

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM KEY ISSUES

- **GROUP 1 - Fund management and decision making**
- **GROUP 2 - M & E**
- **GROUP 3 - Sustainability, Institutionalisation, and Integration**

Fund management and decision making

- Encourage farmer group management and monitoring of LISF by farmers
- Maintain country specific structures “ No fit all size”
- Facilitation agencies to play advisory roles
- Monitor at all levels to ensure good fund management
 - systematic monitoring guideline
 - MSC monitoring should be involved

- Commitment will come with time:
 - Good selection of partners is very important
 - Partners should identify with the concepts
 - check their history
 - Involve them in the overall ProInnova programme.
 - Give them a stake in management
 - The involvement should align with and link to core functions
 - Payment for services may vary.
 - Allow space for people to play their role.
 - Sign MOUs/MOAs with partners

M & E

Focus was on the community. What can the community monitor and evaluate? There are national level questions too but this was not covered here.

Key stages are:

Pre stage where selection is involved. What is the ‘quality’ of the innovator? Why do they need financial support? What is the reason? Is it for the objective or other purposes?

In implementation:

There need for a systematic M&E system.

In Kenya M&E is institutionalised through farmers.

In Tanzania M&E is done by the innovator and sometimes a person working with them. In Kenya there is one person in the group. There need to be incentives for this.

Allocation of roles will vary according to if it is a group or individual innovation.

How much can the register be used? One or two countries have teething problems with the Register. This does require us to go back and examine what it is that we want to monitor?

Usefulness of Kenya and Nepalese examples are worth considering. They have systematic guidelines for practice and M&E

FAIR and how it is understood shifts over time.

In Cambodia there is a need for additional training for partners/ facilitating organisations. In Uganda the sense is that there is a need. Exchange visits could be useful too. Nepal has visited Cambodia, Niger to Ghana, etc.

There is a learning by doing that is important. Joining in across pilot zones can be important for learning.

Staff changes are an issue that affects continuity and capacity.

There is no single way of implementing FAIR. Models will emerge from different contexts.

There is a need to revisit the framework and check that we are working within it or whether it needs to be revised.

Some pilots promote recycling of funds. There is a need to monitor the use of these funds. Do they get recycled for innovation or for what?

Sustainability, Institutionalisation and Integration

- Create an enabling environment for other stakeholder participation.
- Agree on roles of different stakeholders
- Social scientists to document the processes and physical scientists to do joint experimentation.
- The coordinating NGO should promote involvement at all levels. Policy dialogue and advocacy are important.
- Establish local funding mechanisms that can empower innovators to play roles.
- Build alliances with other NGOs and work towards mainstreaming

Threats:

- Don't over romanticize the role of farmers to do research on their own.
- Don't underplay the role of scientists/ researchers to complement farmers' efforts.
- Maintain the integrity of the use of funds for innovation and research.
- Coordinating partners need to be able to exercise multiple roles. They are intermediaries between stakeholders and need to be able to adjust according to the situation of their respective interests.
- Need to work with problems in the system.
- There are local allocative structures that could support FAIR financially