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# Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACDEP</td>
<td>Association of Church Development Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community based organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Country Platforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FaNS</td>
<td>Food and Nutrition Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNS</td>
<td>Food and Nutrition Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLD</td>
<td>Farmer-led documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GALID</td>
<td>Gender analysis of local innovation development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IST</td>
<td>International Support Team (Prolinnova)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIRR</td>
<td>International Institute of Rural Reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KALRO</td>
<td>Kenya Agricultural and Livestock Research Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>Local Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISF</td>
<td>Local Innovation Support facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSP</td>
<td>Multistakeholder Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NABOCADO</td>
<td>Navrongo Bolgatanga Catholic Diocesan Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Non-Governmental organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC</td>
<td>National Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID</td>
<td>Participatory Innovation Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRA</td>
<td>Participatory Rural Appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proli-FaNS</td>
<td>Promoting Local Innovation for Food and Nutrition Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prolinnova</td>
<td>Promoting local innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SULCI-FaNS</td>
<td>Scaling up local innovative capacity for food and nutrition security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WN</td>
<td>World Neighbors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

The Scaling Up Local Innovation Capacity in Food and Nutrition Security (SULCI-FaNS) project funded by Misereor under the German government’s “One World No Hunger” initiative is being implemented in four African countries in the Prolinnova network. This project is a follow on to the Promoting Local Innovation for Food and Nutrition Security (Proli-FaNS) project that was implemented from 2016-2019 under the same funding initiative.

SULCI-FaNS will be implemented in Ghana and Kenya (Anglophone) and Burkina Faso and Cameroon (Francophone) Africa. The need for further capacity building in the local innovation and participatory innovation development (LI/PID) approach was noted during the formulation of this project and funds were allocated for this purpose. Two LI/PID training workshops in English (for Kenya and Ghana) and in French (for Burkina Faso and Cameroon) were included in the overall work plan.

The Anglophone training workshop in LI/PID took place in Tamale, Ghana, from 3-8 February, 2020. The workshop was facilitated by Zimi Al Hassan from Prolinnova-Ghana and Chesha Wettasinha from the Prolinnova International Support Team.

The trainers and participants together covered some of the key topics related to the LI/PID approach. Special attention was given to women as innovators and supporting their innovations related to food and nutrition security as this is a key objective also of the SULCI-FaNS project. Thematic sessions on LI and PID, documentation of LI and farmer-led joint research, multistakeholder partnerships, gender analysis of local innovation development, policy influencing and institutionalisation of PID covered conceptual aspects as well as Prolinnova’s diverse experiences in each of them. The group undertook a field visit to Bongo village, one of the field sites of SULCI-FaNS in Ghana, and interacted with local innovators and community members and learned about their innovations and joint research.

At the end of the workshop, the participants in country groups developed a LI/PID training plan for their field sites based on what they had learned in this workshop. The feedback from participants during the workshop evaluation indicated a high level of confidence gained in the subject matter. They were also very satisfied with aspects such as time management, facilitation and logistics of the workshop. They however felt that working on a Saturday was quite difficult due to the other social engagements that they had to forego. They also mentioned that the workshop was intensive and tiring due to the large number of topics that had to be covered. The facilitators explained that the workshop had to be stretched because of the content that needed to be covered, a field visit that would take a whole day and to make the best of the budget allocated to the activity.
DAY 1 – 3 February 2020, Monday

Welcome and introductions
Malex Alebikiya, Executive Director of ACDEP, the host organisation of Prolinnova Ghana with overall coordination of SULCI-FaNS, warmly welcomed the participants to Tamale. Joe Nchor, project coordinator of SULCI-FaNS, also welcomed the participants and handed over to the trainers Chesha Wettasinha from Prolinnova’s International Support Team and Zimi Al Hassan from the Regional Department of Agriculture for Upper East Region, Ghana. Zimi was a participant in the PID training in Kenya in 2016 and was selected as a co-trainer for this workshop.

Chesha invited the participants and co-trainers to introduce themselves using two words that would best describe them in relation to their work. The group used the following words:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creative</th>
<th>Adaptive</th>
<th>Listener</th>
<th>Human centred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue seeking</td>
<td>Zealous</td>
<td>Appreciative</td>
<td>Results oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open minded</td>
<td>Optimistic</td>
<td>Resilient</td>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diligent</td>
<td>Farmer-centred</td>
<td>Respectful</td>
<td>Committed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local economy</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Life changer</td>
<td>Advocate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oriented</td>
<td>development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the introductions, the participants also briefly mentioned where they were from, their professional background and how they were connected to the SULCI-FaNS project. The list of participants is found in Annex 1 and included three from Kenya (2 women and 1 man), five from Ghana (1 woman and 4 men) and one man from Senegal.

Chesha introduced the workshop programme as found in Annex 2. She mentioned that the workshop needed to cover a lot of content in six days that would mean having to endure a longer working week than most participants are accustomed to. It also included a field visit to Bongo district that would take a whole day. Chesha requested the participants to “park” any additional issues, beyond those in the programme, to be taken up during lunch breaks or after hours.

Chesha asked the participants what their expectations were from the workshop and captured them on a flipchart and put them up on a wall.

**Participants expectations**

- Learn practical experiences from others to improve my knowledge and skills to support CPs for improved results
- Get a good understanding of PID in order to improve its application in the SULCI-FaNS project
- Understand the SULCI-FaNS project in the context of Prolinnova
- Be fully equipped in facilitating PID training and other related activities
• Understand clearly the PID approach including how to integrate gender into it
• Internalise what is expected of the SULCI-FaNS project
• Innovations and technology – difference/identification
• What is PID all about? Distinct difference between PID and PRA methods
• How to mainstream gender into LI/PID: which tools? How to monitor? Which criteria?
• Deepen my understanding of PID/M&E
• Improve my knowledge of LIs in other CPs.

Chesha explained the objectives of the workshop and mentioned that she and Zimi as co-facilitators would do their best to fulfils the expectations of the participants while meeting the objectives of the workshop.

**Objectives of the workshop**

- Provide awareness on the concepts of LI, PID, local innovation support facilities (LISFs) etc. that form the core of Prolinnova’s work
- Pay particular attention to gender analysis in local innovation development (GALID) and introduce the guidelines developed by the IST with FAO funding
- Ensure that the participants have a good understanding of the objectives/strategies/outcomes of SULCI-FaNS project
- Enable implementation of the project
- Support participants to go back and share what was learnt with others in the field-site teams and provide downstream LI/PID training

The trainers then asked for volunteers who would document the key learning points each day and recap them the following morning. The following schedule was made:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>End of day evaluation</th>
<th>Recap of previous day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day 1 (Monday)</td>
<td>Elizabeth, Shaibu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2 (Tuesday)</td>
<td>Dan, Vincent</td>
<td>Marta, Margaret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3 (Wednesday)</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>FIELD VISIT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 4 (Thursday)</td>
<td>Djibril and Marta</td>
<td>Joe and Albert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 5 (Friday)</td>
<td>Margaret and Elizabeth</td>
<td>Shaibu and Dan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 6 (Saturday)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vincent and Joe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Introduction to the SULCI-FaNS project**

Joe Nchor, SULCI-FaNS coordinator from ACDEP, made a short presentation of the project. It included the goal and key objectives of the project as well as the key activities to be undertaken under each objective. All participants has received a copy of the project proposal ahead of the training workshop so that they could familiarise themselves with what the project intended to do and achieve.

**Short introduction to Prolinnova**

As there were several participants who were new to Prolinnova, Chesha gave a brief introduction to the history, development and current status of the community of practice.
She also introduced the Prolinnova website and guided the participants on navigating it so that they could access relevant resources. She provided the contact of Prolinnova’s webmaster Annie Secretario at the International Institute of Rural Reconstruction (IIRR), in the Philippines, who they could ask for assistance in uploading their material to the website. She also introduced Prolinnova’s e-list and several of the participants wished to be included in the e-list.

**Session: local innovation**

Zimi led this session and started with a group exercise for which he formed two small groups and did a brainstorming exercise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group assignment: Discuss and explain the following: who is a farmer? What is indigenous knowledge? What is local innovation? Types and domains of local innovation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farmer</strong> - Anyone engaging in agricultural practices (crops, livestock, fisheries, apiculture, snail farming etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local innovation</strong> – new ways of doing things or improving on existing ways of doing things in agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local innovations</strong> – the new practices that have emerged from local innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous knowledge – Farmers way of addressing challenges based on practices, skills, abilities, capacities within a certain geographical area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farmers</strong> – People – men and women – in a rural setting who engage in crop production, livestock rearing, fishing and management of natural resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous knowledge – Knowledge that has been inherited and used over time in a particular location by a certain group of people. It is also external knowledge that has been internalised over years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local innovation</strong> – a new way of finding a solution to a problem by using local resources/indigenous knowledge; making an improvement to existing knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local innovations</strong> – the outcomes/products as a result of local innovation (such as a new farming method or a new way of controlling pests.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Types of innovation</strong> – social and technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domains of local innovation</strong> – crop production; livestock rearing; processing; marketing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zimi shared the following definitions with the group:

**Farmers** - crop farmers, livestock keepers, fishers, forest dwellers, artisans and processors, women and men, who are involved in agriculture and natural resource management. Prolinnova focuses on poor, marginalised and vulnerable categories of women and men farmers.

**Indigenous Knowledge**: knowledge of a people living in a certain area or a social group generated by their own and their ancestors’ experience and including knowledge gained from other sources - eg scientific knowledge, which has been fully internalized with the local ways of thinking and
IK is dynamic and changes through creativity and innovativeness as well as through contact with other local and external knowledge systems.

**Local innovation** is a process by which men and women in a given locality discover or develop new and better ways of doing things on their own initiative, using their own resources without external support and often in the face of challenges or opportunity.”

Farmer Innovation (FI) = Farmers Wisdom (FW) + Indigenous Knowledge (IK) + [-] Scientific Knowledge (SK) + Value Addition (VA)

**Local innovations** (with an “s”) are the results of the innovation process such as:

- The outcome of an innovation process eg. new farming technique or ways of organising work that are new to the particular locality.
- Something that is new in the locality (as opposed to traditional practices) and adds value to what is being done already, that creates new values in the local context; locally new and better ways of doing things.
- New ways of production, processing, distribution/marketing or managing farming/natural resources by building on local knowledge, but using new ideas from various sources including their own creativity.

Zimi mentioned that indigenous knowledge, traditional knowledge, traditional practice, scientific technology without modification, a known innovation acquired from elsewhere or introduced but without adaptation, modification, or nothing new added to it cannot be considered as local innovation.

Local innovation can be found across the different domains and components of agriculture and natural resources management including crop production, post-harvest processing of crops and tree products, pest control through bio-pesticides/botanicals, food processing and nutritional fortification, livestock keeping and animal health improvement, soil fertility management and erosion control, water harvesting, marketing etc.

**EXAMPLES OF LOCAL INNOVATIONS**

**Abdul Ramani Abbieli**  
Use of Onion Leaves to Control Striga in Cereals

**Joseph Aberike**  
Use of Local Ingredients Prepare Compound Fish Meal

---

---

---
He then discussed the need to view local innovations broadly referring to different types of local innovations:

**Technological innovation** relates to new techniques such as a new crop, way of growing crops, managing water etc.

**Socio-organisational innovation** relates to new forms of organising farming or resource management activities. These could also be new marketing arrangements or savings schemes.

**Institutional innovation** relates to new policy interventions or laws for governance at local level.

In the context of the SULCI-FaNS project, Zimi touched on some aspects of food and nutrition security (FNS) that would be useful. Drawing on related literature, the four aspects of FNS as defined by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) in their World Food Summit in 2009 are:

- **Availability** – capacity to produce enough food or have the resources to buy food (at household level)
- **Access** – physical, social and economic access to sufficient food
- **Utilisation** – actual consumption of diverse good to meet individual dietary and nutritional needs
- **Stability** – reasonable level of stability in relation to food supply, access and utilisation

| AVAILABILITY (sufficient quantity of food for consumption) | • Sufficient quantities of food available on a consistent basis.  
• Reduced agricultural production in some areas locally (especially in Upper East) could affect dietary diversity  
• Changes in the suitability of land for crop production  
• Changes in precipitation patterns could affect the sustainability of rain-fed agriculture the region  
• Increases in temperature could lead to longer growing seasons in the region and affect the dry season cropping |
| ACCESS (ability to obtain food regularly through own production or purchase) | • Having sufficient resources to obtain appropriate foods for a nutritious diet.  
• Lower yields in some areas could result in higher food prices  
• Loss of income due to the potential increase in damage to agricultural production |
| STABILITY (risk of losing access to resources required to consume food) | • Instability of food supplies due to an increase in extreme events  
• Instability of incomes from agriculture |
| UTILISATION (quality and safety of food, including nutrition aspects) | • Appropriate use based on knowledge of basic nutrition and care, as well as adequate water and sanitation  
• Food security and health impacts include increased malnutrition |
• Ability to utilise food might decrease where changes in climate increase disease
• Impact on food safety due to changes in pests and water pollution

Small group exercise: Form two groups per CP and describe two innovations (one social and one technological) that were discovered under Proli-FaNS in your CP, including the following: a) Name of the innovator; b) Who is the innovator (man/woman/group); c) Short description of the innovation.

Social innovation – Ghana – Improving Shea butter market
Innovator – Mrs Atingbun Abaah, Atamolga Women’s Group
Community – Yelwongo
Description – Adding saltpeter to improve the colour of the butter; makes the butter look whiter/cleaner and increases its quality and hence attracts a better market. More development partners (big buyers) linked up with the group. The women were able to access training to improve their processing. [https://www.prolinnova.net/sites/default/files/documents/ghana/2019/proli-fans_ghana_success_story_on_sheabutter_innovation_in_bongo_final.pdf](https://www.prolinnova.net/sites/default/files/documents/ghana/2019/proli-fans_ghana_success_story_on_sheabutter_innovation_in_bongo_final.pdf) (Video available at ACDEP)

*Technical innovation – Ghana – Shea bark to treat New Castle disease in local poultry*
Innovator – Mrs Adongma Azure
Community – Adaboya, Bongo district, Upper East Region
Description – Two to three pieces of Shea bark is put into an earthen ware pot with 2.5 litres water; soaked for 2-3 days; fowls are released to drink the solution 2-3 times a day. The process is repeated three times.

*Technical innovation – Kenya – Modified cassava pits*
Innovator – Mr Amos Okondo, Kisumu County
Resources – hoe, measuring tape, labour
Process: Identify field site; measure and dig holes (2x2x2 feet); plant cassava cuttings and fill half way to leave a basin; spacing 1x1 m; Benefits – retains moisture, longevity, easy harvesting, reduced attacks by rodents; early maturity, higher yield
Added value – availability (increased yield hence higher productivity); access (increased income and access to food, increased purchasing power); utilization (source of starch, can be processed and preserved)
**Technical innovation – Kenya – Organic fruit fly trap**

Innovator – Mrs. Benigna Mutiso, Makueni County

Resources – honey, lemon, water, recycled plastic bottles, string/rope

Description: Fill 500 ml plastic bottle halfway with water; put 2 teaspoons of honey and one teaspoon of lemon juice into water; make holes in the upper part of the bottle; hang the bottles in mango trees. Fruit flies get attracted to the concoction and fly into the bottle through the holes and drown in the solution.

Food and nutrition – availability (prevents loss of fruit due to fly attacks); access (increases purchasing power/income); utilisation (fruits have nutritional value)

Zimi presented a slide on the **ways of identifying LIs** which included:

- Meeting with and talking to people in communities (separately to women and men)
- Using a questionnaire/survey
- Using LISF register, innovation catalogues etc. to look at innovations documented earlier and revisiting them
- Going to exhibitions, fairs and other events at which farmers present their work
- Holding farmers’ competitions
- Using key informants
- Advertising in newspapers, radio and other media used by communities
- Looking for people who are doing “strange” things in a community
- Observation
- Using school children to find out what new things their parents (farmers) are doing?
- Use of volunteers (public health workers, teachers etc.)
- Chain or “snowball” interviews

Thereafter Zimi talked about **criteria for prioritising innovations** to be taken up in joint research in relation to SULCI-FaNS and mentioned the following:

1. Should be related to food and nutrition security and nutritional diversity
2. Innovations by women
3. Innovations that address local issues
4. Innovations that are inexpensive, use mainly locally available resources, increase income and/or save expenditures, reduce labour etc
5. Innovations that are scalable
6. Innovations that pass the TEES test: good technical performance, economically sound, environmentally better, socially acceptable
7. Innovations that have potential for PID, i.e. There are questions that farmers, formal researchers and other partners are interested in; for which farmers have ideas / suggestions for improvement
8. Innovations that are amenable to PID: stimulate interaction and co-generation of knowledge; attract partners – foremost farmers – around the question(s) to investigate, excite other stakeholders to want to interact with farmers and can keep the farming community interested

9. Innovations that focus on quick-wins to open the eyes of other stakeholders that farmers are doing something wonderful

10. Not only technical but also institutional and social innovations (diversity of innovations)

11. Innovations by youth (female and male)

12. Innovations that are related to climate change adaptation

13. Innovations that cater to the needs of a majority of farmers, eg. small-scale poorer farmers (as only a minority of farmers are rich)

He also discussed the criteria for selecting an innovation that included:

- Passing the TEES (technical, economic, environmental and social viability) test.
- Locally evolved and developed using local knowledge
- Addressing immediate local needs or long-term solutions/ opportunities of smallholder farmers
- Has the consent and interest of the innovator
- Easily adapted by another individual farmer or farmer groups
- Addresses a theme not covered by many applications
- Addresses gender and social inclusion (women, children, youth and other marginalised and vulnerable people)

In closing the session, Zimi referred to the guide for documenting innovations that was prepared for the Proli-FaNNS project which would also be used in this project.


The participants evaluated the day and summarized it as follows:

**What went well:**

- Time management by facilitators was good.
- Most of the presentations were simple and clear
- The participants bonded very well and had great interactions
- Group work and presentations were good
- Clear presentations
- Got clear idea of what PID is about
- Facilitation of local innovation was participatory and enriched with practical experiences
- Good learning

**What could improve**

- More clearer distinctions on the types of innovations with examples
- More work on documentation guide
- There was a bit of Day 1 drudgery

**DAY 2: 4 February 2020, Tuesday**

**Session: Participatory innovation development (Farmer-led joint research)**

Chesha facilitated this session in an interactive way using a power point presentation to highlight some of the important points. To start with the group discussed the different types of research and agreed on the following:

**Farmers’ (own) research**

- Completely controlled by the farmers
- Farmers decide what they want to explore, how they want to do it, what they want to observe and what is done with the findings
- They cover the costs and carry the risks themselves

**On-farm trials**

- Initiative comes from scientists (others), who are interested in validating “their” technologies under “real” conditions
- Degree of participation of the farmers in planning, implementing and analysing the on-farm trials varies;
- Final decision about what is being explored or tested is made by the scientists/development agents trying to introduce new technologies

**Farmer-led joint research**

- Conceived and controlled by farmers who carry out the research in collaboration with other (non-farmer) partners;
- Farmers play a leading/equal role in research design planning, implementing and evaluating the research process and results
- Control over the process remains in the farmers’ hands.

Chesha also briefly revisited the types of participation in such research namely:

**Contractual participation:** Farmers are contracted to provide land or undertake services

**Consultative participation:** Farmers are consulted for their problems, provide information before outsiders develop solutions; staff talks, questions, acts, farmers give answers, contribute
**Collaborative – interactive - participation**: farmers are full partners in the development and research process; staff and farmers jointly act and decide

**Collegiate participation – towards farmer self-management**: Outsiders support and strengthen farmers own research and innovation activities; farmer questions, acts; staff supports

Thereafter the participants looked at the differences between farmers’ and scientists research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal researchers’ experiments/ research</th>
<th>Farmers’ experiments/ research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longer-term perspective</td>
<td>Shorter term perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused on insight generation</td>
<td>Focused on problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of capital intensive equipment</td>
<td>Little use of equipment in experiments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complicated design and analysis</td>
<td>Limited design analysis; trial and error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard procedures</td>
<td>Procedures often ad hoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often single commodities</td>
<td>Often integrated systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled variables</td>
<td>Multi-variables and criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics-based assessment</td>
<td>Holistic assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificial situation</td>
<td>Real-life situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small numbers of scientists</td>
<td>Large number of farmer innovators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As SULCI-FaNS places emphasis on scaling out innovations, the participants were asked the question: “What comes to mind when you talk about “scaling out?” The responses were as follows:

- Horizontal
- Adopting and adapting
- Taking it to a different place
- Extending the reach
- Spreading to others
- More people get to know

There was agreement that scaling out was horizontal dissemination to others within and beyond the community (to other areas).
Group assignment: Work in two country groups on ways of scaling out that are being used now and could be used in the future

Group 1 (Ghana)
- Community sharing sessions
- Radio discussions
- Farmer innovation fairs (local, national, international)
- Cross learning visits
- Posters, brochures, flyers
- Documentation (video, flyers)
- Innovators offering training to peers
- Local, national and international fora
- Electronic/ print media
- Programmes organised by chiefs
- Video shows in communities

Group (Kenya)
- Exchange visits/ cross learning visits (a farmer group with no innovation to visit a farmer innovator or take an innovator to a farmer group)
- Exchange of farmer innovations from one location to another
- Set up a farmer innovators network/ prepare a schedule/plan visits
- Farmer innovator fairs and other exhibitions
- Documentation such as leaflets, flyers, brochures
- Media (theater, community video, cinema)
- Radio, social media, TV
- Innovation contests (integrated into schools, community, internships)
- Bring together partners who are interested in talking about the concept/idea

During the plenary that took place after the group presentations, Chesha added a few more options:
- Travelling photo exhibitions
- Cartoons
- Markets
- Mobile phones/ Whatsapp messages
- A Growing Culture and its Library of Food Sovereignty
- Newspaper articles (e.g. Nepal)
- Involving school children in sharing (e.g. Nepal)

Session: Multistakeholder partnerships (MSPs)
Zimi facilitated the session on MSPs and used a PPT to draw attention to the following:
What is a MSP? Why is it important? Basic principles of a MSP and Challenges of a MSP

He mentioned that there are many different ways for groups of people to work together to solve a large and complex problem, or exploit a promising new opportunity. These types of partnerships and interactions and the processes followed are described in different words -
coalitions, alliances, and platforms, to participatory governance, stakeholder engagement, and interactive policy-making.

In the context of agricultural research and development:

“Stakeholders” are all actors who have an interest in the production and consumption of agricultural products. These include – in addition to the primary stakeholders of women and men farmers – researchers, extension workers, educationalists, government policymakers and business people from the private sector.

“Partners” are actors who jointly plan and implement activities. In order to collaborate, these partners mobilise and share resources and agree on how these will be managed.

“Platform” is a concept based on the principle that a space for negotiation should be created: it is on this platform that dialogue takes place and agreements are made.

Imagine a theatre with a stage (a platform) where a troupe of actors (stakeholders) play together (as partners) to bring to life a performance.

A MSP is an organisational framework or structure which adopts the multiple processes of governance or policy making, which aims to bring together stakeholders such as businesses, civil society, governments, research institutions and non-government organisations to cooperate.

Multi-stakeholder partnerships can serve a variety of purposes and there are many different models for their design and operation. Different groups come together to share a common problem/ aspiration/ pursue a shared vision, while nonetheless having different interests or ‘stakes’. It is a strategic collaboration that can be long term or short term.

Building partnerships between key actors and stakeholders in ecologically oriented agriculture and natural resource management is a key strategy of Prolinnova. Effective collaboration between farmers and researchers, extension workers, educationists, government policy makers and private sector is required to accelerate farmer innovation and farmer-led joint research.

In Prolinnova- related projects, MSPs are established at community, district, regional, national and international levels for joint experimentation, capacity building, learning and policy influencing.

Guiding principles for local level MSPs are:

- A MSP should be composed of diverse stakeholders: research stations, development agencies, universities, non-governmental organisations, government departments/ministries, farmer organisations/ groups including other resource-user groups such as fishers and pastoralists. The diversity should be in terms of the organisations represented in the MSP as well as specialisation/ focus of the organisation such as education, agriculture, water, soil, sociology, community mobilisation and participation, ecology, innovation, nutrition, monitoring and evaluation, research etc.
- Though a project is implemented within a small geographical area, usually within one or two districts/sub-counties or communes, the MSP should cover a wider area so as to facilitate broad sharing and learning and, more importantly, to facilitate effective advocacy and policy dialogue.

- Participation in the MSP is voluntary and no sitting allowances are paid. Only necessary costs such as for travel, communication and meals are reimbursed, subject to availability of funds.

- The MSP should develop a charter or bylaws to provide the general rules and regulations on the management and operation of the platform. The guidelines should include structure of the MSP, gender composition, election/voting process and terms of office, roles of MSP members, procedures for calling and conducting meetings, establishment of sub-committees, procedures for communication, inclusion and expulsion of MSP stakeholders etc.

- The composition of the MSP should ensure a gender balance, and the members should have a clear understanding of gender issues such as gender equality, women’s and girls’ rights including reproductive and sexual rights, women’s access to justice and participation in decision making, and gender equity.

- The MSP should have the capacity to establish and strengthen linkages (both horizontal and vertical) with various partners and stakeholders and at various levels. Such networking should strengthen the capacity of the MSP in implementation of activities, resource mobilisation, technical support, advocacy and policy dialogue, documentation and information dissemination etc.

- The MSP should have members who have the capacity to facilitate the operations of the MSP including moderating discussions and providing opportunities for dialogue, voicing opinions of the stakeholders and articulating the goals of the project and of PROLINNOVA.

- The MSP should have a clear communication and feedback mechanism to its stakeholders and other partners. These mechanisms should be effective and provide accurate and clear information on the project, MSP operations etc.

- The MSP should not be limited to the operations and timeframe of the Proli-FaNS project but should be established as a long-term platform that will ensure active participation, discussions and negotiations among stakeholders.

- The MSP should have at least one PID-based learning agenda – and preferably more – to discuss in the platform. The partners in the PID should report to the MSP, and the platform members should be in a position to discuss the progress of the PID work.

- A few members of the local-level MSP should engage in national-level policy dialogue, funds permitting. In this case, they should take a well-formulated message from the MSP to the higher (national) level.
Group assignment: Work in country groups and discuss the characteristics and challenges of local-level MSPs established under the project

MSP (Ghana)

Partners
- NGO (NABOCADO) – coordination; mobilising communities; providing extension services; facilitation of PID
- Department of Agriculture – technical backstopping; mobilizing communities; policy dialogue; facilitator of PID processes
- Forestry Commission – facilitator of community NRM; enforcing national by-laws
- District Assembly – provide resources for farmer associations; mainstream PID in districts of operation
- Women in Agricultural Development – gender issues; women’s enterprises; nutrition and food safety
- Community members
- Department of Cooperatives
- Innovators
- National Vocational Institute
- Media (local radio station)
- Traditional Ruler
- Assembly Man

Challenges
- Commitment of members
- Resource limitations
- Time constraints of members

Solutions
- Finding a date suitable to all/ planning in advance
- Reminding partners of roles/ responsibilities at regularly
- Supplementary funds from local NGO
- Travel support from Dept. of Agriculture/NABOCADO
- Concentrate on at least 5 partners to continue the process (after some drop out at the beginning)

MSP (Kenya)

Partners (Makueni)
- Innovators
- Kenya Agricultural and Livestock Research Organisation (KALRO)
- Inades - project admin, management, coordination
- County Department of Agriculture
- WRC Association
- Department of Livestock and Fisheries
- Department of Sand Harvesting, Utilisation and Conservation – policy and mobilisation
- Religious communities

Partners (Makueni)
- KALRO – technical backstopping; M&E
- County Department of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries – Extension; community mobilization; policy dialogue
- County government – mobilization; profiling of innovation;
- Rural Development Initiative (RUDI), CBO – mobilization and profiling
- World Neighbors – project administration, management, coordination

**Challenges**
- Managing expectations of partners
- Different levels of understanding on LI/PID
- Availability of partners for meetings etc.
- Communication to partners
- Sustainability of MSP post project/ post funding

**Solutions**
- Planning dates ahead of time
- Local level training to bring all partners to speed on LI/PID
- Communicating to different partners in different ways – not simply sending an email to all; follow up via telephone

Participants were reminded to read the guidelines for MSPs on the PROLINNOVA website:
http://www.prolinnova.net/sites/default/files/documents/About_Us/prolinnova_guidelines/prolinnova_guidelines_10_guiding_principles_for_local-level_msp_dec2016r.pdf

**Session: Gender responsive LI/PID**
Marta started the session using the PPT found in Annex 3. She examined the concept of gender, looked at some common terms and focused on what is meant by gender mainstreaming and the steps to be taken when mainstreaming gender into development initiatives.

Chesha continued the session and introduced the participants to the GALID (Gender analysis in local innovation development) guidelines that had been developed over two years with the support of FAO. She used a PPT that is based on the guidelines that are still to be approved by FAO. The participants were given a copy of the guidelines on the condition that it was for their own use and not for circulation until FAO approval is given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 1</th>
<th>Activity 2</th>
<th>Activity 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifying women’s innovation</td>
<td>Analysing, documenting and sharing women’s innovation</td>
<td>Engaging women in farmer-led joint research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How to find women innovators

- Seek information from community workers who work closely with women, especially women-headed households
- Look for women who are doing things differently to their mothers and grandmothers
- Look for women who appear to be active in more male-dominated aspects of agriculture or in related structures
- Engage with women in spaces where they congregate, share, socialise and work together and use women’s organisations as entry points

How to be gender sensitive in analysing local innovation processes and results

- Describe the separate inputs/contributions of men and women in any given local innovation
- Find out how the local innovation affects men and women, positively or negatively

How to get more women to engage in joint research

- Give priority to women’s innovations and their areas of interest for further research
- Use criteria suggested by women for screening innovations for farmer-led joint research
- Find research partners who are interested in topics of interest to women
How to find women’s innovation

- Look for less obvious aspects of farming when visiting a household/community
- Pay more attention to so-called women’s activities

How to give recognition to women innovators

- Document the stories of women innovators
- Involve women innovators in documenting their own stories
- Select and support women innovators to share their experiences in relevant events and through various channels

How to ensure that women participate in and benefit from farmer-led research

- Engage both women and men in the design and process of the experiment
- Address the specific challenges to women’s involvement in experimentation
- Use criteria of men and women in evaluating the joint experiment and its benefits

Small group Assignment – Frame 2-3 questions that can be used to tease out gender-related information on each of the points in the activity framework above:

**Group 1 (Djibril, Margaret, Vincent) – Activity 1**

**Bullet 1.**
- How many women are you working with?
- Are they engaged as a group or as individuals?
- What is their common interest (eg. FNS)?
- How are they dealing with challenges associated with food security (any new thing or intervention they are doing)?
- If any, were they told about it or did they develop it on their own?

**Bullet 2.**
- Where in the community are they located?
- What is the common practice (traditional or adapted)?
- In the past, did you do the same things in the same way?
- If yes, is it still effective in solving food and nutrition security?
- If no, what modification or improvements have been made and what is the current effectiveness?

**Bullet 3.**
- In your community, which roles are assigned to men and women and which are for both?
- Do you know of any women in male dominated roles/activities in your community?
- How does the community judge or view them?

**Bullet 4.**
- What motivates you to come together as a group?
- How often do you meet?

**Group 2 (Joe, Marta and Dan) – Activity 2**

The group used the innovation of *Wasawasa* as a nutritious food for their analysis.

**Bullet 1.**
- What do you use in the preparation of *Wasawasa*?
- Are you able to get all the ingredients yourself?
- How did you get the ones that you could not find yourself/who assisted you?
- How long does it take to prepare the food?
- Do you need extra labour?
- What is your source of help/labour?

Bullet 2.
- Would you like to share your innovation with others?
- What does your innovation involve?
- Who would you want to share your innovation with?
- How beneficial has your innovation been to you?
- Who has something they would want to share?

Group 3 (Elizabeth, Albert, Shaibu) – Activity 3
This group was not familiar with LI/PID as they have just joined the SULCI-FaNS project and did not have PID experiences to base their responses on.)

Bullet 1
- What innovations are women interested in?
- Are the innovations beneficial to the women?
- Are there resources available to support the adoption by women?

Bullet 2
- Are innovations friendly or attractive to women?
- Are the innovations labour intensive for women?
- Will the innovations go against the traditional norms of the community?

Bullet 3
- Does your organisation have a gender policy?
- What project(s) has/is your organisation implemented/implementing that has benefitted a lot of women?
- Do you have documentary evidence of your work related to women’s innovations?

Bullet 4
- What % of women are involved in the process of this experiment?
- Who will lead what?
- Is there a fair playing field for both men and women

Bullet 5
- Can the women in the area make a plan/schedule of how often they will come to check on the experiments?
- Which of the innovations are more likely to generate income for the women?

Bullet 6
- Which women specific benefits are expected from this innovation?

The small groups presented the questions they had framed followed by a short plenary discussion. The participants felt that it was quite a lot to digest in a short session and that they would need to study the guidelines once they are home. The participants agreed that probing was a necessary skill in gender analysis of LI/PID.

Chesha reminded them of the importance of probing as a means of generating information and recapped the six helpers (five wives and husband questions) used in participatory rural appraisal:
DAY 3: 5th February 2020, Wednesday

On Wednesday, the trainers and participants undertook a field visit to Bongo village in North Ghana. The participants were divided into three groups and were given a field assignment.

| Field visit to Bongo Learning Site, Ghana, Wednesday, 5th February 2020 |
|---|---|
| **GROUP 1** – Elizabeth, Dan, Shaibu  
**Assignment:**  
Discover one/two local innovation for food and nutrition security in the community and document the innovation using the SULCI-FaNS guidelines for documenting innovations. Give attention to gender aspects.  
**GROUP 2** – Albert, Margaret, Vincent  
**Assignment:**  
Find an innovation that has already been discovered in the Proli-FaNS project and find an aspect that could be improved through PID. Write up the different stages of the PID process – planning, monitoring and evaluation, documentation and sharing/dissemination  
**GROUP 3** – Djibril, Joe, Marta  
**Assignment:**  
Undertake a gender analysis of a PID process that has been completed in Proli-FaNS using the GALID guidelines – look at ways that gender can be incorporated into the case that has already been documented.  
**Use any creative method of presenting your findings (audio-visual, written, drama (skit), poem etc.)** |

The field visit was organized by NABOCADO, a partner in the SULCI-FaNS project. After a courtesy visit to NABOCADO’s office in Bolgatanga, the participants moved on to Bongo village. Albert did a quick introduction to the community and the participants broke into their assigned groups and had a discussion of about two hours with members of the community. Each group has at least one person who did the translation from the local language.

**Group 1 (Elizabeth, Dan and Shaibu)**
Group 2 (Albert, Margaret, Vincent)

Group 3 (Djibril, Joe, Marta)
DAY 4: 6th February 2020, Thursday
Albert and Joe did a quick recap of the main topics that were covered on day 2 as the group set out early on Day 3 for the field visit. Thereafter the three field groups presented their findings.

**Group 1 - presentations (Shaibu, Dan and Elizabeth)**
Used role play to present their innovations.

**Ateltaba group to support one another (knowledge is not in the bush to be taken but with each other)**

**Pest control in storage of millet**
The traditional method is using ash for pest control. One woman came up with a new way of pest control using *kul-enka*, a grass found in the area.

**Description**
- Mix “*Kul-enka*” flowers (grass) and ash (in a pan)
- Pour the mixture into an earthenware pot
- Add the millet into this mixture in the pot. Cover the pot with a cloth.

She and others have been this for the last four years.

**Benefits**
- Millet can be stored for up to one year without pest attacks
- The *Kul-enka* flowers are freely available during the rainy season
- It is safe and has no side effects as it uses no chemicals
- Readily available for consumption
- Fetches a good market as it is very clean even after one year
- Better germination percentage (due to less damage)

**Gender issues**
- The innovator has been able to access part of the family farm land for own cultivation
- Husband and children now support the innovation and help her harvest the flowers from trees in the area

**Dissemination**
- Participated in farmer innovation fairs
- Shared with friends and relatives who are now using the method.
- Has been linked to NGOs through agricultural officer

**Problems/challenges**
- *Kul-enka* grass is not found within the homestead and is seasonal when the rains come and the grasses sprout.

**Questions:**
- Has she used *kul-enka* alone? No.
- Have they tried growing the *kul-enka* in their own homegardens? *Kul-enka* is a wild grass that comes up during the rainy season and is harvested during a short period.
- Have they tried it on other cereals? No.
- Have other women taken it up? A few women are using the method.

**Group 2 - presentations (Albert, Vincent and Margaret)**

**Innovation:** Shea butter concoction for Bambara beans preservation
Nsomu Azure; 30 years; 4 children; 1 acre (intercropped with ground nut, Bambara beans 0,25 acre)

**Description:**
A concoction from Shea bark is put through heat treatment. The innovator uses a metal pot to boil water and Shea bark. She used this hot solution to wash the Bambara beans by pouring it over the beans which are in a sieve.

**Benefits:**
- Better taste of Bambara beans
- Nice colour of beans attracts customers
- No chemicals used in process and less expensive

**Actors:** Innovator; NABOCADO; ACDEP; Dept of Agriculture; community group (Ayelbia)

**What can be improved:**
Improving seed dormancy
Her issues are how to get sufficient firewood to fire the pot for washing a bag of 100kg of Bambara seed.

**Stages of PID:**
- Identification of innovation
- Vetting by local MSP
- Funding where necessary through LISF
- Experimentation
- M&E
Joint documentation

Gender aspects
Labour is now divided among the family members; does joint ploughing with the husband; lands is owned by man – 0.25 acres for Bambara beans. Women are allowed to get a piece of plot from someone from the village but are expected to give some of the harvest back to the landowner. When women don’t consult with their husbands, then they cannot go back to their husbands if a need arises. Another woman is trying bitter leaf as an alternative to Bambara beans. The innovator is very willing to share her innovation with others.

Group 3 - presentations (Djibril, Joe and Marta)

Title and description of innovation
Managing African Swine Fever with local herbs
It is a concoction of two herbs that is prepared by boiling and used to treat pigs suffering from swine fever
The farmer led joint experimentation focused on:
- propagating the two herbs in the farmers garden, domesticating them to reduce the time and cost of fetching them from the forest and to guarantee their availability
- trying out a better package for the herb

What processes involved men and women?
Men
- Collecting herb from the forest
- Preparing the herb for the boiling process
- Issuing out the concoction/preparation to farmers who needed to use it
- Instructing the users

Women
- Boiling, to ensure that the fire was sustained throughout the process
- Fetching water for the process
- During PID, watering the garden where propagation was done
- Weeding the garden

Were the women involved in the design?
No.
- Collection/ fetching of the herbs was left to the man due to the distance and physical energy required
- However, some of women’s pigs were involved in the experiment (with permission from the men)
- The women were interested in benefitting from the improved concoction/preparation

Men’s and women’s criteria for PID
Women
A woman tried to use the herb by soaking and not boiling. She used it on the dogs and it worked. This may imply that her interests would be in a less fuel-consuming process

Men
- Availability of the raw material
Efficacy of the herb

Do men and women have space to share and give opinion about the innovation, PID?
- They hold meetings and intercommunity fairs where both men and women participate and they share about the innovations
- Both are able to provide feedback to the innovator

Do men support women in innovation?
- They may help with some processes especially in tasks not considered women’s tasks
- Women’s participation seems to require consent from men e.g women with pigs need permission to participate in the testing of the swine fever herb
- Women feel that to participate they need to learn about the processes in order to be part of it.
- Men may also provide some inputs to women’s innovation

Do women own whatever comes out of an innovation process/ can they make decisions?
The decisions to sell are made by women who own the pigs, e.g the pigs owned by men are negotiated for by the men, however the money is paid to the woman. The proceeds are ploughed back into household needs

Conclusions
- It is important to include women/ gender specialists/ people trained in gender in the teams that facilitate PID as a strategy to attract more women to participate
- The women were not involved during the PID design but they added their inputs during all the phases of the processes (sharing results, providing labour).
- Roles and division of labour didn’t change
- The innovation did not challenge norms or values
- The decision making was more skewed towards the men than the women
- The woman have access to the concoction which means that their pig mortality due to the disease is reduced. They can have income from the pigs

Session: Local Innovation Support Facilities (LISFs)
Zimi presented experiences on operating LISFs from Ghana. Under the Farmers Access to Innovation Resources (FAIR) project in Ghana from 2008 to 2011, LISFs were piloted to demonstrate a sustainable community-based funding mechanism to provide small funds to innovative farmers to improve their innovations, to experiment and stimulate learning. The initiative sought to ultimately empower farmers and create favourable conditions and opportunities for them to play lead and decisive roles in demand-driven research in sustainable agriculture and natural resource management to improve food security and livelihoods of rural resource-poor farmers.

The LISF structure consisted of:

a) **LISF management committee (district level) that:**
• Made major policy & management decisions for effective functioning of LISF & up-scaling
• Approved work plans, budgets and funds for innovations and other LISF activities
• Screened and approved LISF applications
• Undertook program planning, review and monitoring

b) **Local development partners (facilitating organizations) who:**

• Undertook community sensitisation, mobilising applications from farmers/groups
• Built capacities of CBOs, farmers and innovators in experimentation, local innovation processes and relevant issues.
• Provided technical support for implementation of field level activities
• Monitored and backstopped farmers’ innovation activities
• Facilitated implementation of district LISF activities, including farmer to farmer learning
• Sourced supplementary local funds to support LISF activities

Farmer innovators could apply for LISFs for the following purposes:

• Organising learning or sharing visits to sources of new information (e.g. innovative farmers or communities, research centres)
• Acquiring specific equipment or tools needed for carrying out farmer-led research and innovation, such as for measuring, record keeping and documentation
• Organising community-level events for sharing outcomes of local research with other farmers
• Sharing innovations and farmer-led research experiences at fairs, exhibitions, farmer conferences, policy workshops etc.
• Training other farmers in working with the local innovations and/or in carrying out farmer-led research
• Covering transport costs of scientists or technical advisors invited by the farmers to support their local research.

LISFs were operationalised using the following steps:

1. Sensitisation of community and mobilisation of applications: call for proposals
2. Administration of applications
3. Screening of applications
4. Disbursement of funds
5. Implementation of activity funded by LISFs
Step 1: Sensitisation of community and mobilization of applications: call for proposals

- Announcement on local radio and at community events
- Organising of radio programmes to involve farmers to talk about FAIR and the procedure for accessing funds. This included the criteria that must be met.
- Organising of one-day sensitisation workshops at the district level, inviting representatives of CBOs, relevant NGOs and GOs, introducing them to FAIR and they, in turn, introducing their members to FAIR, spelling out the application procedure
- Sensitised organizations setting up gender-focused fora with community members and passing on the call for proposals. Such meetings and other announcements were integrated into the regular activities of the identified organisations
- A certain minimum number of female applicants was one condition required for farmers and CBOs to submit proposals and to receive consideration
- The call for innovations spanned all themes including social innovation. Stakeholders were given awareness on social innovation and farmer-led joint experimentation.

Step 2: Administration of applications

- Applicants submitted proposals through their CBO or representative organisation to their district coordinating institution
- Forms were to be kept simple.
- Forms were to be in two parts:
  (i) personal details of applicant, description of proposal and budget (name, sex, contact, purpose, activities and budget, expected results and cross-cutting themes) to be completed by applicant
  (ii) Additional information for documentation (theme, activity, screening result, financials and monitoring and evaluation reports) to be completed by the person responsible for managing the register.
- CBO executives or representative organisations supported farmers to fill out forms
- A register was kept at the district coordinating institution for entering application data
- CBOs were responsible for informing applicants that their proposals had been submitted

Step 3: Screening of applications

- Checking whether the application addressed a theme not covered by many applications
- Checking whether it would receive the approval of the District, Municipal and Metropolitan Assembly where the innovation would be implemented or tested.
- Making sure that the amount requested did not exceed the ceiling. If it did the applicant was asked to review his/her budget or the application was disqualified
• Screening was done at the district level by the LISF management committee made up of representatives from CBOs, NGOs and GOs
• National steering committee gave final approval
• Farmer representation was increased in the screening process and included female farmers
• Female representatives were included in the LISF management committees
• The National Steering Committee was also given gender considerations
• Individual applicants were present at the district review of screening results meeting.
• Final approval or non-approval was communicated in writing/orally through the respective CBOs or partner organisations to the individual or group applicants

**Step 4: Disbursement of funds**

• Monies allocated to the zones were distributed into the bank accounts of CBOs with successful applications from their members
• CBOs and partner organizations notified successful farmers of the availability of funds in CBO bank accounts
• Farmers submitted requests to their respective CBOs and the funds were released to them
• In the case of joint-experimentation the farmer submitted the request to his/her CBO
• Funds were released to the farmer and the farmer, in turn, made available part of the money to the partner involved in the joint-experimentation.
• The farmer could request for the money in a number of installments or one-time payment depending on the volume of funds and the financial demands of his/her innovation
• Funds were disbursed taking cognizance of seasonal imperatives

**Step 5: Implementation of activity funded by LISF**

• Successful farmers started their experiment at the beginning of the rainy season or other suitable period
• Farmer innovator did the day-to-day monitoring and evaluation of his/her innovation development
• Farmer innovators were encouraged to implement, monitor and evaluate in a participatory manner
• Farmer innovators provided progress as well as final reports written or orally at review meetings; this included a financial report at each stage. The financial report was on
activities planned in the application, the approved budget, actual expenditure per activity and reasons for any deviations

• Farmer to farmer learning took place throughout the activity

• farmer innovators were asked to take photos before, during and at the end of funded activity and were allowed to include these costs in their budgets

• A CBO executive paid one or two monitoring visits upon the invitation of the innovator and the innovator was responsible for bearing the cost of the monitoring visit by the CBO executive. The costs of the monitoring visits were included in the budget prepared by the innovator

• The CBO executives integrated these visits, whenever possible, into their regular work in the communities

• The CBO executives forwarded both narrative and financial reports on the innovation to the zonal office

• The district level also organised one monitoring visit at their own cost, with one or two people.

• Experience-sharing and review workshops were held at the district level

• Documentation and publication of findings was encouraged

• Farmer-led documentation of individual innovations was the responsibility of the innovator and the cost for documentation was included in the LISF request.

• Documentation took the form of policy briefs, videos, posters and leaflets

• Cataloguing a number of innovations was the responsibility of the district coordinating institutions

• Members of the district coordinating institutions also undertook occasional monitoring of innovations at their own cost

• The focal person will carried out monitoring and evaluation of the functioning of the whole LISF based on data from the register

• Registers were kept at the district level

• The national coordinating institution evaluated the programme to assess its impact.

• Innovators were allowed to include money for participation in innovation days and conferences into their budgets

Vincent presented some challenges faced in operationalizing LISFs in Proli-FaNS Kenya and how they addressed them:

**Challenge 1: Inadequate funds (for operating beyond project period)**

- Use revolving fund method
- Find local MSP (fund management committee) who are willing to volunteer their time for meetings etc.
- Use other local meetings to piggyback on
- Find win-win solutions that are favourable to the community and outsiders involved
- Transition to a purely community-based mechanism
- Find ways of tapping into public funds (eg., Netfund Kenya)
- Find solutions from within the community – start conversation on sustainability early on in the process
- Use innovations that have attractive to the community to make people aware of the importance of sustaining the LISF
- Grow innovations into social enterprises that would feedback into LISF

**Challenge 2: Limited understanding of the concept**

- Use peer-peer communication
- Use visuals

**Challenge 3: regular attendance of LISF committee members**

- Assign a role to every attendee so that they are stimulated to come
- Plan the meetings in advance
- Synchronise with other meetings in the community

**Challenge 4: Time gap between application and disbursement of funds**

- Reduce number of steps and make process less cumbersome
- Have a time plan indicating periods of application, vetting and grant making
- Make application form simpler to speed up vetting process
- Include LISF allocations into quarterly disbursements to local partners (ACDEP)

Chesha facilitated an interactive session to elicit ways to overcome the challenges faced in operationalizing LISFs which resulted in the following:

**DAY 5: 7th February 2020, Friday**

**Session: Monitoring and evaluation of PID**

Chesha guided the group through a discussion on the basics of monitoring and evaluation and noted the following responses from the participants:

**Monitoring:**

- Checking the progress of an activity
- Checking whether implementation follows the plan
- Making mid-course corrections
- A process that goes on throughout PID

**Evaluation:**

- Looking back at the process, whether it met our expectations/objectives, whether resources were spent effectively and efficiently
- Learning from the process
- Can be done periodically and at the end
- Can find out intended and unintended outcomes
- We are looking at the process and products

Chesha used a PPT to go through some basics in M&E.

**Monitoring** is continuously verifying and documenting whether implementation is progressing according to plan and making adjustments wherever and whenever necessary.

**Evaluation** is the periodical or final verification to see whether the objective(s) have been achieved according to plans.

**Participatory monitoring and evaluation** (PME) is the **active participation of all stakeholders** (farmer innovator, extensionist, research scientist, community members e.g. in a given activity (farmer-led joint experiment). Each stakeholder will have a **defined role and tasks** for monitoring and evaluation in the PID process as agreed during the planning of the experiment.

Differences between monitoring and evaluation were noted as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>MONITORING</strong></th>
<th><strong>EVALUATION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective</strong></td>
<td>To keep track of progress of an activity</td>
<td>To find out whether objective was achieved, to learn from the process and to share findings with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
<td>Happens throughout the activity</td>
<td>Happens periodically or at the end of an activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who</strong></td>
<td>All stakeholders with farmer innovator in the lead</td>
<td>All stakeholders and other invitees from the community and beyond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Result</strong></td>
<td>Make mid-course changes if and when necessary</td>
<td>Find out whether objective was achieved; draw conclusions, lessons and findings; get ideas for next experiment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An **INDICATOR** is a quantifiable measurement of the progress of an activity towards the achievement of an objective and should be **SMART:**

**S** – **Specific; M** – **Measureable; A** – **Achievable; R** – **Realistic; T** – **Time bound**

The following were considered requirements for successful PME:

- A well-defined **objective**
- Specific **activities** relating to objective
- Realistic **plans** (with timing and task division) to achieve activities
- **Criteria** to assess the result of Activities
• **SMART indicators** to measure progress of activities
• List of records to be kept, **data, information** to be collected and recorded, according to the indicators
• Names of stakeholders and their specific data recording tasks

The group was then led in a discussion on how to design a PME system for PID using the following framework:

1. **What is the objective of the experiment?**
   • For example, to see whether a new variety is better than the present one.

2. **What criteria should be used to assess an experiment with this objective?**
   • What makes the variety better? For example, yield, taste, colour, storability, profit, women’s labour requirements, men’s labour requirements.

3. **What indicators will show whether these criteria have been met?**
   • For example, yield - kg/ha.

4. **What measurements are required for these indicators?**
   What essential information do we have to collect?
   • (For example, Area - acre/sq.ft/ha, of plot, Yield in kg/lb from plot)

5. **What information/data do we collect?**
   • How do we collect the information?
   • What techniques of observations and measurements can we use?
   • What equipment do we need?
   • Who will do this? When? Where? (For example, at sowing and amount of seed used)

6. **How do we record the data?**
   • How do we keep track of what was measured so that we can refer to it later when we want to compare and analyze results? (For example, note book, recording form, wall hanging etc).

---

**Group exercise: Work in two small groups to apply the M&E to a selected PID process that they had undertaken in Proli-FaNS**

**Group 1 – Improving the quality of Shea butter of the Alongtaaba Women’s Group (Joe, Albert, Dibril and Elizabeth)**

**Criteria:**
- Colour
- Purity (use tamarind to take away impurities)
- Taste
d. Level of Aflatoxin

Indicators:

a. Colour of Shea butter at end of the process
b. Taste of Shea butter at the end of the process
c. Volume of the butter produced
d. Percentage of moisture/water content of the final product

Measurement:

a. Colour of the final butter (white/light colour is considered superior)
b. Taste – neutral is considered best
c. Low water or moisture content

Information/data to be collected:

Observation – for colour and impurities
Moisture meter for the moisture content

Who will do this? The processors, M&E team composed of men and women

M&E starts from the time of collecting/buying the nuts until the Shea butter is pressed.

How do we record data?

- Photos
- Interviews
- Videos
- Documenting success stories

Group 2 – Determining the effectiveness of the organic fruit fly trap (Marta, Dan, Shaibu and Vincent)

Criteria to be used:

- What is the cost of using the fruit fly trap against the cost of using conventional methods?
- How much flies can it trap within a given period of time compared to the conventional method?
- What is the yield of mangoes when the trap is used compared to when a conventional method is used?
- What is the quality of mangoes when the trap is used compared to when a conventional method is used?

What indicators will show that these criteria have been met?

- Cost of using the fruit fly trap – Reduced cost of fruit fly control;
- How much flies can it trap – Increased no. of flies trapped per unit area
- What is the yield of mangoes – Increased quantity( no., kg, tons) of fruits per unit area (per tree, per acre, per ha)
- What is the quality of fruits – Reduced number of mango fruits with black spots, Reduced number of rotten fruit, diversified market opportunities/ advantages

What measurements are required for these indicators?

- Reduced cost of fruit fly control - (Ksh/ GHC)
- Increased no. of flies trapped per unit area – (no. of flies /trees/acre/ha)
- Increased quantity - ( % increase in no/ tree; basin/kg/acre, tons/ha) of fruits
• Reduced number of mango fruits with black spots – (no. of spots per fruit; no. of spotted fruits per kg(also per basin or ton);)
• Reduced number of rotten fruit (no. of rotten fruits per tree/ basin/kg/ ton)
• Diversified market opportunities/ advantages (no/types of new markets entered)

What information/data do we collect?
• How? Observe and measure
• What techniques? Counts and weights
• What equipment do we need? Baskets, weighing scales, sacks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Where</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced cost of fruit fly control</td>
<td>Innovator</td>
<td>At the end of the season</td>
<td>On farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of flies trapped</td>
<td>Innovator/ PID facilitator/other stakeholders</td>
<td>During infestation</td>
<td>On farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity of fruits</td>
<td>Innovator/ PID facilitator/other stakeholders</td>
<td>At fruit formation/ At maturity/harvest</td>
<td>On farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of mango fruits with black spots</td>
<td>Innovator/ PID facilitator/other stakeholders</td>
<td>At harvest</td>
<td>On farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of rotten fruit</td>
<td>Innovator/ PID facilitator/other stakeholders</td>
<td>At harvest/ at grading</td>
<td>On farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No/type of new markets</td>
<td>Innovator/ PID facilitator/other stakeholders</td>
<td>At marketing</td>
<td>On farm/ at market</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How do we record?
• Note books
• Pictures
• Simple data protocols
• Illustrations

Comments in plenary:
- Be more specific about who is involved and their responsibilities
- There are some aspects such as Aflatoxin content in Shea Butter which requires more scientific laboratory analysis
- Prepare a M&E plan for each PID process at the start of the process

M&E Framework for SULCI-FaNS

Finally we looked at the Proli-FaNS M&E framework that will continue to be used in SULCI-FaNS. The framework was discussed at length during the inception workshop and Brigid developed an Excel Sheet to be used by all partners based on the framework.

In Proli-FaNS, the second part of the framework (which is about impacts) was not operationalised. However, the focus group discussions conducted at the end of the project
captured some of this data by recall. In SULCI-FaNS, the framework will be used in its entirety, thus data related to the impact indicators will have to be collected.

The CPs did not collect any baseline data in Proli-FaNS. However, for our purposes, a community participatory historical time line can be done by recall. We can also use available secondary data. The CPs will have to collect some key baseline information at the start of SULCI-FaNS.

**Session: Documentation of PID**

Chesha facilitated an interactive session on process documentation using a powerpoint presentation.

Process documentation involves continuous reflection by programme partners on the approach, methods, processes, progress and results of the programme, which are described, analysed and documented in written and, if possible, also in audio-visual form. Insights gained through the process documentation should:

- contribute to adjusting the approach and improving the performance of the programme
- help others involved in participatory research and development to learn from the experience.

In addition, the documentation should convey information about what promoting local innovation actually entails.

Process documentation is a **record of what really happened** - not what was planned or should have happened. It should cover:

- a description of the actors (partners) in the process
- the partners’ aims and expectations, and how these changed over time
- how the partners built up a working structure and relationship, how this changed over time and for what reasons
- a chronological account of the main activities in the collaboration, with details as to *who* did *what*, *where*, *when*, *how* and *why* (always expressed in the active form, never in the passive or impersonal form)
- a description of intermediate outputs of the process and how these influenced what followed
- intermittent internal analyses of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats involved in the process
- intermittent internal assessments of the results and impact of the collaboration
- lessons learned, positive and negative.

The participants discussed the conventional way of documentation in which outsiders capture what has been happening. Farmer-led documentation (FLD), on the other hand, allows farmer innovators and their communities to document their PID experiences in the way they wish to, highlighting what is important to them and for the audiences that they hope to reach. Prolinnova’s experiences in FLD was briefly summarized and the booklets and policy briefs were shared with the group.
Group exercise: Work in CP groups and use one of the PID cases documented under Proli-FaNS and examine it in the light of what was discussed above – for example, ways to bring in more information, make it more attractive etc.

Group Kenya – Organic fruit fly trap

What was not sufficiently well documented?
• The various roles of those who took part wasn’t fully documented. For example, the role of the community and other stakeholders
• Challenges during the process were not fully documented
• The processes of getting round the challenges may not have been fully covered
• Photo documentation was not done well
• The process of documentation may not have been systematic enough to cover all aspects of the process

What could we do better?
• Assign an individual to follow up and carry out documentation activities systematically
• Involve more than just the innovator in documentation (include spouse, family etc.)
• Acquire better photo documentation facilities
• Equip field staff with capacity to document

Group – Ghana - Improving the Nutritional Value of “Wasawasa” Food in Northern Ghana

Ways of improving documentation of the case
• The preparation method is not catchy and we have agreed that we should put it in a box.
• Add pictures of Wasawasa
• The innovation process was jointly identified and selected by the innovator, the community and MSPs, through a stakeholder participatory process.
• Give more attention to gender when documenting.
• Design the activities in a diagrammatic form.
• Monitoring was not captured. It will be included in the revision.
• Take out the long introduction but says evaluation was done by both men and women. Also bring in the objectives.

In the short plenary discussion in concluding the session, participants mentioned the following in relation to documentation:

- Document success stories
- Short documentation/ stories could be shared via Whatsapp
- Find partners/organisations who are involved in development communication (Kenya broadcasting corporation); journalists who could support in documentation
Find low-cost solutions for documentation; short videos made with mobile phones.

The end-of-day evaluation was done by Margaret and Elizabeth using cards. The cream card was for areas that were clear and the green card was for areas that needed more attention.

The cream cards/areas that were clear included:
- M&E in PID through guidelines
- M&E group exercise led to better understanding of concept
- Use of the 5 wives and 1 husband (why, what, when, where, who, how) questions
- Using someone who knows nothing about Prolinnova to read a PID documentation could be a good indicator of a good documentation (if the person understood the process)
- Design of M&E system for PID

The green card/areas that needed more attention:
- Documentation for PID needs further reading and exploration
- More time needed for better documentation

**DAY 6: 8th February 2020, Saturday**

**Session: Policy Institutionalisation, policy dialogue and advocacy**

Zimi led the session and asked the participants the question: what is institutionalisation?

They gave two responses:
- Making a new practice part of the everyday work of an organisation
- Conscious effort to adopt a "new" practice within an institution

Using a power point presentation, Zimi took the participants through several aspects of institutionalisation:

**Why integrate PID into our institutions (education, extension, research, farmer organisation, community-based organisation, farmer companies)?**

- To get more people to adopt the PID approach
- To improve chances of getting funding
- To facilitate scaling up and out
- To get greater policy support from government and others with influence
- To get acceptance of the approach within ARD institutions
- To create conducive environment for acceptance of innovations for scaling out (eg. farmer-bred varieties)
- To ensure sustainability within community structures (eg. local level facilitators)
- To sustain the process of LI/PID

**How do we institutionalise?**

**Research/Extension**

- Bring researchers into the local and national MSPs
- Engage researchers in PID at local-site levels
- Build capacity of researchers in LI/PID approach
- Sensitise research institutions through researchers involved in PID (eg. Kenya – exhibition at biennial conference included FIs, provide support farmer innovator)
- Make publications on PID to share within ARD institutions
- Engage in research-extension liaison committees (in Ghana)
- Make research organisations host of CP - KALRO was host organisation of CP for a period
- Support researchers to integrate LI/PID approach into their work – getting farmers ideas into research; in Ghana, indigenous knowledge is now recognized in the agricultural research policy
- Use participatory extension approaches in advisory services (farmer-to-farmer sharing) – mass methods

**Education**

- Integrate courses into under and post graduate programmes
- Provide student internships
- Give grants for students to undertake research related to LI/PID

**Farmer-based organisation/farmer organisation/community based organisation**

- Participate in PID processes
- Visit to farmer innovators
- Build capacity of people within the CBOs
- Make space for innovators to share their innovations with others
- Enable innovators to make relevant linkages
- Allow innovators to select their own awards based on the value of the prize
- Other farmers adopting and adapting innovations within the community

**National NGOs**

- Using the approach in projects (eg. ACDEP – bottom-up, based on what farmers are doing as in Ethnovet project)
- Hold national policy workshops on participatory methodologies
- Embed in thematic areas as in the case of Inades/ WN who have integrated LI/PID into regular activities
- Make presentations (as WN does at international for a)
- Coach innovators (as is being done by NABOCADO as part of its work)
- Link innovators with other platforms/ innovators forum so that the approach – part and parcel of their work
- Share beyond the thematic area of agriculture – health, water and sanitation etc.

Chesha continued the session by asking the participants what comes immediately to mind when talking about policy influencing. The responses included:

- Interaction between farmer-government
- Dialogue
- Conversation
- Influence
At this point Chesha shared the diagram on the continuum of policy actions:

The discussion continued on the type of actors that come to mind when talking about policy dialogue for LI/PID. The following were mentioned:

- Farmer innovators
- Researchers
- NGOs
- FOs
- Opinion leaders
- Politicians
- Traditional rulers
- Community leaders / religious leaders
- Heads of academic institutions
- Journalists/media people
- Local spokespeople
- Heads of government ministries/departments
- Ambassadors/ public figures

Group exercise: work in CP groups and Group assignment – draft policy influencing plan for SULCI-FaNS project considering: a) Who are we going to
influence – actors at different levels? b) What are we going to do? (Key activities); c) How are we going to do these activities? d) When and where? e) With whom?

**Group 1 Ghana (Albert, Dan, Joe, Margaret, Shaibu)**

Objective: Policy advocacy/dialogue to institutionalize PID and LI approach among Prolinnova Ghana partners (farmers, NGOs, MoFA, researchers, universities, media)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>What</th>
<th>How</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>With Whom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>• Farmer Innovators</td>
<td>Community level sharing on innovation and PID outcomes,</td>
<td>Community durbars and fairs, video shows, posters</td>
<td>MSP members Innovators chiefs, DOA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Opinion leaders,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Community chief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>• District assembly</td>
<td>Organize innovation fairs</td>
<td>Traditional durbars of chiefs At festivals Meetings/fora</td>
<td>Local MSP Local NGO DOA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• DOA</td>
<td>• NGO consortium meetings at the district assembly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Outstanding innovative ambassadors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• WIAD</td>
<td>• District level stakeholder experience sharing forum</td>
<td></td>
<td>Media (district/community radio)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Community Development</td>
<td>• Sensitization and awareness creation forum on PID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Local MSP members</td>
<td>• District farmers’ days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Forestry commission</td>
<td>• Participation in RELC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Paramount Chief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>• Regional Coordinating Councils</td>
<td>Farmer innovation fair</td>
<td>Participation in RELC</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Regional Dept of Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Research (ARI, SARI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Universities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group 2 Kenya (Elizabeth, Marta and Vincent)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity/what</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Where</th>
<th>How</th>
<th>Why/output/output come</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round table meeting(s) to include a category exclusively for farmer innovators (award scheme)</td>
<td>County Government, innovators’ reps, Prolinnova Kenya (PK)</td>
<td>Quarterly (1st week of March)</td>
<td>County govt offices</td>
<td>Scheduling and facilitating the quarterly meetings</td>
<td>The innovative capacity of women and women’s groups is increasingly recognised and celebrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation and publication of the farmer Local Innovations</td>
<td>Researchers/Farmer innovator/PK</td>
<td>At least semi-annually</td>
<td>County/National/International</td>
<td>Conferences/Innovation Fairs and exhibitions</td>
<td>Local innovations identified and/or improved through PID are widely shared within the community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy dialogue  |  Technocrats and researchers  |  Quarterly  |  Media (print/electronic) Meetings Conferences  |  lobby through publications, sensitizations, conversations  |  Rural communities at the two learning sites are experimenting with their own local innovations to improve food and nutrition security.

Sensitization fora/meetings/events/activities  |  PK  |  Continuous  |  Research/county gov’t fora and education sector  |  Sharing information/dissemination materials, contests  |  Training on local innovation and PID processes considered in non-Prolinnova institutions

These plans were considered a starting point for further deliberation and finalization within the SULCI-FaNS project teams in the CPs.

Session: Post training plans
At the end of a very intensive six days, the participants worked in CP groups to prepare step-down training plans for SULCI-FaNS in their field locations. They shared their plans in plenary.

Ghana – workplan for April-May 2020 for local-level training in LI/PID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Training Content</th>
<th>Who participates</th>
<th>Who facilitates the training</th>
<th>Time line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Bongo learning site       | PID/LI; Gender; M&E framework and tools; LI documentation process; basic introduction to institutionalisation | • NGO staff (NABOCADO)  
• Local MSPs  
• Working group members | Zimi Albert Joe/Margaret  | April 2020                |
| Walewale Learning site    | PID/LI; Gender; M&E framework and tools; LI documentation process; basic introduction to institutionalisation | • NGO staff (CEAL)  
• Local MSPs (Yet to be established-End of March)  
• Working group members | Dan Franklin Zimi Joe/Margaret  | April-May 2020 |

Session: Workshop evaluation and closure
Zimi used an individual questionnaire to evaluate the workshop and tabulated the findings as follows:

1. FACILITATORS (level of Confidence) – participants scored the confidence level of the facilitators in the different sessions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Confident</th>
<th>Moderately Confident</th>
<th>Not Confident</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Innovation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Innovation Development</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Stakeholder Platforms</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Inclusion in PID</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Innovation Support Facility</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation of PID</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation of PID</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalization of PID approach</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. PARTICIPANT’S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION – participants scored themselves on how they felt about the different aspects of the workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASPECT</th>
<th>Least</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation of sessions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance/content of topics</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field visit</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which aspect/topics would you like to have more information on/support in?

- Identification of local innovation
- Process documentation
- Gender inclusion
- Institutionalisation of PID

Any recommendation for future improvement?

- Scale down number of workshop days to 4-5 days
- More time to digest some topics
- Reduce number of topics
- Include videos to emphasize some topics
## Annex 1: Participants sub-regional anglophone PID training, February 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vincent Mariadho</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>World Neighbors, Nairobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Elizabeth Wanja</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Inades Formation Kenya (MACHAKOS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Martha Opondo</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>KALRO Kibos (KISUMU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Djibril Thiam</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>AgriBio Services, Thies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dan Kolbilla</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Retired NGO Manager, Member of Ghana Working Group (to support WALEWALE SITE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Shaibu Mohammed Tiyumtaba</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>CSIR-Animal Research Institute, Tamale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Albert Avoka</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Bongo NABOCADO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Margaret Ama Kyiu</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>ACDEP, Ghana CP coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Zimi Alhassan (Co-facilitator)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Joe Nchor (Organizer)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>ACDEP, Project coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Chesha Wettashina (Lead facilitator)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Consultant /</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 2: SULCI-FaNS Project: Sub-regional Anglophone PID training, 3–8 February 2020 – Tentative Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time slot</th>
<th>3 February</th>
<th>4 February</th>
<th>5 February</th>
<th>6 February</th>
<th>7 February</th>
<th>8 February</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30 – 10:00</td>
<td>Opening of workshop/</td>
<td>Recap of Day 1</td>
<td>FIELD VISIT</td>
<td>Recap of Day 2/Field</td>
<td>Recap of Day 4</td>
<td>Recap of Day 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>welcome (Malex)</td>
<td>(participant)</td>
<td>(Joe and Zimi)</td>
<td>visit (participant)</td>
<td>(participant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Session: Introduction of participants and programme (Chesha)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Session: PID (contd) (Chesha)</strong></td>
<td>Participants undertake field assignment to better understand the concepts of LI/PID and the related gender aspects</td>
<td><strong>Feedback from Field visit (Zimi)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Session: M&amp;E of PID (general) (Chesha)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants’ introductions/expectations</td>
<td>PID in SULCI-FaNS – following on from ProlifaNS – Ghana and Kenya present their PID plans per field site and get feedback from others</td>
<td>Scaling out of PID outcomes and using these outcomes for improving food and nutrition security</td>
<td>Presentation of groups</td>
<td>Monitoring within PID – what to monitor, how to monitor, who will monitor?</td>
<td><strong>What is institutionalisation/ scaling up?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objectives of training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussions on issues that arise from presentations</td>
<td>Evaluation within PID – what do we evaluate, how and with whom? Findings – how do we use them?</td>
<td><strong>Why is it important?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteers for session documentation/daily evaluation and recap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Different forms of M&amp;E</td>
<td><strong>How do we institutionalise LI/PID approaches?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to SULCI-FaNS (Joe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Making a M&amp;E plan for PID</td>
<td><strong>Examples from Kenya and Ghana</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Examples from other CPs</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TEA/COFFEE BREAK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time slot</th>
<th>10:00 – 10:30</th>
<th>10:30 – 12:30</th>
<th>Feedback from Field visit (contd) (Zimi)</th>
<th>M&amp;E of PID within SULCI-FaNS – using experiences of Proli-FaNS for better, more efficient and effective M&amp;E of PID processes</th>
<th>Session: Institutionalisation/ Policy dialogue &amp; advocacy (contd) (Zimi and Chesha)</th>
<th>Policy influencing – why, how, at what levels and with whom?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:30 – 12:30</td>
<td><strong>Session: Local innovation (LI) (Zimi)</strong></td>
<td>Session: Multistakeholder partnerships (MSPs) (Zimi)</td>
<td>Presented of groups</td>
<td>M&amp;E of PID within SULCI-FaNS – using experiences of Proli-FaNS for better, more efficient and effective M&amp;E of PID processes</td>
<td>Specific examples of how policy influence can be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is local innovation? Types of local innovation? Ways of identifying innovation?</td>
<td>What is an MSP? Why is it important? Basic principles of MSP Challenges of MSPs</td>
<td>Discussions on issues that arise from presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples from Kenya and Ghana in relation to SULCI-FaNS
Thematic areas for LIs in relation to SULCI-FaNS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session: Local innovation (contd) (Zimi)</th>
<th>Session: Gender in PID (Chesha/Marta)</th>
<th>Session: Local innovation support facility (LISF) (Zimi and Chesha)</th>
<th>Session: Documentation of PID process (Chesha)</th>
<th>Session: post-training plans (Chesha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:30 – 13:30</td>
<td>Documentation of LI – innovator and innovation (examine guidelines for documenting innovations)</td>
<td>Why give attention to gender?</td>
<td>What is a local innovation support facility? What role does it play?</td>
<td>What is process documentation? Important elements of process documentation</td>
<td>Sharing information within CPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharing/disseminating LIs (learning from Proli-FaNS to improve in SULCI-FaNS)</td>
<td>How to integrate gender into PID (introduce guidelines developed by IST)</td>
<td>How is it managed? How do we sustain it?</td>
<td>Forms of process documentation</td>
<td>Application of learning within the SULCI-FaNS project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giving recognition to local innovators and their innovations</td>
<td>Examples from what we have learned through the previous pilots</td>
<td>Examples from Kenya and Ghana (Joe and Vincent)</td>
<td>Study cases of PID documentation from Proli-FaNS – what is strong? what is weak?</td>
<td>Training implementing teams in the field sites/teams (define per CP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cases from Kenya and Ghana (Joe and Vincent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session: Documentation of PID process (contd) (Chesha)</th>
<th>Any other topics from parking lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13:30 – 15:00</td>
<td>How can we improve documentation in SULCI-FaNS? Use cases from Proli-FaNS to come up with areas for improvement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How do we include gender analysis in PID documentation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LUNCH BREAK**

**TEA/COFFEE BREAK**

Session: Participatory innovation development (PID)/Farmer-led joint research (Chesha)

- Basic concepts, principles and elements of PID process
- Presentation of one PID case each from Ghana and Kenya as examples.
- Kenyan participants share experience with GALID guidelines (Marta, Vincent)
- Mainstreaming gender into LI/PID within SULCI-FaNS – using the guidelines

Session: Gender in PID (contd) (Chesha/Marta)

Session: Local innovation support facility (contd) (Zimi and Chesha)

Session: Documentation of PID process (contd) (Chesha)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17:30 – 18:00</td>
<td>Evaluation of the day (participant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of the day (participant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of the day (participant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of the day (participant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of the day (participant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of training and closure (Chesa/Zimi &amp; Joe)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3: Gender mainstreaming and Social inclusion in relation to Sustainable agriculture (Marta Opondo)

The concept of gender

*What is Gender?*

- Socially and culturally constructed differences between men and women constructs which vary across cultures and time.
- Economic, social, political, and cultural attributes and opportunities associated with being male or female
- Is dynamic, changes in space and time

*What is gender mainstreaming and social inclusion*

• Gender mainstreaming involves identification of gender gaps (for example, in agricultural production and natural resource management) and consequently addressing them
• Social inclusion involves ensuring equal opportunities for all members of the society

*Objective of gender & social inclusion*

• to ensure all members of the community participate and benefit equally from development initiatives

*Definition of common terms*

**Gender:** socially and culturally constructed differences between men and women, vary across cultures and time.

**Sex:** Biological and physiological differences between males and females as determined by nature, is universal and non-changeable.

**Social construction of gender:** How society values and allocates duties, roles and responsibilities to women, men, girls and boys, creates the gender division of labour and determines access to benefits and decision making thereby influencing power relations.

**Culture:** People’s way of life, systems of beliefs, values, rituals, interaction patterns and socialization which determine attributes, roles, responsibilities, and expectations in a society.

**Gender roles:** Gender roles are reflected in activities ascribed to men and women on the basis of perceived differences which are reinforced through the gender division of labour.
**Gender relations:** Social relationships between men and women within a specified time and place.

**Gender stereotypes:** Structured sets of beliefs about the personal attributes, behaviors, roles of a specific social group.

**Gender division of labour:** Different types of work that men and women do as a consequence of their socialization and accepted patterns of work within a given context.

**Gender analysis:** Process of examining roles and responsibilities or any other situation in regard to women and men; boys and girls, with a view to identifying gaps, raising concern and addressing them.

**Gender Equality:** A situation where men and women enjoy equal rights and opportunities in the civil, political and economic life

**Gender equity:** Is the process of being fair to women and men including compensating for historical and social disadvantages that prevent women and men from otherwise operating on a level playing field.

**Gender issue:** Point of gender inequality that is undesirable and therefore needs an intervention. It results from some form of gender discrimination or oppression. (e.g Land rights)

**Gender practical needs / interests:** Needs related to the roles of reproduction, production and community work of men and women which, when met, do not necessarily change their relative position in society.

**Gender strategic needs / interests:** Needs of women and men which, when met, help change their status in society. (e.g. access to information, extension services, credit, education, crisis management, improved decision making, leadership and management skills)

**Gender sensitivity:** Ability to perceive existing gender differences, issues and equalities, and incorporate these into strategies and actions.

**Gender Based Constraints:** Restrictions of men and women’s access to resources or opportunities that are based on their gender roles and responsibility

**Gender responsiveness:** Planning and implementing activities that meet identified gender issues/concerns that promote gender equality (e.g. change in land inheritance laws)

**Gender transformation:** A situation where women and men change their way of thinking from patriarchal towards a gender equality perspective.

**Gender mainstreaming:** Process of integrating a gender equality perspective into the development process at all stages and levels.
Rationale

Why Gender in Agriculture and NRM?

- Economic argument: Gender inequalities undermine women’s production potential. By addressing them then we improve their performance
- Social justice argument: Gender based constraints prevent women and men from benefiting equally
- Health and nutrition: improving women status and access to education and resources has positive impact of child health and nutrition and the well being of the community

By closing gender gaps in Agriculture and NRM, we accelerate progress towards food security and nutrition

What is Gender mainstreaming

The process of integrating a gender equality perspective into the development process at all stages and levels as a strategy for the achievement of gender equality.

Levels of gender mainstreaming

- Policy
- Institutional /organizational
- Programmes/project.

Gender mainstreaming occurs when there is...

- A clear gender policy
- Practical coordination of all gender mainstreaming initiatives
- A clear guide on gender mainstreaming and best practices
- Training and capacity building
- Awareness creation and advocacy on gender mainstreaming
- Partnerships and networking for persons and institutions
- Research and information dissemination on gender issues e.g.
- Sex disaggregated data (for decision making)
Resources mobilization

Monitoring, evaluation and reporting.

**Steps in Gender mainstreaming**

**Needs assessment**

Establish:
- Activities done by men and women
- Issues related to access, control, ownership
- Sharing of Benefits

Collect gender disaggregated data

**Program design and planning**

- Determine activities e.g. carry out capacity building in gender mainstreaming
- Develop indicators e.g. no. of men and women participating in a particular activity, or no. on men and women trained...
- Gender responsive budgeting

**Implementation**

- Provide equal opportunities in project activities e.g. ensure number of men and women trained in a particular aspect, skill is equitable
- Employ affirmative action where possible/necessary
- Promote strategic interests

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

- Review outputs, indicators
- Assess impact e.g. what is the result of training more women or men in a particular aspect of agriculture and NRM
- Review tools if necessary e.g. include or introduce frameworks and tools that enable comprehensive data collection