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Foreword

The dynamic changes taking place in Africa’s increasing population, diminishing natural resources accelerated by climate change effects call for a renewed effort in food production, natural resource management and protection of the environment. In the past, Agricultural Research and Development agencies used diverse approaches to share ‘best practices’/‘best bet options’ with the farming community but there has been dismal impact at farm level. The efforts made in the past include the linear technology transfer approach in the 1950s, the farming systems perspective in the 1970s, and the farmer participatory approaches in the 1990s. All these approaches have led to ‘Islands of Success’ observed around pilot testing sites instead of the expected widespread success. A new perspective, the Agricultural Innovation Systems perspective has recently been launched with a view to addressing the shortcomings of the previous approaches.

The Agricultural Innovation Systems perspective has a major point of departure from the earlier approaches which is the recognition that it gives to institutional challenges and multi-stakeholder engagement. The perspective advocates for users and suppliers of knowledge and other services to interact from the outset to ensure innovation takes place within the value chains. The aim is to combine existing knowledge types (local and global) to generate technological, institutional and organizational innovations.

This process takes place in an agricultural innovation platform, which is characterized by sharing of information, identification of challenges and opportunities and agreement on joint activities related to a shared interest. Each actor makes a contribution and also draws benefits in a win-win situation.

This perspective is quite useful in that it provides Science, Technology and Innovation organizations in Africa with an opportunity to participate in developing appropriate technological, social and institutional innovations and also participate in scaling them up and out. The private sector taking part in these endeavours will go a long way in contributing towards the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals, the CAADP, IGAD and FARA goals and objectives.

On behalf of all who have been involved in the preparation and production of this guide, we thank the Consultative Group on International Agricultural
Research (CGIAR), the NARS and the Educational Institutions from 19 countries in Africa whose representatives shared their experiences on the setting up and management of Innovation Platforms in a workshop facilitated by Dr Jurgen Hagmann of PICO Team. These are further summarized into the chapters of this guide.

Finally, we call upon all NARS in Africa involved in working with Innovation Platforms to make use of this guide and to send any feedback for future updates.
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**DIRECTOR, KARI**
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION
1.1 Why Innovation Platforms?

A vast majority of the population in Sub-Saharan Africa depend directly or indirectly on agriculture for their livelihoods and any improvements in this sector could make a huge difference in the lives of millions of people. The sector faces manifold challenges that relate to production, post-harvest handling, marketing, policy frameworks and the information/knowledge exchange/flow between the stakeholders. There is need to boost efforts towards transforming agriculture with a view to reducing poverty, increasing food and nutrition security and reduced environmental degradation.

Such efforts started in the 1950s when the linear transfer of technology model was introduced. Scientists were considered as the innovators and farmers were the target audience with the goal always being to improve productivity of a single commodity. In the 1970s, Farming Systems perspective emerged aimed at understanding constraints faced by the farmer while the scientific input was interdisciplinary, and the work was conducted on-farm. Farmers were consulted, but scientists remained as the key source of knowledge and innovation. Then emerged the farmer participatory approaches (FPR) in the 1990s where scientists and farmers were co-creators of new knowledge that was directly relevant to the farmers’ livelihoods. The new approach recognized the importance of farmer engagement in the knowledge development process but failed to recognise institutional constraints, and the usefulness of multiple actors besides the necessity to engage all key stakeholders. Towards the end of the 1990s, the innovation Systems Approach and its actualization through Innovation Platforms was introduced. This approach unlike FPR includes institutions and policies which are regarded as major obstacles to adoption of improved methods (Hounkonnou et al., 2012).

An innovation platform is described as a forum established to foster interaction among a group of relevant stakeholders around a shared interest. The stakeholders perform different but complementary roles in the development, dissemination and adoption of knowledge for socio-economic benefit. This could be in the form of new ideas, methodologies, procedures, concepts or technologies used or adapted from other locations. Reference is basically the value chain but other actors playing critical roles in the innovation process
can be included. Innovation Platforms seek to harness innovations related to technology processes, institutional and social-organizational arrangements. To promote these innovations, partnerships along and beyond agricultural value chains must be fostered to bring on board actors with special mix of skills (World Bank 2011). These skills are complemented with functional expertise since the new ways of working require a mix of scientific, technical, managerial and entrepreneurial skills.

In constituting the IP membership, all possible obstacles that could hinder the accomplishment of developmental goals are considered. Every member of the platform is considered to have something unique to contribute and to benefit making it a win-win collaborative mechanism. The stakeholders interact to jointly identify problems and opportunities, seek and apply solutions, learn, reflect and source more solutions for the innovation process to continue (Adekunle et al., 2010).

An innovation platform has boundaries which can be thematic, geographic, and sectoral or value-chain related. It can be formal or informal in character, but must always possess clear ground rules to define how decisions are made, conflicts are dealt with and how new organizations can join. The existence of ground rules does not mean that the platform is static but rather it is a fluid entity with an evolving membership that draws in relevant expertise depending on the problem being addressed. Organizations join and leave at will, while roles of actors change over time and the focus of the platform also changes (Nederlof et al., 2011).

Innovation Platforms are applicable to all aspects of agriculture and for a wide range of technologies from simple to complex to integrated and composite. Platforms present opportunities to increase the yield in farmers’ fields through increased access to information, inputs, agricultural lending, and capacity building. With increased market linkages, farmers’ incomes increase, and contribute towards reduced poverty. Innovation Platforms have to strategically engage researchers for continual contribution to the development of technologies, new products, increased productivity, natural resource management, policy, markets development and gender.
1.2 Why this Guide?

Innovation Platforms have become attractive to a wide range of stakeholders who include researchers, development practitioners and policy makers. They are used as a mechanism to enhance learning between stakeholders with a view to improving food/nutrition security, reducing poverty and environmental degradation. Innovation Platforms provide a new framework and call for a new set of skills and tools. Their establishment and management are complicated by the multiplicity of actors who start with diverse objectives and expectations. This guide has been prepared to support the users to navigate along the path leading to socio economic benefits. The guide is not prescriptive but meant to inspire practitioners into exploring by using applicable combinations of tools and methods.

Setting up and managing Innovation Platforms has been likened to driving a car which one can read in a book. It however requires coaching, mentoring and iterative learning to be a good driver. This guide therefore requires to be complemented by coaching, mentoring and peer learning for success. The
guide comprises of a synthesis of experiences from various regions of Africa and allows inclusion of more experiences as they become available to capture the wide heterogeneity of operational contexts. The guide does not take away the necessity to analyze one’s own context and develop a specific intervention. The guide has incorporated experiences shared during an experience sharing workshop held in Nairobi from 28th to 31st January 2013.
Chapter 2

OVERVIEW OF THE IP PROCESS DEVELOPMENT

Plate 2: Innovation process as a journey through unfamiliar territory
2.1 Underlying Values and Principles

An innovation platform (IP) is a forum comprising of stakeholders bound together by their individual interests in a shared issue aimed at improving livelihoods, enterprises and/or other interests. Innovation platforms facilitate dialogue between the main local value chain stakeholders. They provide insight on technology and information challenges in production, marketing and policy environment. This process is spurred through discussions on the requirements of the different value chain segments. The platform members then innovate to improve production to fulfil own and market demand. The platform stakeholders innovate along technological, institutional and social-organizational lines and in the process improve the way their organizations or enterprises function. This cannot happen successfully without collaboration of multi-sectoral or/and multi-institutional stakeholders. Innovation occurs either through several small continuous improvements or as radical changes.

2.2 IP Process Design

Innovation platforms can be formed at three levels - operational (local), intermediary and national levels. They may deal with different sectors such as dairy, food crops, horticulture, and natural resources among others and may have different objectives. All however deal with common problems found in a specific sector or sub-sector for which solutions depend on more than one actor. Stakeholders may have different interests yet share a common objective and depend on one another in responding to the challenges and opportunities encountered.

At the local level (district, community), platforms often look for practical solutions to a local problem or opportunity, by linking local actors (e.g. farmers) to markets and other stakeholders. Higher level platforms which may be at provincial or national level target policy change. They inform policy makers who in turn formulate policy that will have an influence on local level activities. A platform innovation broker (champion) is responsible for connecting the local and higher levels and for providing guidance for a period before leaving these roles to the local stakeholders (Fig 1).
Formation of Innovation platforms falls into three broad phases which are i) engaging with stakeholders (this includes initiation and visioning), 2) planning, learning and assessing (includes establishment and management) and 3) ensuring sustainability (includes management and sustainability measures). At each of these phases of the innovation process, the role of the participants is likely to change from interest to active collaboration and finally ownership and leadership. The role of research and development organizations changes from initial leadership to facilitation of the process and finally to providing backstopping when and as required and the role of the private sector changes from interest to one of active collaboration and finally farmer support and commercial opportunity (fig 2).
2.3 IP Process

2.3.1 Delimitation of Innovation Platform (Initiation)

To initiate an innovation platform, it is important to get a general understanding of the challenges constraining the productivity and profitability of a region. Information may be obtained from literature review, secondary data, key informant interviews, focus group discussions, case studies, market chain analysis and other methods. The topographic areas (site) to intervene in may be identified with local resource persons. Alternatively, priority commodities could be identified in advance, thus guiding the choice for a geographic location based on the agro-ecological and economic potential of that commodity. This is done by the initiator/broker/leader.
2.3.2 Establishment (Stakeholder mapping, scoping study and visioning)

This stage entails a situation analysis to capture current knowledge, attitudes and practices of stakeholders. Key stakeholders are identified and roles clearly defined. Farmers, input suppliers, output handlers, financial institutions, extension agents, research institutions and policy makers and other actors may also be identified. These various stakeholders are involved in a visioning process that involves reflecting on where they currently are and where they would want to see themselves in a period of five or ten years time. The visioning process may be researcher or market led. The researcher led process involves sensitization of stakeholders about the agricultural problems to discuss the potential role they can play in resolving them. Stakeholder-mapping, selection and identification of action entry-points are done and the needs, challenges and opportunities of specific platform topics are defined. Initial orientation and boundaries of the platform-to-be are also set.

The market led process can still be approached by researchers identifying a good market for a commodity and initiating an IP along the same pathway as above. Researchers should also be able to listen to suggestions and requests for participation if an IP is started by market players or farmers associations.

2.3.4 Developing Action Plans and Implementation

At this stage narrowing down of the main points raised from the joint analysis and defining of a clear strategy for action is done. It is essential for platform participants to understand the mandate and tasks of the organization providing the main facilitation services. Similarly, roles and responsibilities of stakeholders and facilitator(s) at action sites such as governance, M&E, capacity building are defined.

2.3.5 Sustainability, Scaling-up and Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation

For innovation platforms to avoid pitfalls of previous approaches there is need to map out sustainability and scaling out strategies upfront. The success of an IP scaling out process depends on the effectiveness of the Participatory monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) framework established by the stakeholders. PM&E helps to ensure that milestones of the programme are met and also assesses whether the delivery process and management are on course and that necessary changes are made. Joint identification of success indicators is a prerequisite for a sound PM&E framework.
Chapter 3
THE PHASES: HOW TO PUT THEM INTO PRACTICE

3.1 Initiation Phase

Plate 4: Platform initiation from a felt need – Marketing of goats in Mozambique
(photo by Van Rooyen et al)
The initiation of an IP is done by an innovation broker who is also referred to as a leader or initiator. This could be an organization or an entity operating within an area. Initiation should be done with due consideration of various elements which have a bearing on interactions that take place in the later phases of the platform. The initiation phase is the entry point into starting off the actors’ interaction process in an IP. It is however worth noting that irrespective of how well prior planning is done, diverse contexts in the IPs environment will lead to unexpected challenges, opportunities and other occurrences invariably leading to changes in the way a platform works. Before initiating an IP however, it is important to understand the positive and negative experiences that may have taken place in line with what the platform will be addressing.

The initiation phase comprises of various key elements that help in determination and understanding of the entry point. These elements include the identification of a compelling agenda (issue/challenge or opportunity), site selection and the expected level of operation of the IP. Depending on the objective of the broker or initiator of an IP the process can be started either by

i)  Determination of the agenda or

ii) Site selection

It is from these that essential stakeholders will be identified as well as their potential roles including setting the IP boundaries.

### 3.1.1 Determination of the Agenda

This sub-stage which may also be termed ‘scoping’ refers to the activities that help to better understand the context where the platform is to be established. It serves as the initial effort to narrow down the platform’s topic. It entails seeking and consulting information about an area in terms of key challenges/constraints and/or opportunities for example value chain enterprises and their status or a non-agricultural issue and how local institutions (policies, rules, regulations) and organizations work. Scoping provides a clear understanding of the issue or opportunity that will impact positively in an area in terms of addressing food insecurity, poverty, natural resource degradation or local capacity. The issue may entail producing more food at reduced cost, value addition of an agro-enterprise, improving markets, sustaining agricultural and natural resources or improving the policy and institutional environment.
Scoping also helps to get an idea of the existing stakeholders, their agendas or mandates (institutional and individual), power relations and openness to collaborate; and the extent of organizational and individual technical and managerial capacities.

Methods and tools to be used here include secondary data collection and analysis, literature searches, baseline studies, semi-structured interviews, historical trends and observations.

3.1.2 Site selection

Site selection can also precede the determination of the agenda depending on the objective of initiating an IP. The site of an IP is determined using different criteria that may include consideration to administrative/social boundaries, biophysical characters, access to markets, main crop enterprises or the overall aim of a project or development initiative. It can also be guided by priority value chains that will lead to the choice of a geographic location based on the agro-ecological and economic potential of the chain. In all cases, site selection should be in response to the need to alleviate the impacts of a certain constraint in a given area or utilization of an existing or emerging opportunity. It is important to also understand the background of the selected site including any initiatives that may have been implemented in the past. Methods used will very much depend on how clearly the agenda is set.

3.1.3 Methods

i) Stakeholder mapping and engagement

After the agenda has been determined and site identified, the next activity is accurate identification of essential stakeholders, their roles, skills, strengths and opportunities. This is followed by their mobilization and building of interest. An important achievement of this process is to get ‘buy in’ by local leaders, which is a deviation from past approaches that took the involvement of leaders as optional. Discussion on actual roles to be played should be made clear and not assumed since the success of an innovation platform hinges on the synergy between the skills sets of different actors. Mobilization of all stakeholders facilitates collaboration, co-operation, networking and mobilization of social capital which are all ingredients for creation and sharing of knowledge. The
stakeholders may include farmers, input suppliers, output handlers, financial institutions, extension agents, research institutions, policy makers and other actors who may be operating in an area. To avoid conflict of ‘political interests’ vis a vis stakeholder interests, government actors are best treated like any other member, instead of taking up a coordinating role.

Once stakeholders are mobilized, they are taken through an initial visioning process where the diverse actors are facilitated to appreciate being part of an effort to achieve a dream. It is also a process that levels the expectations, ensuring that the different actors are part and parcel of the decision making process within the platform and hence own the platform. At this point essential missing stakeholders need to be identified and efforts made to involve them in the initiative.

In order to avoid pitfalls of previous approaches, a crucial activity is the clear definition of roles and responsibilities of stakeholders for every action point. These include governance, capacity building, monitoring and evaluation, facilitation, and experimentation. It is crucial at this stage to identify and discuss the role of the facilitator of the platform. An understanding among the platform actors with regard to the mandate and tasks of the organization or individual providing the main facilitation services is essential. An initial action plan leading to the establishment of the platform should be undertaken although this may change as the focus of the IP is refined and/or changed. Some of the methods for stakeholder mapping include social network analysis, focus group discussion, gender analysis, outcome mapping and market chain analysis and are briefly discussed below.

1) **Social Network Analysis**

This is the mapping and measuring of relationships between people, groups, organizations and other connected information/knowledge entities. It is done using nodes and lines to show interconnectedness between actors.

2) **Focus Group Discussion:**

A focus group discussion consists of a small group of six to ten people led through an open discussion by a skilled moderator. The discussion is structured
around a set of not more than 10 questions which are carefully predetermined. The idea behind FGDs is to acquire depth of understanding of an issue and not to generalize unlike in surveys.

3) **Gender Resource Mapping:**

A ‘gender map’ presents the rural landscape as an arena of complementary and/or conflicting relationships between men, women, and children in regard to natural resources. It represents men, women, and children as distinct land user groups and thereby clarifies the intra-household division of control, responsibility and labour of resources and related activities.

4) **Outcome Mapping**

This is a monitoring and evaluation methodology for planning and assessing development projects which is oriented towards socio-institutional change. It provides tools to design and gather information on behavioral changes and focuses on a project’s influence on the progression of change in partners. It allows partners to systematically and realistically think about the project progress and also to adaptively manage variations in strategies to bring out desired outcome. Outcome mapping puts people and learning at the centre and accepts unanticipated changes as opportunities for innovation. The approach helps to modify the intervention according to the complexity of the change process and pays special attention to behavioral change, boundary partners and the respective contribution.

5) **Market Chain Analysis**

This is a method used for obtaining more detailed understanding of actors, activities, costs and opportunities related to flow of a particular product and associated services. It starts with the farmers and ends with the targeted buyer and consumer. The information gained helps in designing, implementing, evaluating and scaling up enterprises. A deliberate effort should also be made to capture current knowledge, attitudes and practices of all stakeholders.
3.1.4 Challenges and how to address them

A major challenge that may be encountered at this stage could be lack of inclusiveness, failure to provide for strategies to maintain momentum, lack of documentation strategies and how to ensure continuous learning and feedback. Capacity and strategies to enhance stakeholder mapping with the different actors is important as well as the quality of facilitation. Inclusiveness is important to ensure that no actors or group of people that may be relevant to the platform is left out. These may include minorities or other disadvantaged groups hence the need for gender analysis that will ensure an inclusive process.

It is also important to factor in strategies that maintain momentum. This should be at the visioning stage where both benefits and the inputs into the process by the different stakeholders are deliberately discussed and mutual benefits for all involved ensured.

It is also imperative to put in place documentation strategies with a view to enhancing learning and feedback. This process is crucial because innovation platforms may be targeted to delivering specific products and this can only be captured through proper documentation.

Case Study: Goat value chains as a platform to improve income and food security: the case of imGoats in Inhassaro district, Mozambique by Kees Swaans, Birgit Boogaard, Yenni Astete Salazar, and Saskia Hendrickx

Text Box 1: Platform broker: IMgoat case in Mozambique

In a goat IP experience in Mozambique, ILRI and CARE played a strong role in the establishment and facilitation of the platform but this was slowly handed over to the IP secretariat elected by the platform members. A notable observation is that it takes times to develop a well functioning secretariat. In the initial stages, the role of agenda setting, was taken up by ILRI and CARE as the innovation brokers trying to link the knowledge, skills, capacities, and resources from different players..
Text Box 2: Action planning – Kieni – Embu (Kenya)

In Kieni, Embu, an Innovation platform was set up to with the aim of evaluating and promoting technologies, innovations and knowledge from the various institutes. The site team conducted activities that identified partners and created awareness on the project’s objectives and the implementation framework. Farmers meetings were sensitized into forming farmer research groups (FRGs) or joining the LIPs within their sites to benefit from technologies and knowledge from other partners. Over 82% of farmers who attended the meeting were those who participated in the baseline surveys meant to identify and prioritize the area agricultural production constraints and opportunities. The platform members were requested to get involved in technology evaluation and promotion and concurrently disseminate feasible local knowledge/innovations from the project and their institutions. Farmers to participate or host demonstration trials were nominated by combined team of Embu SIMLESA research scientists, extension providers and community leaders in the respective sites.

3.2 Establishment Phase

Plate 5: An established IP in session (Kieni IP in Embu)
This is the stage where visioning, creation of incentives for diverse actors, and common understanding of the process takes place. A deeper understanding of the system, constraints, issues or opportunities occur leading to action planning and implementation.

Scoping is the initial effort to narrow down the platform’s topic, understand it better in the context in which it will be implemented. After narrowing down the platform’s topics and gaining a deeper understanding of it, a further stakeholder analysis is necessary to concretize the relevant stakeholders required for the platform. This will entail a situation analysis to capture current knowledge, attitudes and practices of stakeholders.

These stakeholders, mobilized by a broker/initiator/leader need to meet in a workshop setting for the visioning process which may take different forms and could be researcher or market-led. The data, constraints, or opportunities are then presented for a common understanding and buy-in.

Interests of each stakeholder are taken into account to create incentives for participation and clear roles and responsibilities for each actor are identified and agreed upon. This stage is accomplished by stakeholders defining a road-map that will include determination of the resources required and mobilization for implementation. This will provide the innovation platform with the way forward because it will be their implementation framework. It is necessary that frequent consultative meetings are held by the stakeholders to evaluate progress and address challenges that may occur.

3.2.1 Action Planning

Action planning is a sub-stage of establishment of an IP which entails a narrowing down of the main points raised from the joint analysis and defining a clear strategy on what will be done, by who and when. It entails defining roles and responsibilities of stakeholders at action sites (e.g. governance, capacity building, M&E, facilitation, experimentation). It is crucial at this stage to discuss the role of the facilitator of the platform. An understanding among the platform participants with regard to the mandate and tasks of the broker/initiator/leader providing the main facilitation services is essential.
During this sub-stage it is also important to include a component on monitoring and assessment of the need for change of strategy and documenting of lessons learnt from initiatives taken by the platform. Action planning takes place through a series of meetings and workshops. The resultant joint action plans and division of tasks may change later when actors focus of the innovation platforms dynamically change.

3.2.2 Implementation/Operation
A Participatory Action Research (PAR) approach involving planning, action and reflection at all stages of implementation of the IP should be adopted to ensure that there is learning at all stages. The IP members should meet at regular intervals to discuss and implement opportunities and the desired changes to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the different aspects of the agricultural value chain or sector. Such changes should be tested, evaluated and adapted as necessary and these are important ingredients for sustainable change. Initially this process may be driven by the broker/initiator/leader but stakeholder involvement should increase with time as the benefits of increased cooperation are realized.

During implementation, certain activities are necessary to enhance learning. These include field exchange visits, participation in field days and other events where members of the platform are exposed to different ways of doing things and especially in areas where activities aimed at adding value to the IP value chain activities are conducted and building capacity of all the IP partners. This is crucial especially owing to the fact that IPs are a new way of conducting business and all IP members have something to learn from each other.

3.2.3 Challenges in this Stage
Challenges that may occur include lack of common understanding, which may lead to fallout of actors. This may be as a result of lack of benefits or incentives for participation and / or having an entry point that is not clearly defined. It can also be a consequence of improper stakeholder analysis to identify the critical actor for the activity at hand.
3.2.4 Strategies, Tools and Actors

The strategy is to ensure that there is a compelling agenda that benefits all the actors in the IP. If it is a constraint or opportunity, it should affect each actor in the IP, whether the constraint has been resolved or opportunity taken up. This means that the identification of the entry point and narrowing the topic is critical. This may be conducted through diagnostic and exploratory studies. Secondary data sources, market chain analysis, field data collection through interviews, focus group discussions, participatory modelling and others are possible sources of information. A thorough value chain analysis is also essential to identify critical value chain nodes that need interventions for value chain efficiency. (Figure 3)

Figure 3: Value chain analysis: a case study of the Honey Bee Value Chain Platform by Evelyne K. Nguku and Suresh. K Raina

This should be followed by a proper stakeholder analysis to identify critical actors for collaborative advantage and synergies. It should be an all-inclusive approach where decision-making is participatory and all actors air their views freely leading to a jointly defined agenda. This is a crucial ingredient of a joint vision and eventual sustainability of a platform.

Text Box: Identifying a compelling agenda and visioning: A case study “Innovation Platforms for crop livestock intensification in Zimbabwe” by André F. van Rooyen and Sabine Homann-KeeTui

Text Box 1:
Within the first meetings of the IPs the members discussed the merits of the process and discussed the potential benefits for each member. The members jointly defined the specific roles and contributions, but more importantly what they can achieve for themselves as members of the IP. This was achieved through a visioning process where all stakeholders were requested to visualize where they wanted to be in 5 to 10 years and to define the challenges and hurdles to achieve that. This provides a realistic framework of what the process should be – rather than focusing on a specific commodity of technology. It created an opportunity for farmers to design their own development pathway within the
context of their own household and community. The process in Gwanda, Zimbabwe, was galvanized through discussions on: existing production challenges, including technologies/strategies, input supply, knowledge; functioning of the market; market requirements (quantity, quality, and the timing of sales) and any related policy constraints/opportunities. The IP then prioritized activities and interventions and drew in the necessary research and development agencies to help with testing technologies to improve production to fulfill market demand.

3.3 Management of the IP Process

Plate 6: A reflection and capacity strengthening session in an IP

3.3.1 Importance of management in an IP:

This section highlights the underlying issues in the management or governance of IPs for sustainability and success. It is important to note that managing an IP is not meant to ensure similarity of interests among actors, but rather to guide diverse objectives into a common vision, uphold transparency, gender and policy issues.

3.3.2. Main challenges in managing IPs

The overall challenge in managing an IP is to ensure a progressive process with sustainable reciprocal benefits. Attendance and commitment of platform members is a major challenge. Existence of platform long after the stipulated
period (‘project’ period) largely depends on the ownership entrenched in actors in the early stages. A Platform may evolve based on circumstances, for example coffee IP to banana or dairy IP but structures may remain.

An IP cannot function while actor objectives are competing. For instance, a stockist aiming to make profit may not share an IP with an NGO that is promoting free inputs.

Spoiler factors, such as sudden change of agenda among actor(s) or death of a key participant can derail progress. This can be overcome by ensuring that core businesses are diversified, or transformed through democratic dialogue that may include a memorandum of understanding (MoU), and linkages among actors. Rules and regulations should not be set hurriedly as their acceptability is not everlasting, especially when new actors join. Therefore it is important to ensure consultation process is set so that conflict resolution processes are inbuilt, rather than to assume that rules are always enforceable.

Learning and feedback among relevant actors do not spontaneously happen. This inhibits knowledge creation essential to fuel innovation, especially because vital lessons are never utilized. Learning improves when both failure and success are embraced, and underlying causes assessed and findings shared collectively. This requires a gifted facilitator who will make aware and clarify what benefits accrue to whom, where and when. Learning improves confidence and change of mind-sets, which are perhaps the two most important processes in an IP.

Formidable obstacles impede continuous transition from potential to real benefits, from one level of success to the next. To mitigate against such, it is important to ensure that after meetings there is a small representative group or committee that addresses the question “what next?”.

The timing of meetings is seamless rather than pushing for regularity. This is achieved by scheduling meetings to follow logical sequence of targets. Actors need to agree on a functional communication strategy so that they maintain awareness of IP functions and individual tasks.
Different expectations are managed by seeking ways of eliminating hidden agendas, for example, ‘confidential’ matters are eliminated by asking questions openly. IP leaders should be known personally and promises should not be made on behalf of one’s institutions before consulting with relevant decision makers. There is need to deal with sensitive issues informally.

Documentation on the functioning and dynamics of the IP entails a clear strategy. It is not spontaneous. It involves auditing the full range of benefits including financial and material factors. The findings must be shared so that the lessons are distilled for accountability among all actors to allow flexibility in decision making. Knowledgeable IP actors will know why change is a must and how it should happen, by analyzing what went right or wrong by linking to participatory monitoring and evaluation.

IPs are set up to pursue diverse actor ambitions. The stronger the ambitions, the more driven the actors. The more actors realize ambitions, the more they trust the IP process. Trust brings about devotion that drives innovation. However, ambitions must be pursued without upsetting progressive relationships, or without creating extra complexities that delay generation of benefits among IP actors.

Actors need to understand the full range of benefits, such as enhanced knowledge, superior market intelligence, reduced input prices, strengthened smallholder organization, upgraded networks, improved attitudes about development processes, reformed service delivery, changes in stereotypes among actors, new market opportunities, better productivity, and advanced income sources.

The IP leadership need to skilfully interpret collective vision by illustrating how such benefits accrue at different times. IPs cannot produce equal benefits, but rather equitable returns dependent on objectives and inventive effort.

Transparency stems largely from openness. It must be seen to function through efficient information sharing, dialogue, business relationships rather than mere familiarity.
Leadership in IPs should not be position-based, but rather task-oriented. This will therefore change depending on the need/expertise required. There could well be several levels of leadership complementing each other.

Finances need to be controlled skilfully. For instance, the IP may explore mechanisms of outsourcing funds. This will require a self-regulating, impartial funds manager who is not the facilitator, lead actor, or convener. This minimizes conflict of interest, improves efficiency and net benefits, even if management costs increase marginally.

Managing challenges: Experiences from the community-based seed production initiative in the Limpopo Province, South Africa: Joe Ramaru, Jürgen Hagmann and Jeff Mkhari

Text box 4:
Initially, the community-based seed production initiative focused on Vhembe and Capricorn districts. Previously, all the actors were not operating as a functioning innovation system at all and it was realised that they were simply dealing with ‘system/institution failure’ rather than technology or innovation failure. To enable them to play their roles together to provide services to support farmers. The facilitation of a platform of different stakeholders was linked with the farmers and other service providers along the market/value chains. The roles and mandates of service providers were clarified and, more importantly, they began to ‘learn to play the roles’ and work together in synergistic ways towards making a difference. Our experience shows that the development of a functioning platform requires high quality facilitation – particularly during the first 1 to 2 years until the systems’ own procedures are fully developed. The facilitation required is far much more than workshop facilitation. It is the facilitation for change for personal entrepreneurship and institutional development and it requires a lot of technical and business expertise too in order to guide the development of the platforms. Key to the success of the innovation platform for the maize seed evaluation has been a shared understanding by the diverse range of stakeholders of the operational process of implementation the initiative. The different roles and mandates of service providers need to be clarified and even more importantly, they need to ‘learn to play the roles’ and work together in synergistic way towards making a difference. This is a big challenge, particularly in a highly competitive environment where every provider wants to have a credit for themselves. It requires high-level facilitation that opens up the space to negotiate interest, clarify the benefit, and a sound competence development and information management system to give equal opportunities to the various providers.
3.4 Sustenance of IP Innovation Capacity

3.4.1 Importance of sustenance in an IP:

Sustenance ensures that learning and feedback happens, and new opportunities are continuously identified to expand current solutions. There is also continuous regeneration or improvement of benefits, which acts as incentives for continued participation and change. Various steps could be taken to ensure that there is sustenance of the processes but this should start right from the initiation and early stages of the IP. These steps may include capacity strengthening of local management committee and identification of local stakeholders with capacity to be ‘champions’ or specialists in certain issues taken up by the IPs.

Plate 7: Eco honey from the honey bee IP - Mwingi, Kenya
Plate 8: Fund set up to support IP-Mwala, Kenya
Plate 9: Commercial maize in Kieni IP
In Kieni IP, KARI introduced Conservation agriculture at the beginning of the IP. The ministry of agriculture introduced livestock husbandry innovations while ministry of fisheries introduced fish culture. Since then, local stakeholder members have emerged who have specialised in these innovations and hence have become resource persons in the respective innovations. They are the ones who are consulted by the IP members and any other local producers out of teh IP in these respective fields. KARI gives such members special training and also confers a ‘local’ certificate to motivate them. This has enhanced their skills and has facilitated their role of local resource persons.
Chapter 4

CROSS-CUTTING ENABLING FACTORS

4.1 Roles and Complementarities of Functions

Plate 10: Involvement of all gender groups in IPs
The IP is normally started by an initiator, innovation broker or leader who is described as that “person or organization that brings together and mediates between stakeholders within the context of an IP”. However, after an IP is initiated, other individuals / actors whose roles are critical are incorporated and these include facilitators (connectors) and champions (specialists).

**Facilitator:**

A facilitator is required to ensure that the IP remains operationally alive. He/she should be transparently elected, preferably democratically or by consensus and should remain a neutral actor who builds consensus especially where agreement is elusive. S/he ensures clarity of roles, responsibilities and benefits for the actors as well as managing the evolution of roles. The facilitator should also be good at networking, and thus able to recommend or draft in new actors necessary to fuel new innovations. The facilitator in this case plays a connector role. For the facilitator to have legitimacy, some supportive instruments are required. These are rules or admissible charters that frame the IP arrangement and not necessarily legal documents.

**Champions:**

These are people who can influence the overall direction specifically on issues that may arise in the life of the IP. They may champion a cause and coordinate the process for that particular intervention. Champions who are knowledgeable and self-motivated individuals are not elected but emerge naturally. Often times, specialists (who then may double up as champions) within the IP may be required to share their vast knowledge in critical aspects that the IP may be engaged in and can therefore bring in practical experiences or ‘hidden’ opportunities which are critical to the IP.

### 4.2 Managing the Level and Range of Operation of an IP

There is an inherent threat to the IP if it overstretches or exceeds its scope or if it has narrow actor, geographical or thematic focus. It is therefore necessary to achieve a balance. This can be done through network analyses’ or mapping to identify and ‘fix’ weak, dormant or worthless linkages that may bog down the IP.
and/or identify non-existent but necessary links that can spice up the IP. This role can be accomplished by a “connector” as indicated above.

There is also need to strengthen the capacity of smallholder entities to partner by improving their management because often, smallholder institutions are the weak link in the value chain and may lead to failure of the IP yet they may be the main reason for the formation of that IP. Therefore, there is need for an analysis of the bottlenecks emanating from institutional arrangements and strategizing around them where backstopping is provided for IPs when they move from one scale to another, or when there is a thematic shift or new leadership is inaugurated to ensure continued success. Backstopping is also necessary to instil confidence among actors i.e. manage feelings of ‘abandonment’, etc.

### 4.3 Gender Issues in IP

Gender is one of the principal issues that influence impacts of IPs. An IP process needs a context-specific gender strategy that advises all the phases. It is worth noting that an IP is not a solid institution, in the sense that roles and benefits may not be equally shared among men and women actors. In essence, the impacts of IPs are likely to happen at the household or family level.

When initiating, implementing or managing an IP, therefore, the key challenge may be to identify the implications of the IP among smallholder’s households. The various actors in the IP, and how their participation affects the family, has to do with target household/family structures.

Research actors therefore should collect and analyse information that is gender disaggregated which may be about the actors in the IP (if relevant) or on the key benefits and/or impacts that are likely to accrue or result.

The facilitation process should therefore be skillfully done for gender to be mainstreamed, though indirectly in terms of having impact felt equitably among men and women. This is especially because an IP may not possess control mechanisms to ensure gender balance since actors participate voluntarily, based on interest and they may not enforce change in practice, or attitudes.
However, the IP leadership may identify actors with specialized skills or experts in gender to enhance inclusion through dialogue and who may enrich the overall IP goal.

### 4.3.1 Key features of a gender-sensitive IP

To ensure inclusiveness especially of gender in an IP, it has to be embedded in the design, implementation and management of the IP. Gender disaggregated needs data should be collected and analysed for gender differences in the activities or sectors that are targeted. The IP design or vision needs to articulate relevant actions that aim to enhance women’s access to and control over fundamental IP benefits, including assets, knowledge and finances.

Strategies and/or opportunities have to be sought to facilitate women’s access to basic services such as access to inputs, better tools, or credit that the IP infrastructure may offer. Their decision-making role in community based organizations (CBOs), especially those facilitated to engage in the IP, should be strengthened since CBOs are institutional conduits for engaging and benefiting the community.

An IP can also be designed with scaling out components such that there is direct outreach to women, for instance through suitable field staff. This is necessary where women are marginalized or their association and mobility are limited.

The measurable indicators should specify how gender-disaggregated impact may appear at IP maturity or the notable achievements that can be expected. These may include; the planned capacity building and empowerment of the women and marginalized persons, gender-based action research and gender-responsive, labour-saving technology resources available within the IP. It should also include gender-inclusive farmer field and life schools for empowering the marginalized and gender-fostering rural funding especially among relevant participating financial actors as well as institutional support for gender integration among participating actors.
4.4 Policy Issues and IPs

An innovation platform needs to identify policy impediments and/or opportunities pertinent to the target activities. Actors with significant knowledge gaps on relevant policy are likely to engage in uninformed processes that are unsustainable. Participatory monitoring and evaluation, knowledge generation, synthesis and sharing, effective communication and shared intelligence have to be combined to influence policy.

Another strategy is to seek the membership of a national level policy actor, policy link, policy specialist or ‘connector’ or incorporate these policy actors as reference resource persons in the IP. This is also an opportunity for the policy actors to get first-hand evidence of success, and channel such proof into important government deliberations for needed changes and may hasten scaling up of IPs. It is also important to acquire relevant policy documents to advice functions and operations of the IP.

4.5 Scaling-up and Scaling-out

At the initiation of the IP, it is important to include a clear scaling up and out strategy indicating the what, who, how, when and why. Identifying which of the available actors can be relied on or the source of knowledge required at the beginning of an IP can improve the success prospects of an IP and can help policy actors comprehend attribution in a timely manner. This is because evidence is required to convince policy actors at the right time and is invaluable in scaling up IPs.

However, it is important to demonstrate what is possible before seeking to scale-out and up for example there is need to identify and package technologies that are proven in simple packages and illustrate marketability of products.
4.6 Communication

Communication is the most basic requirement for the success of an IP. Basic information may flow spontaneously unlike strategic knowledge, which requires a communication strategy. Such a strategy must always consist of a set of tools, approaches, feedback, and roles which need to be decided through careful consideration of the IP requirements. The strategy should always be in sync with knowledge generation and management.

An IP may benefit when media actors are incorporated as actors. These are critical in ensuring the IP story and needs are known locally and beyond. The IP may also assign communication roles to actors with capacity in communication to ensure participants are actively engaged.

However, as an IP matures, it may need to link with a community of practice, beyond local resource persons. Community of practice (which needs to be established) is a necessary source of key experiences from across the world. It is a link to ensure lessons from across the world are collated, synthesized and shared with local actors for future IP evolution.

Information communication technology (ICT) should be incorporated and exploited to hasten information flow and communication. ICT includes mobile telephones, skype, Google talk, MSN, Yahoo Messenger, video messaging, email, blogs, wikis, newsgroups, podcasts, RSS Feeds, YouTube, audio-graphics and online forums. On-line knowledge bases such as encyclopaedias, on-line libraries, on-line journals, and on-line magazines can be very useful for acquiring information and knowledge while exchange of information and other learning can also be through social networks such as Twitter, Orkut, Myspace, Ning and Facebook. Other useful tools are portable video players, Webcams, USB, Bluetooth and IPods. An appropriate computer software will be useful for knowledge management.
4.6.1 General tips in communication

It is important to avoid information overload because it can also change from being useful and instead cause confusion. There is therefore need to assess what information is needed, for whom, when and how and appropriate tools chosen that solve problems and/or meet needs. Complicated tools can create new problems although different actors may prefer different tools or approaches.

It is necessary to explore multiple ways for actors to stay in touch while setting clear expectations for all communication. Both formal and informal channels and forums can be used for communication that should be done early and often but not excessively. After communication, response time, reminders, clarifications and feedback should be considered.
Chapter 5

MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Plate 11: Participatory monitoring and evaluation in an IP (above FGD, below in the field)
Monitoring and evaluation is an integral component of the innovation platform formation, functioning and outcomes. It is essential to monitor and evaluate the role that these platforms play in enhancing communication, coordination, information and knowledge sharing in the project as well as whether they facilitate the delivery of outputs and outcomes as detailed in the project M&E framework. It is important to note here that the platform level monitoring and evaluation should be part of a larger monitoring and evaluation framework that governs the reporting and accountability mechanisms required so that it generates learning amongst the stakeholders.

5.1 Key Principles of Monitoring and Evaluation in the Platforms

The key principles that should govern the integration of monitoring and evaluation of the platform activities should ensure that all stakeholders in the platform benefit from the platform activities through the learning mechanisms that have been put in place.

5.1.1 Learning
A system should be put in place to ensure that learning is integrated into activities of the platform and that periodically the platform stakeholders meet to reflect on the functioning and outcomes of the platform. To ensure this, an external facilitator (also called a learning facilitator) should be engaged initially for the activity-based learning but should disengage and only facilitate the periodic based learning.

5.1.2 Behavioural Change
Learning is directly associated with the behavioural change in two aspects of the platform. At one level, learning happens as each platform activity occurs and with each periodic reflection activity and it should be integrated in such a way that the attitudes of the stakeholders are noted. This behavioural change is expected to occur at the individual actors, organizations, households and system levels.
5.1.3 Relevance and Responsiveness
The monitoring and evaluation system of the platform should be relevant and responsive. For this to happen, the system should be developed by the actors of the platforms themselves in a participatory manner that ensures joint planning and visioning at the beginning of every cycle. The facilitator should be able to facilitate the development of the indicators that the platform will use to show progress or changes at the platform level. Tools used to collect data should also be developed jointly with stakeholders. A data collection system should be developed in such a way that data are collected, synthesized and fed back to the platform stakeholders. As the platform evolves and matures, some of the original objectives of the platform may have been achieved. With the help of the learning facilitator it is important that new objectives, indicators and tools are developed by the IP stakeholders. The learning facilitator may facilitate the use of inbuilt systems such as observation and the use of a system to ensure regular reflection and learning by for example tracking changes in the stakeholder participation and activities that happen at the platform level.

5.2 Key Steps to Implementing a Monitoring and Learning System
There are several steps to implementing and integrating the M&E system into the formation, functioning and outcomes of the innovation platform in order for this system to be sustainable for the life of the platform. Once the platform members independently engage in the active learning processes the learning facilitator can focus on the global learning from the different component of the project.
Table 1. Key steps to implement a monitoring and learning system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engaging stakeholders</td>
<td>Enables the stakeholders to understand the need for learning</td>
<td>Learning Facilitator</td>
<td>Once the IP has been established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>Understanding how to monitor and learn from platform activities and outcomes</td>
<td>Learning Facilitator</td>
<td>After the IP establishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint visioning and development of objectives, indicators and tools</td>
<td>Global understanding of the issues</td>
<td>Participatory and guided by the facilitator</td>
<td>After the capacity building exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing a sustainable M&amp;E system</td>
<td>Backstopping and coaching and learning by doing on how to use the tools and reflect on the process</td>
<td>Led by the learning facilitator</td>
<td>On going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing the data base and data management</td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning facilitator</td>
<td>After the joint visioning exercise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 6
RESOURCING THE PROCESS

Plate 12: Honey retail outlet in honey bee IP (Mwingi)

Plate 13: Seed processor managed by IP members (BASED IP - Limpopo)
6.1 Importance of Resourcing IP

There is need to identify required resources, their sources, and mechanisms for their sustenance and/or regeneration for optimizing the functioning of the platform as a whole. A thorough value chain analysis is also essential to identify critical value chain nodes that need interventions for value chain efficiency for example training, input supply, production, market place development, marketing and stakeholder mapping and analysis. Resources include: Finance, time, knowledge, transport, land, e.g. for demonstrations/trials, marketing, actors, research technologies and packages.

However, finance is the most critical resource that has been identified to affect the maintenance of IPs. Platforms require funds for running specific joint activities such as workshops, exchange visit and purchase of inputs. Facilitation role is essential to enable interaction between actors, direct joint training, and development activities for the actors, and this requires substantial funding. For example production of promotional/marketing materials for the products may require sourcing for external expert with a background in the marketing field. It is important to note that IPs formed through “outside” facilitation need proper management of expectations, and ownership or ‘localization’ of resource regeneration process.

Sources of funds may include membership fee to generate own revenue. Members of the platform can identify NGOs to broker some platform activities such as linking to markets; initiate income generating activities that may not be necessarily related to the initial objective of forming the IP e.g. hire out facilities for outside catering (chairs, tents, public address system, utensils), group tractor for land preparation and transport etc.

Most critical to sustainability is the business model on which the partnership on the innovation platform is built. This business model will almost certainly need to be adapted over time to ensure that all partners benefit in ways that make their own delivery more effective and efficient. This calls for sharing of resources such as transport for collective marketing of products and licence to run business.
Glossary of Terms

**Innovation:** The process of application of new or existing knowledge in new ways and contexts to do something better.

**Innovations:** Products arising of innovation process and may be technological, social or institutional. This may be a new production method, a new working modality of an institution to enhance effectiveness, or new ways of organization by stakeholders or stakeholder group.

**Innovation platform:** A forum that consists of a broad range of stakeholders who share a common interest and come together to solve problems and develop mutually beneficial solutions.

**Stakeholders/Actor/Players:** All individuals and organizations that have an interest in the issue at stake.

**Champion:** Representative of local stakeholders who specializes and plays a leading role in an IP. Such people are not appointed but emerge spontaneously.

**Broker/Leader/Initiator:** These terms are used interchangeably to refer to a person or organization who mediates interaction between stakeholders in an Innovation platform.

**Facilitator:** A person who stimulates and assists the interactive process between stakeholders with the objective of improved quality of interaction. Facilitators remain neutral to the regular business process and restrict themselves to creating awareness, facilitating joint strategy building and action and the coordination of support activities.

**Technical backstopping:** Providing technical advice and training in order to ensure that opportunities discussed are economically, technically and socially viable.

**Scoping:** The initial effort to narrow down the platform’s topic, and to better understand it and also the context where the platform is to be inserted.

**Mobilisation:** Lobbying essential stakeholders to join a platform or local level organisation.

**Mediation:** Conflict resolution.

**Advocacy:** Promoting the network and ensuring support of and buy-in into the network by those individuals and organisations that matter.

**Problem solving:** Identifying, proposing and providing practical solutions for bottlenecks hindering progress of multi-stakeholder action.
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About KARI

The Kenya Agricultural Research Institute (KARI) is a premier national research institution that was established in 1979 as a semi-autonomous government institution through the amendment of the Science and Technology Act Cap 250, following the collapse of the East African Community (EAC) in 1977. The institute promotes sound agricultural research and technology generation to ensure food security through improved productivity and environmental conservation. Links with National and International collaborators are managed through the Outreach and Partnerships department.

Research network:
The institute has a network of 23 research centres spread out in various agro-ecologies in Kenya.

KARI Vision
KARI envisions a vibrant commercially oriented agricultural sector, propelled by Science Technology and Innovation.

KARI Mission
To contribute to increased productivity, commercialization and competitiveness of the agricultural sector through generation and promotion of knowledge, information and technologies that respond to client demands and opportunities.

Research Programmes

- Food crops research on cereals, root and tuber crops, legumes and pulses.
- Horticultural and industrial crops research on flowers, vegetables, fruits, fibre crops, herbs and spices
- Animal production and range research on dairy, beef, small ruminants, poultry, pigs, pastures and fodder crops, and range
- Animal health research on livestock diseases.
• Socioeconomics and applied statistics for crop, livestock and natural resources

• Natural Resource Management including land, soil and water management and climate change.

• Biotechnology research for crops and livestock improvement

• Adaptive Research and Outreach

• Technology Packaging and Transfer

**Cross-Cutting non-research programmes**

• Foundations seed and germplasm conservation, KARI Seed Unit.

• Agricultural Research and Investment Services (ARIS)

• Information Management and Communication Technology focussing on information technology and content delivery, organisation, repackaging, marketing, maintenance and archiving.

For more details see [www.kari.org](http://www.kari.org)