will be distributed over many years to come, so we cannot assess at this stage of the process – but benefits are likely to be achieved in spite of the costs.

Ghana

- Promoted and enhanced mainstreaming of PTD/PID/LEISA concepts & principles and participatory methodologies makes them more relevant to the end users.

Nepal

- Partnerships have been established with commitments to internalise and continue promotion of local innovation. This is going to create long-term impact in the future.

South Africa

- We have more impact on government R&D than if it had been a single NGO initiative only.

Uganda

- The local innovation approach is now appreciated, and efforts to integrate this into the government agriculture research and extension systems are evident.

But the cost concerns also require a rethink about the partnership process

Ghana

- Initiating and coordinating the partnership in PROLINNOVA context is centred on NGOs: how possible is it to reverse this, with government R&D institutions taking the lead?

Nepal

- The partnership approach should not be a prerequisite to start a country programme: the lead organisation should be given flexibility.

South Africa

- Partnership processes are generally slower than timeframes and resources allow. The programme has managed to strike a balance by “piggybacking” on other initiatives.

Uganda

- Joint efforts in most cases help overcome cost challenges. Meetings demand time and energy, yet the use of e-mails can facilitate quicker and easier decision-making.

Partnerships can be the most cost-effective way of reaching furthest, and making best use of the abilities of the various stakeholders involved. In the case of PROLINNOVA, the limited funds available in the countries formed a strong incentive for partnership building in order to access facilities and other resources of partners.

Partnerships are also a way to effectively mobilise a variety of skills and capacities, including the ability to cover wider geographical areas. The challenge to the facilitator is to bring out the best in others and act as a catalyst in the process of mobilising these. This also works the other way around: for non-facilitating organisations, the partnership is also a source of organisations and related expertise to support its own



Importance of face-to-face meetings (PELUM Tanzania)

programmes and activities. In the case of PROLINNOVA-Uganda, for example, the National Agricultural Research Organisation (NARO) and the Uganda National Council for Science and Technology used PROLINNOVA expertise to review, and then enrich, their own indigenous knowledge policies.

On top of this, there are the infrastructures that have been established by the different agencies: centres of operation, vehicles and networks that can be put to work to achieve common aims. Joining forces means avoiding unnecessary expenditure on setting up new facilities, buying new vehicles and building offices. Money then can be used directly for programme implementation. There are huge savings to be made in this way: supporting partnerships of existing agencies means that money can be spent on “software” (action programmes) rather than eaten up by “hardware” (offices and buildings). And, as a final note here, money invested in partnerships helps to eliminate the “competition” between individual actors when projects are funded in the same area, and have a similar mandate. Sometimes they can otherwise tread on each others' toes.

2.3 Facilitation by non-governmental organisations (NGOs)

NGOs are in a unique position to help build partnerships in the area of agricultural development and research by facilitating “iterative processes for social learning, negotiation, accommodation and agreement” (Röling & Jiggins 1998). They can play a bridging role between farmers and formal research and development organisations. These formal organisations are often relatively slow and their services spread thinly across a country.

NGOs, particularly the more established ones, often have developed skills not only in technical aspects but also in social issues such as organisational

development, conflict management and gender sensitivity. In summary, the main factors that favour NGO facilitation in agricultural research and development (ARD) partnerships are:

- NGOs have built up an understanding of farmers' problems through intensive field interaction;
- NGOs are used to networking and have knowledge of like-minded individuals in other organisations;
- NGOs are well placed to balance the interests of farmers and outsiders: they can “speak the language” of the different stakeholders;
- Staff of NGOs are (generally) well trained in participatory approaches;
- NGOs are relatively flexible in their methods of operation;
- Farmers' interest groups have commonly been encouraged by NGOs – and are known to them.

Box 4: NGOs seeking links with government agencies

The NGOs that were involved in initiating PROLINNOVA have long recognised the development potential of building on local knowledge and innovation, combining this with relevant external knowledge. To be able to bring the two knowledge systems together, the various individuals and organisations involved in ARD need to work together in partnership. Over time, the NGOs realised that the lack of, or weakness in, such partnerships has been a major reason why formal ARD has been so slow in improving the livelihoods of resource-poor farmers. There was obviously a need to exert greater efforts so that institutions of research, extension and education in their countries would – and could – include participatory approaches as part of their regular activities. These NGOs now give high priority to working more closely with government agencies so as to capitalise on potential synergies and to make the government agencies – and themselves as NGOs – more accountable to the local people and organisations they profess to serve (Waters-Bayer *et al* 2005).

2.4 Principles and prerequisites

The need to focus on principles

Partnerships can be effective only when certain basic principles are adhered to (for example, “shared ownership”, “equality” and “openness”). These principles, we believe, are the fundamentals of partnership building. And allied to these principles are prerequisites. By prerequisites, we mean things that are basic necessities to make partnerships function well (for example, “good facilitation” and “internal motivation”). The reason that we have put the two together here is that they are closely related – and sometimes they overlap. Here are some of the most important considerations.

Partnership as part of the agenda: a goal in itself

One basic principle is that partnership *itself* should form part of the overall agenda amongst partners. It is not enough to simply come together and assume that partnership will magically appear. It needs to be understood from the beginning that the relationship itself needs building and culturing, and this must be a conscious effort. So, a prerequisite for this to occur is an

understanding from the beginning that functional partnership itself is a goal. Practically speaking, that means bringing it up as an agenda item and talking about it regularly.

Shared ownership

A second guiding principle is that partnership implies shared ownership of the agenda and programme of activities, and an overall sense of joint responsibility for outcomes of endeavours. This distinguishes partnerships from other forms of collaboration, where overall ownership and responsibility stays with the main organisation while others contribute their part as per agreement – for example, under a sub-contract. Sharing of ownership and responsibility by definition implies a relative reduction in the central role of the coordinating organisation, and it is the reluctance of many organisations to make this step that forms a major bottleneck in many non-functioning partnerships.

A culture of equality

Shared ownership and responsibility in turn imply equality. It is important – but challenging in practice – to establish a culture of equality amongst actors in a partnership. This is especially so when there was previously an unwritten hierarchy, which placed – say – government agencies above NGOs, and all other agencies above farmers' organisations. Perhaps establishing a "balance" and mutual respect is a more realistic goal. But to make a partnership work, that is the minimum. All partners need to be able to create a balance between accommodating others' interests and negotiating for their own position. Part of PROLINNOVA's success in partnership building may be in its ability to develop a working relationship built on mutual respect and a degree of "equality" between farmers, NGOs and government agencies. A small but significant step in this context was the decision to do away with formal titles during discussions in international meetings. Farmers and university deans alike are addressed using the name chosen by them, without "Professor", "Doctor" or similar titles.

Allied to equality is shared responsibility. If all partners are working together then they have to accept joint responsibility for what goes wrong or for what challenges need to be faced. But of course they also share success together – the feeling of being part of a winning team.

Matching individual interests with the common agenda

Partnerships need to be able to link the common agenda to important *institutional* and *personal* interests of the partners. Addressing partners' own institutional interests allows them to create time, and even to provide their own resources for activities of the partnership. The link to personal interests creates commitment with the people involved and allows them to find space in their already-full diaries. This issue needs careful consideration in an inception phase when potential partners are visited, the need for partnerships discussed and areas of interests of organisations identified. The Uganda case in Chapter 4 shows how this process was shaped in a participatory planning process.

Addressing partners' own interests is clearly reflected in PROLINNOVA's insistence on what has become known as "own contribution". From the onset, it was made clear to partners at all levels that one could not just join to *receive* resources but also had to *commit* resources. Forced upon PROLINNOVA initially by one major donor, all people involved gradually realised the importance of this working principle in building the partnership. Despite the fact that donor requirements for the period 2007–2010 appear less strict, partners agreed that this principle should be continued.

Openness and transparency

Another fundamental principle is that a partnership cannot work unless there is openness and transparency in decision making. This implies that, at the very beginning and to the greatest extent possible, partners need to make their interests and expectations clear. They must articulate what is at stake for them: what they stand to gain and what they could lose through the partnership. The resources that can be made available from internal and external sources should be openly discussed. This allows the partnership to move together from a common position of understanding and respect for each other's positions. Even though this is set up at the outset, clarifying objectives and identifying stakeholders and stakes is an iterative process. Being transparent, however, is not without risks, as the example of Box 5 shows.

Box 5: Practising transparency

During the first international PROLINNOVA partners meeting in Ethiopia, the 4-year budget made available through the Netherlands Government and its breakdown was presented in detail. This led to a lively discussion on the allocation of resources for international facilitation and support functions, in relation to those for the country programmes (budget-wise 50:50) in which the international partners were openly challenged. Several partners, however, pointed to the higher costs levels with the international partners while others emphasised the crucial role they play in a number of areas. In the end, the fact that this was openly discussed contributed to the credibility of the partnership and its facilitators.

"Open nucleus"

The platform needs to be prepared to change its partnership composition if and when necessary: that's what we mean by the principle of being an "open nucleus" arrangement. The partnership starts with a smaller group of (often) the most committed partners and then allows others to join at a later stage: begin small, establish the relevance of the partnership through evidence and gradually grow by accommodating others. Of course, the other side of the coin is that, if one partner wishes to leave – at any time, for whatever reason – that is possible also. If a partner loses commitment, for example, it is better to withdraw than to continue as a reluctant passenger. Thinking again about our image of a theatre, one of the "actors" may become disenchanted with the "play" and decide to leave the "stage" – in other words, the platform. Keeping a reluctant partner for the sake of numbers or image can jeopardise

internal motivation of the group, and things can fall apart. The “open nucleus” nature of PROLINNOVA was, in fact, identified as one of its characteristics and its strengths during its 2006 review:

“New partners benefited from the accumulated experience of the group. This enhanced the opportunities for peer-based learning and mentoring. New partners infused new ideas and new enthusiasm and perspectives.” (Gonsalves 2006).

Breaking down barriers of competition and territoriality

Another principle of partnership is that it can only work when competition between agencies with conflicting interests is turned into agencies working together towards a mutual goal. Thus, unless there is a change in mindset (a prerequisite) between agencies that were previously competing, then partnership is impossible, and an illusion. Underlying this principle is the very real concern that farmers are confused by various development organisations offering different rewards and conflicting advice. A simple, consolidated stand achieved through partnership can help to end these mixed messages and the energy wasted on one-upmanship amongst agencies.

2.5 Making the partnership work

This section looks at the nuts and bolts of putting partnership into practice. We concentrate on “how to go about it”. What can we do to ensure that partnerships are effective and the above principles become a reality? Problems that can be encountered, ways to handle these and trouble shooting are discussed separately in Chapter 3.

Capacity building and learning by doing

It is self-evident that, when a new way of working is proposed, stakeholders need to understand what the potential benefits are and what is expected of them. And the facilitating organisation needs to be ready and capable to play its crucial role. Capacity can be built in two ways. The first is through training workshops and written information. When there is a danger of these becoming too theoretical (losing people’s attention and boring them), there is ample opportunity for building knowledge through sharing of experience and group work on problem solving.

The other route to better understanding of how partnerships can be built and improved is through “learning by experience”. Creation of multi-stakeholder partnerships is novel to most people. It is important for minds to be kept open and for people to learn from doing – and to share their experience as they gradually build up partnerships with sensitivity. To realise this:

- One needs to put the issue of the multi-stakeholder partnership approach as a *joint learning item* on the agenda from the start;
- Present the coordination or steering committee in terms of partnerships: why is this different from the usual steering committees that most people have joined in the past? Box 6 presents some of the issues for such discussion;

Box 6: Comparing “normal” and “partnership” steering committees

“Normal” SC

Gives guidance only
Limited ownership feeling by members
One/few organisations implement
Membership fixed

No grassroots membership

Hosted by senior govt department
Chair appointed *ex officio*

“Partnership” SC

Decides on major issues
Members feel fully responsible
Sharing of implementation tasks
Membership dynamic (“open nucleus”)
Grassroots/beneficiaries represented
Hosted by “facilitating” NGO
Chair elected carefully

- Make the functioning of the partnership, the National Steering Committee (NSC) or whatever the partners in a country choose to call this, an explicit part of the agenda for monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and learning: put the functioning of the partnership annually on the agenda, jointly and openly discuss and analyse this, formulate recommendations and show how you implement these. Box 2 in Chapter 1 shows how this was done in the case of the PROLINNOVA international partnership.

To support such learning from experience, it is extremely important that the process of partnership building and the lessons learnt are carefully documented. This confirms, to all involved, the body of experiences generated and becomes the point of reference in further developing the partnership.

“...the achievements of PROLINNOVA in the past couple of years...have generated some very useful insights and lessons on fostering partnerships in R&D and bringing about a development orientation in research....There is an urgent need for extracting and synthesising the lessons on the partnership initiation and development process...” (Gonsalves 2006)

While the above comment was directed at PROLINNOVA itself (and this book itself is one outcome of the recommendation), the more general message is that learning from experience is important – and to achieve this, experience needs to be documented.

Start with looking into what is already there

Many initiatives assume that the new partnership proposed is filling an important gap. But in a number of cases there are relevant networks and initiatives at least partly covering the new agenda. Overlap and competition needs to be prevented. Commitment of partners is also likely to be greater if the new initiative builds on relevant existing initiatives and networks, and gives serious attention to these while acknowledging them as a valid starting point. This confirms the importance of allowing for a process of inception consultation and planning in which stocktaking of existing experience is a key element. “Stakeholder Analysis” and “Rapid Appraisal of Agricultural Knowledge Systems” are effective approaches and tools in this context. Table 1 presents

the summary outcome of one such stakeholder analysis used as the starting point for planning of the PROLINNOVA country initiative in Uganda. Beware of one danger however: existing networks may constitute exclusive “clubs” where new members may not feel welcome.

Choosing partners

At the start of a programme, the agenda needs to be moved forward rapidly to show evidence of the usefulness of the partnership. There may be the tendency to invite only very like-minded individuals and organisations so that conflicts are avoided and consensus can be reached quickly. This may exclude, though, stakeholders whose contribution could be critical. If the agenda includes mainstreaming and institutionalisation ambitions, the inclusion of stakeholders beyond the converted inner group becomes even more critical. Strategic choices have to be made in which the existing culture of collaboration between civil society and government institutions, as well as the own facilitation capacity of the coordinating organisation are critical factors (compare Box 7).

Box 7: The steering committee as platform for negotiation: an example

In Ethiopia, the National Steering Committee (NSC) has become a microcosm of mediated negotiation that is preparing the members well for entering into the wider arenas of open discussion and dispute in day-to-day life – in meetings to discuss other projects, in seminars and congresses, in municipal and state-level planning meetings. Moreover, the NSC has chosen the strategy of feeding these wider arenas (e.g. conferences of fairly conventional professional associations related to ARD) with practical and grounded data and experiences in order to stimulate discussion and catalyse change (Amanuel Assefa 2004).

Role definition: specialist input, backstopping and facilitation

Clarity is needed about roles and responsibilities. Overlapping roles can be a source of inefficiency, confusion and even conflict. In many cases, there is a need for formalisation of roles agreed between organisations involved in the partnership. This can be done through the signing of memorandums of understanding (MOUs). A simpler approach is to define rules and roles in a document that is approved in a meeting of the Steering Committee. This helps to govern the partnership – but is weaker in terms of formal support by the relevant organisations.

In PROLINNOVA’s experience, it can be very valuable to establish MOUs between partners at an equal level (for example, members of the core team of implementing NGOs) as well as between partners representing different groups of stakeholders – an example here is when researchers, extension-facilitators and farmers come together to carry out joint experimentation. The MOU should not just be seen as a formal document: more important is its role in obliging partners to think about – and then agree on – what they expect from each other. As mentioned before, true partnership can be realised when tasks, responsibilities and the related resources are truly shared among partners. Prospective partners will critically examine draft MOUs with regard to the extent to which these express this important principle.

Governance

Closely related to the above is the issue of partnership governance. What is the structure and process for decision-making within the partnership? Who decides on what? A partnership implies that some of the power and control from the initiating organisation (which often holds the budget) is transferred to the other partners. This is essentially what the governance set-up should cater for. To allow this shift to become a reality, the process of forming the governance mechanisms and rules needs careful attention, allowing for maximum possible influence of partners and their constituencies in the process (Box 8).

Box 8: The formation of the PROLINNOVA Oversight Group and its growing role

The PROLINNOVA Oversight Group (POG) was initiated in 2004 to become the platform where general policy directions of the international partnership were to be established. The international facilitators decided to organise a process to maximise the influence of partners in its composition and thus its independent, representative, position. The first four steps took place during the 2004 international workshop in Ethiopia:

1. An agreement was reached on the general composition of the POG: three people representing the country-level partners, one person representing the IST partners, and three external people;
2. ETC EcoCulture, the initial facilitating organisation, proposed that it should not be a member of the POG but *ex-officio* secretary. This was accepted;
3. The participants agreed that the three country seats be given to three groups of countries, depending on the length of their involvement in PROLINNOVA: within each group, partners attending the Ethiopia workshop discussed and came up with one candidate mandated to represent them;
4. IST partners present in Ethiopia discussed and nominated one representative for the POG;
5. Post-Ethiopia, ETC facilitated a process of nominating candidates for the three external positions, listing main criteria, and asking each nomination to be accompanied by a brief description of the person;
6. Subsequent voting by e-mail led to the choice of the three external (but with close exposure to ideas and vision of PROLINNOVA) POG members.

Commitment grows from successful first actions

Partnerships need to be built on a shared will to succeed – by pooling together resources and enthusiasm. This is team work in contrast to individuals (or organisations) working for themselves, in competition with others. When a partnership has been built, one of the best ways of strengthening bonds between partners is by facing a shared problem together – and allowing commitment to be demonstrated and reinforced through success. The partnership quickly gains momentum if a first activity is strategically chosen: an “entry-point activity”. Identification and study of local innovations is such an activity. It can:

- Involve many stakeholders in the implementation;
- Give interesting insights in relatively short periods of time;
- Lead to tangible outputs as evidence of success (brochures, leaflets etc), where both information and logos can be jointly displayed.

Another facet to commitment is not just at the human level, but a demonstration that materials and other resources can also be shared. This may take the form of finances, but also meeting rooms, vehicles, and even field sites with farmers who have already formed bonds with one organisation.

Ensuring effective communication

Good and effective communication is the central strategy to achieve openness and transparency. A regular flow of information either through meetings, phone calls or written materials is also critical for implementation and coordination of activities. In this modern era, when overwhelming amounts of information circulate, the challenge seems to be to strike a balance between too much and too little information.

Though modern ICT greatly facilitates communication electronically, face-to-face meetings remain critical to build strong partnerships. There should be *regular* though not necessarily *frequent* meetings; planning this balance is often one of the responsibilities of the facilitating organisation. Even at international level, face-to-face meetings are critical, particularly in such a decentralised set-up as PROLINNOVA. During its first electronic M&E conference (Chapter 5), country partners asked for an annual partners meeting, even though the original budget had envisaged a meeting once every two years. Through additional fund-raising and budgetary reallocation this demand of partners was met. The international meetings do play an important role in maintaining coherence in ideas and in practice/activities, given the great number of partners, and the high levels of autonomy at country level.

Another central role of the facilitating organisation is ensuring effective communication with organisations outside the direct partnership, which helps to mobilise stakeholders' interest. Two lessons are clear:

- It is beneficial to use communication strategies specific to the audience/stakeholder group and to find relevant triggers. Neutral messages should be found, not ones that promote specific organisations or even the network itself;
- The focus should be on the farmers' important role in innovation and how to support this, rather than on building up the name of the partnership.

On a practical note, it must be remembered that transport can consume significant portions of partners' budgets, as can overnight allowances. Meetings far away from a partner's base consume time as well. While the internet has provided a radical and efficient communication alternative for many, others are bogged down by poor, slow connections. In remote areas, the mobile phone has spread like a bush fire. This is rapidly helping to spread the word, and replace the need for frequent face-to-face meetings. So modern information technology systems can help – but ICT is still a qualified blessing.

Joint planning, monitoring and evaluation

To achieve joint implementation, joint planning and joint M&E are essential: these are characteristic of true partnership. To achieve this, good facilitation is required: this is the responsibility of the main facilitating agency, or the organisation to which this is delegated.

Joint M&E is critical in partnerships, with emphasis on *joint*. Without it the spirit of partnership will fade. We need to distinguish two closely related flows of M&E:

The first one is the progress/accountability flow: this is the best-known. It focuses on collecting information systematically on progress made in implementing activities, compared with what was planned, and on results and the impact of these activities in relation to expectations. Realising this part of M&E in a partnership arrangement poses a special challenge, as a good balance needs to be found by the facilitating organisation in setting clear M&E requirements and formats for all partners, and maintaining the dynamics of true partnership (compare the example in Chapter 5).

The second flow is the learning flow: this includes the regular discussion and review of work done and of constraints encountered in all aspects of the work, through an exchange of experience. It leads to generation of insight and identification of best ways forward. General lessons learnt can be formulated and shared among partners and beyond. One should take care to allow enough time for this part of M&E in the often hectic implementation schedules. PROLINNOVA is systematically using its international workshops for this part of M&E. Its guided mid-term self-assessments also fit into this category, as shown again in Chapter 5.

Table 1: Summary outcome of stakeholder consultation for PROLINNOVA-Uganda

Stakeholder category	Name of organisation	Nature of Innovation	Key challenges	Action priorities and linkages for PROLINNOVA
NATIONAL AGRICULTURE RESEARCH INSTITUTE	<p>Kawanda Agriculture Research Institute; Banana and Soil Fertility Research Programmes</p> <p>Fisheries Resources and Research Institute (FIRI)</p> <p>Namulonge Animal and Agriculture Research Institute</p>	<p>Clean planting material production and integrated banana pest management</p> <p>Management of fish stock and biodiversity</p>	<p>Integration of indigenous local knowledge into the scientific parameters</p> <p>Appreciation of originality of innovations, especially where the farmer is the prime source of the innovation.</p> <p>Introducing new methods and technologies</p>	<p>Documentation and dissemination of the vast untapped knowledge</p> <p>Have materials and information to be shared on the PROLINNOVA website</p> <p>Would like to be in the planning of PROLINNOVA in future</p> <p>Guidance to document local innovation on medicinal plant knowledge and application, and linkage of agricultural practices and fisheries</p>
INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURE RESEARCH CENTRE	<p>CIAT (International Center for Tropical Agriculture)</p> <p>ICRAF (International Center for Research on Agro-Forestry)</p>	<p>Crop farming, land-use</p> <p>Agroforestry, soil and water conservation, etc</p>	<p>Full understanding of farmer innovations</p>	<p>Interested to participate in PROLINNOVA.</p> <p>Find out what compels farmers to innovate, and the support mechanisms required to propel farmers' innovations and make them sustainable.</p>
NGO UMBRELLAS AND NETWORKS	<p>PELUM; Uganda Fisheries Conservation Association; National Organic Agriculture Movement of Uganda; East Africa Energy Technology Development Network; Uganda Agroforestry Network</p>	<p>Multiple</p>	<p>The organisations provide linkages and information to facilitate the attainment of Sustainable Agriculture and NRM objectives</p> <p>Need guidance on local innovation methodologies</p>	<p>Sharing information on PROLINNOVA website</p> <p>All interested to participate in the initiative, by providing and sharing experiences and information from the membership</p> <p>Want to be part of PROLINNOVA-Uganda</p> <p>Database and have materials to share on website</p>

Stakeholder category	Name of organisation	Nature of Innovation	Key challenges	Action priorities for PROLINNOVA
TRAINING INSTITUTIONS	Faculty of Agriculture Makerere University, Kampala Institute of Environment and Natural Resources	Do not interface directly with farmers. Innovations in the approach and information transfer.	Use of materials; guidelines on roles of participants, action plan/ structure for coordination. Student research is source of innovations, but findings are not used to inform NRM	Interested in participating in further planning Materials and a wealth of knowledge for wider dissemination on the PROLINNOVA website. Would like to interest students on case studies that explore local indigenous knowledge
NGOs	More than 10 consulted	A wide variety of agricultural, NRM, fisheries, energy, technologies Participatory approaches	Linkages with research institutions for on-farm activities The cultural environment does not encourage women farmers to innovate and, if they do, the credit is attributed to the man.	Support existing programmes to encourage, document and disseminate local innovations Review of policy provisions and intellectual property rights draft policy helps ensure the ownership by local farmers A clear understanding of local innovations and criteria to select them
Government departments/ institutions	Departments of the Ministry of Agriculture: Land Management Project, National Action Programme on UNCCD, Chemotherapeutics Research Laboratory	Multiple	Inward looking with minimal opportunities for sharing experiences, particularly with the NGO community and researchers	Collaboration with other stakeholders in land resources Networking, information exchange Involvement in implementation of PROLINNOVA