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1. Introduction

1.1 Workshop Context

Research and development (R&D) organizations in Kenya and East Africa have been vocal in the need to address the quality seed bottleneck as a crucial element in improving the livelihoods of potato farmers. Given its importance, tackling deteriorated seed quality is a key objective of the International Potato Center (CIP) in its new Strategy and Corporate Plan (SCP) and a flagship of the CGIAR Research Program on Roots, Tubers and Bananas (RTB). In order to scale up the promising work achieved so far, CIP/RTB invited partners to jointly prepare a business plan for going to scale and putting in place a shared framework for Results Based Management (RBM) to maximize the value of investment in potato research. To do this, national partners from the public and private sectors in Kenya, Rwanda and Ethiopia and the CGIAR were brought together in a planning workshop in Nairobi, Kenya on 12th and 13th of June 2014.

1.2 Objectives of the Workshop

- Share ideas and current status for scaling up work on quality seed systems in potato.
- Review and refine the impact pathway, strategy, partnership strategies and collaboration plans towards achieving expected outcomes for quality seed potato.
- Improve understanding of the system for Monitoring and Evaluation and how it can be used to manage for results of the quality seed potato.
- Identify additional partners who can contribute to scaling up.

1.3 Planned Products of the Workshop

- Long term strategy (business plans) of quality seed potato updated and enhanced
- Quality seed potato impact pathways enriched
- Partner, next and end user contributions and needs better defined
- Inputs to improve M&E plan for working with quality seed potato

1.4 Structure of the Workshop

The workshop was structured as a mixture of:

Presentations on key aspects, as eg. the “Strategy for scaling out quality seed potato: Collaboration for going to scale with quality seed potato” by Monica Parker (CIP), or key concept for Results Based Management and Impact Pathways by Sophie Alvarez (facilitator CIP/RTB).

Practical exercises, which comprised most of the workshop time, for the analysis and improvement of the impact pathway for quality seed potato.

Group work discussion sessions for the exchange of experiences and feedback from group work.

Plenary session with the participants of the parallel workshop group on “Developing an M&E plan for quality seed potato” (see report and presentations: http://bit.ly/1rUPqql) to bring results of each workshop together: the improved Impact Pathway from the stakeholder meeting and the suggestions
for indicators from the M&E group. In this session, joint next steps were also discussed to wrap up the two workshop days. An interactive session in the evening of June 12th gave the opportunity to each participant to present activities and products related to seed potato.

2. Getting familiar with RBM and the Impact Pathway for seed potato: June 12th

The first workshop day started with a warm welcome from Elmar Schulte-Gelderman, the CIP-Sub-Saharan Africa Potato Science Leader, explaining the broad scope of the two parallel workshop sessions on (1) Business plan for going to scale with quality seed potato, and (2) Development of an M&E plan. He explained the background and objectives of both workshops and that session participants would mainly work separately to come together again for an exchange of progress results and joint wrapping up and planning of next steps on the second day.

A total of 18 participants, representing 8 organization in different East African countries (Kenya, Rwanda, Ethiopia), as well as representatives from CIP, RTB and Humidtropics presented themselves and expressed their interest and commitment to the workshop objectives.

To build a solid basis for joint work, the first action point of the workshop agenda was a presentation on the “Strategy for scaling out quality seed potato: Collaboration for going to scale with quality seed potato” by Monica Parker (CIP).

2.1 Strategy For Scaling Out Quality Seed Potato

The full presentation given by Monica can be found here: [http://bit.ly/1o75dlj](http://bit.ly/1o75dlj)

Monica started by showing, why a strategy for quality seed potato is required, and on which development challenges the strategy is to be based.

In a next step Monica explained how the piloting of a so called 3-Generation Project to support seed potato systems in Kenya, Rwanda and Uganda was followed by several stakeholder meetings to develop a roadmap. National programs, private sector, NGOs, farmer federation, sub-regional organizations from Burundi, Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda were involved.

This consultative process resulted in a roadmap to guide investment in potato value chains and the joint agreement that quality seed is the key entry point for vibrant potato value chains. To be able to improve livelihoods of potato farmers in Sub-Saharan Africa, an integrated approach in joint partnership with all stakeholders is required to tackle deteriorated potato seed quality.

The strategy developed for seed potato - on the basis of the roadmap - contains 7 main key elements/products:
1) Client-oriented (i.e., small-scale potato farmers in SSA) approaches to rapidly access quality seed
2) Robust market-demanded varieties
3) Seed technologies and business models
4) Decentralized multiplication
5) On-farm seed quality and Integrated Crop Management (ICM) technologies
6) Awareness campaigns to create demand
7) Scaling strategies and evidence base

Monica presented each of the products in more detail, showing its main characteristics and how it contributes via the impact pathway to reaching the impact of improving livelihoods. She also strongly highlighted the importance of partnerships for successfully reaching the goals and gave an example of the newly created “(Irish) Potato Coalition” as a unique opportunity for all stakeholders along the value chain to work together toward a shared goal.

Discussions around topics of the presentation can be summarized as follows:

- **Variety selection is an important aspect.** Processing varieties should be given more attention. They are vegetative correlated with disease and can be expensive and special market driven.
- **CIP currently has a highland focus - which should be broadened to warmer temperatures and the preliminary stage and tests running intensified.**
- There is a conflict of policy: need formal standards accepted for quality declared planting materials -> however cannot be moved easily around the country. Movement to broader regions needs formal inspections.
- **More and affordable quick diagnostic tools are required as need exists to test on-farm, such as a lateral flow device which shows immediate results but is costly).**

A strong interest was expressed to learn more about the “Potato Coalition” and how to partner. Further information was given by members of the coalition:

- The coalition started as an informal idea/concept, as a regional platform for discussion.
- The coalition is in process of being established with the pronounced interest of many stakeholders.
- The development of a common strategy is under way -.
- There is no funding available or assured yet, and fundraising is one of the tasks.
- Work has not yet really started; only some action in Ethiopia
- Interventions are foreseen in each country/country led initiatives.
• There is a good chance to find funding support, as many international donors look for coalitions that can cover broad aspects of value chains – support country based efforts and bring actors together.

Workshop participants recommended:

• The Coalition should be able to treat sensitive aspects, as eg. Risks (eg. Seeds from Netherlands) and have a strong mandate.

• Do not wait for funding! Establish partnership and start working; to be able to jointly find resources.

Participants also highlighted two important points that easily led to next workshop agenda points and key tasks of the workshop:

• “We had - here in same place - a meeting to define and develop a vision on where to be in 10 years”.

  Even numbers were defined in this Roadmap for the seed potato sector (see Roadmap: http://bit.ly/TMU3Yb).

• Based on these common goals we should keep on developing our ideas and the business plan.

• In the moment looks like a good sector strategy. But how to go into a concrete strategy for going to scale? How and in which regions? How can we transfer capacity to farmers via business plans?

2.2 CONCEPTS, BACKGROUND AND IDEAS ON IMPACT PATHWAYS

The full presentation given by Sophie can be found under the link: http://bit.ly/TMQMIf

Sophie Alvarez (facilitator for CIP/RTB) introduced participants to key concepts of the management strategy - Results based management (RBM) – by which CIP and RTB plan to ensure that its processes, products and services contribute to the achievement of desired results (products, outcomes and impacts). RBM rests on clearly defined accountability for results, and requires monitoring and self-assessment of progress towards results, and reporting on performance.

This has implications in the way WE:

Sophie highlighted the importance of making Impact Pathways explicit to

✓ Help to establish an explicit common set of pathways, and thus a sense of shared purpose amongst implementing partners

✓ Involve the necessary actors, partnerships and alliances in a joint process

Impact pathways are one important component in RBM as they allow describing, defining and understanding how activities link up to visions and impacts.
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- Identify **synergy areas** with other similar initiatives, or with other related initiatives
- Get **participation of product users in design** of these products and their scaling strategies
- Establish a **common framework for examining** change processes (M&E)
- Systematically provide **information for learning, decision making and communicating** (with donors, partners, general audiences) during the projects’ implementation

An impact pathway is build-up of different elements (activities, products, outcomes, impact) that follow a timeline. HOWEVER, Impact Pathways are NEVER as linear as shown in the image below. This is a simplified presentation – a reduction of complexity for visualization and to facilitate discussion around key issues.

![Generic Impact Pathway and Actors](image.png)

Actors (implementers, next users, beneficiaries) play different roles along the impact pathway.

**Next user** groups are actors who “use” what we produce (using the products) and contribute to achievement of outcomes. Next users can be national partners or international research or development organizations, etc.

**Comments** from participants stressed aspects such as:

- Be careful not to focus too much on the research/researchers’ perspective of impact pathways—these can look different from the next users or beneficiaries point of view.
- The aspect of business partnerships and a stronger focus on the importance and relevance of business is missing.
- Policy aspects are relevant at many levels in the Impact Pathways.
2.3 GROUP EXERCISE: IMPACT PATHWAYS FOR SEED POTATO – IMPROVING PRODUCTS, OUTCOMES

The input presentation led over to this first exercise. Participants split into 3 working groups, built on the basis of regional availability of participants:

- Ethiopia – team that was working with pink cards
- Kenya – team that was working with green cards
- Eastern Africa/Rwanda – team that was working with yellow cards

To begin, Sophie gave some more information on how to have a look on the track between products, its use by next users and the outcomes. Outcomes were defined as:

**Changes in practice or behavior:** A change in practice or behavior is a change in the way people (in this case, each of the ‘next user groups’) DO things. So when thinking about next user practice changes, try to use action words- such as 'coordinate', 'plant', 'participate in', 'integrate', ‘release’, etc.

**Changes in knowledge, attitudes, skills:** To be able to 'use' something, people usually need to first believe or trust the benefits of using it, know/understand it, and its advantages, and have developed the skills to use it. Looking at each practice change for each actor group, reflect: what knowledge, attitudes and/or skills are key to having this actor group change their practice?

Each team received 2 products and their impact pathways (as presented in the seed potato strategy by Monica,) printed on white colored paper and were asked to revise and improve the first elements of the impact pathway: products to outcomes. Participants were encouraged to use colored cards to add new ideas, or reformulate existing propositions (white paper).

Narration back from group work Day 1: Sharing of experiences in the revision of the impact pathway (improving products, outcomes)

Each working group was made up of participants that came from different organizations, different background and working experience – which led to fruitful and insightful discussions for all participants. Discussions and comments arose around topics such as:

- Some products and outcomes are not clearly worded and not self-explanatory enough. Changes are proposed.
- The exercise is very helpful to consequently think through how products lead to outcomes and impacts.
- How inclusive can the impact pathway be? Can the Impact pathway cover all investors and all actors?

- Input from business sector should be here to enrich. No stakeholders from private sector were invited to this workshop.
• The impact pathway contains strong research focus and not a lot on business aspects. However it will be difficult to reach outcomes and impacts if we do not take business aspects into consideration. We also should take into consideration different agendas between the business sector and us – implementers - we want to improve livelihoods and the private sector rather than increase profits solely for the sake of business sector actors. Challenge and task will be to find the incentives business sector actors need to contribute also to the improvement of livelihoods.

• There are different missions amongst participants in the working group that are to be integrated in the impact pathway, for example, potato board is responsible for all.

• Not always new seeds/varieties follow impact pathway steps. For example, the case of the “Shangi” variety which was an escape from breeding programs shows that variety adoption has its own dynamics and can lead to impacts through informal sector. This case should be further investigated for lessons learnt.

The day closed with an interactive session with posters and materials from participants. A “market place” was installed where each partner had a spot to talk about his/her work, using posters, handouts, products, or just explaining in 5 minutes the work his/her organization is doing. The workshop participants went from one spot to another and interacted with the different partners.

3. Joint improvement of the Impact Pathway for seed potato: June 13th

3.1 Group Exercise: Impact Pathways for Seed Potato – Strategies

The second day started with a short presentation of work done so far the day before. No in-depth discussion took place and participants with comments or suggestions were invited to join the respective group to bring in new ideas. This lead to rotation in the working groups which led to enriching input.

Before the groups split up again to keep on working on the improvement of the impact pathway in terms of strategies, Sophie gave an input presentation on “strategies”:

When analyzing and developing strategies it is important to include:

• partnerships!
• gender!
• communications!
• advocacy!
To visualize **partners**, groups were asked to stick “post-its” on the respective cards of strategies, products and outcomes to represent his/her organization.

**Gender** does not necessarily have to be made visible in each and every card – only where we directly can take responsibility for any changes. Important is to analyze the “how” in the strategies: how to work, how to achieve?

After the exercise teams were asked to have a final look on the complete Impact Pathways before presenting it to the other participants.

**Presentation** and sharing of experiences in the revision of the impact pathway: developing strategies and identifying partners. For detailed impact pathways developed by each of the 3 groups, see **ANNEX 4**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Strategies and Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team “Pink”</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robust, market demanded candidate varieties</td>
<td>Strong and effective partnerships among breeders and end users KENAFF/EIAR/KARI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing tools and gender sensitive value chain approaches for creating demand for seed and ware potato ( \text{EAFF/KARI/NPCK/RAB} )</td>
<td>Strong &amp; effective (business) partnerships between value chain actors ( \text{EAFF/VIAT/KENAFF/NPCK/RAB/SHA} ) NPCK, national and regional organizations advocate for adoption and implementation of harmonized production and marketing standards ( \text{EAFF/VIAT/KENAFF/NPCK/RAB/SHA} ) Capacity building and institutional support for value chain actors on marketing tools, quality control and value chain approaches. ( \text{EAFF/VIAT/KENAFF/NPCK/RAB/SHA} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team “Yellow”</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locally adapted protocols for seed quality control ( \text{EAFF/KARI/NPCK/RAB} ) <strong>Sub product</strong>: NPCK, EAFF, ASARECA, MinAgr, regional seed track association, private sector and partners lobby for appropriate policy options on quality declared seeds (Advocacy) <strong>Sub product</strong>: NPCK, EAFF, ASARECA, MinAgr, regional seed trackers advocate the adoption and implementation of harmonized ECA seed standards.</td>
<td>NPCK, EAFF, KENAFF, MoK and other stakeholders advocate to establish private &amp; public regulatory agents Capacity building (training) of seed multipliers &amp; inspection agents by Government agents, Donors, NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence based strategies to scale out seed systems developed with women and men farmers and private sector ( \text{KARI/RAB/NPCK/EAFF} )</td>
<td>Strengthen the distribution systems of seed (by private sector, gvt, research) ( \text{EAFF/NPCK/KENAFF/IMBARAGA} ) Strengthen Farmer Organizations (technical, gender, institutional strengthening, etc.) by FOs, NGOs, private sector ( \text{EAFF/NPCK/KENAFF/IMBARAGA} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team “Green”</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On farm seed quality and integrated crop management technologies, eg positive selection</td>
<td>Protocols and standards for on-farm seed management developed (gender sensitive) Local and national research organizations and national potato council raise awareness, provide training and institutional support including capacity building Local and international research organizations and the national potato</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Strategies and Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seed technologies and business models</td>
<td>council coordinate actors under common strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local and international organizations develop protocols for seed certification and made easily accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural research organizations, MinAgr, NGOs train seed producers and raise awareness on seed technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NGOs/FOs/KARI/NPCK/Agr. Research/MinAgr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local and international research organizations build capacity of inspectors (training and infrastructure establishment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FOs advocate for establishment of regulatory institutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some additional strategies, suggested to use for bridging next users and development outcomes were:

- Training of seed multipliers
- Gender sensitive seed multipliers recruitment decentralized
- Availability and use of appropriate inputs (fertilizers, pesticides, etc.) facilitated
- Good management practices (storage, production)
- Organize seed multipliers into groups (regional/country)
- Facilitate linkages with financial insurance products services
- Support of business development, market linkages and MIS
- Sensitize and support country/regions governments on establishing decentralized production

Sharing of experiences in the revision of the complete impact pathway

The exchange of experiences, comments and discussions had mainly 3 interlinked topics, which resulted in concrete steps for joint immediate action:

Partnering – create and use synergies:

- Partner with ASARECA as they currently are using value chain approach
- We’re often doing the same thing, so we should be doing things together, as eg Irish potato coalition: let’s make it work.
- We need to come together and need to find ways to work together, we have synergies. For the same crop in the same country we have to come up with a way to collaborate.
- In the moment, there is no formal way of sharing. Everybody is on their own. There is no way of knowing how others are doing. Even in case of calls for proposals (eg ASARECA) we do not know what others do or how to join forces.
- What do we want to achieve by building /keep a partnership alive?
• We should come up with common strategy and should find ways to integrate in country’s national strategy. We tend to leave policy people out, but we should include them. National organizations, like KENAFF, working also with CIP. Manuals published with these partners, but we need to do this in each country to harness synergies.

• Start at country level: each time hosted by another actor? Results of meetings can be posted on online potato portal; presented to public?

• Why not have working groups in each country? It's easier within courtiers. Meetings every 2 months and update the common platform?

• There is already a structure existing:
  o The working groups represented at national potato council. Why does it not work?
  o African potato association (APA): big and unfocused, tied to conference every 3 years, rather loose, no funding, so no consistent work. Mainly dormant.

**Communication**

• Lots of things are currently going on in Kenya, concerning outreach of farmers

• There are good examples for taking means of media into consideration, e.g. Orange fleshed sweetpotato in Rwanda. Take chances when they come along!

• We can open an online communication platform – but have to assure that it is regularly updated! It needs update twice per year and it must be assured that someone takes responsibility for it.

• First we need to identify:
  o what is platform for: presenting achievements? Intercommunication platform?
  o who does what
  o how to link up
  o should it look pretty and finished
  o public broad access? Or segment on National Potato Council website?
  o open and big with coordination at different levels.

**Matrix: stakeholder activity mapping**

To start building stronger partnership, it is important to know each other better, to know who is who and who does what. We should do a stakeholder mapping activity by using a matrix structure to capture information and create awareness of links between actors on e.g:

• Matrix by Themes and countries - Detail competency: Research/production for each actor

• Projects mapped per actor - possibly with objectives

• One sheet per country? Contact per country in each sheet.

• Information flowing – as content for homepage.

• Could also visualize in an image.

• Could come as basis into next meetings on country level.

A first draft matrix was designed as presented in ANNEX 5.
Next steps for Partner Matrix:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Send sheets out per email</td>
<td>Elmar/Monica (CIP); Mainza (EAFF)</td>
<td>End of June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filled in sheets 1 week back to Elmar</td>
<td>All participants/ organisations</td>
<td>4th July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compile</td>
<td>Elmar/Monica</td>
<td>11th July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring ASARECA on Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve potato coalition. Coordinator can take a role for coordination of this partner matrix work. Possibly based in Addis or Nairobi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 **TWO GROUPS COME TOGETHER - SHARE RESULTS OF WORK: M&E AND QUALITY SEED POTATO**

The complete Impact pathway as shown in the photo can be found under the link: [http://bit.ly/1qLaz8W](http://bit.ly/1qLaz8W)

The group working on “quality seed potato” presented the complete improved impact pathway. The working group results were joined on one big “wallpaper” to give a complete overview – as shown in the photo above. One representative of each team presented the respective team results.

The M&E team worked to achieve the following objectives: (1) Share first ideas on the global M&E framework. (2) Share and review partners’ frameworks for M&E. (3) Review the impact pathway of “seed potato” and “banana bacterial wilt”. (4) Develop a first draft of the M&E plan for the potato and banana IPs. (5) Define next steps to finalize the M&E plan.

The M&E team presented as example of their work on operationalizing indicators, a proposed detailed description of an indicator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flagship</th>
<th>SO3-PO1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving Livelihoods of Potato Farmers in Africa by Tackling Deteriorated Seed Quality through an Integrated Approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related outcome</th>
<th>First Level Development Outcome – FLDO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decentralized seed multipliers (especially women) selling affordable locally available quality seed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th># decentralized multipliers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Locally available trained multipliers (individuals, cooperatives, farmer groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline (2014)</td>
<td>List of registered decentralized seed multipliers (count) disaggregated by gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data requirement and sources</td>
<td>Sources: District Agriculture Office Marketing and cooperative Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection Method</td>
<td>Secondary sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance and Feasibility</td>
<td>IMPORTANCE: High FEASIBILITY: Easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>M&amp;E specialist Field Officers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 **WRAPPING UP: PLenary About Next Steps**

Participants of both workshop sessions jointly wrapped up the two days of work and envisaged next steps:

**Partnership/stakeholder mapping**

- Implement the planning foreseen for the development of the matrix structure
- Look exclusively on potato when doing the stakeholder mapping as we are specifically/functional group on potato. We will tend to dilute when integrating other crops and stakeholder groups. We should not overload the exercise at the moment.
- End of year, realize a follow up meeting with additional partners to retake and go in detail.
- Bring in ASARECA-project SPIRIT.
- Bring in a business angle – enriched with short meetings with business people – so they can come and contribute
- Define how to best bring in policy makers in process. To be able to influence enabling environment; influence in change / advocacy.

**Website/communication flow**

- Do a platform: use joint R&D platform eg. platforms under Humidtropics
- Define principle of the platform: do not go as lower level specific group. The stronger the platform, the stronger the influence. Convening at the higher level!

**Impact Pathway/M&E**

- Make a good clean up of the Impact Pathway: send to both sections of workshop for checking, before working on specific indicators
- Communication and gender issues carry already through quite strongly. Check for missing aspect “environment”.
• Check with other partners, bring them in. It should be an integrative process. Now it was rather initiated by 1-2 organizations but in the future a collective process for next steps should be organized.

• Have draft M&E plan in month time

Do not lose the dynamic that has been developed during last days!
Keep the bigger vision: A strong stakeholder group working for a longer term goal.
Work together on existing resources, combine new search for new.
ANNEXES

ANNEX 1. WORKSHOP PROGRAM

Thursday 12th June 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15</td>
<td>Broad scope of the workshop, background and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Participant’s presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Presentation and Q&amp;A: Update on Strategy to go to scale with quality seed potato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45</td>
<td>Presentation and Q&amp;A: Concepts, background and ideas on impact pathways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>Group exercise and plenary: Impact pathways for seed potato – practice concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Presentation and Group work: Improving products, outcomes and impacts for the quality seed potato Impact Pathways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>Continued: Group work on improving products, outcomes and impacts for the quality seed potato Impact Pathways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>Sharing results of improving products, outcomes and impacts for the quality seed potato Impact Pathways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td>Closing of the day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30</td>
<td>INTERACTIVE SESSION: POSTERS/MATERIALS FROM PARTICIPANTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Friday 13th June 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08.00</td>
<td>Plenary: Presentations from group work Day 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.30</td>
<td>Presentation and Group Work: Strategies - partnerships, gender, communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>Continued: Group work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>Two groups come together- share results of 2 groups work: M&amp;E- quality potato seed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:15</td>
<td>Plenary about next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:45</td>
<td>Closing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.00</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Annex 2. List of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dagmar Wittine</td>
<td>RTB Program Manager, Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Ortiz</td>
<td>CIP Lima – DDG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham Thiele</td>
<td>RTB – Program Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Kipkoech</td>
<td>KARI-Tigoni (potato program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denys Munuyarwo</td>
<td>IMBARAGA, Rwanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmar Schulte-Geldermann</td>
<td>CIP-Nairobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ermias Guta</td>
<td>VITA-Ethiopia (Irish Potato Coalition), M&amp;E Manager, Vita Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Maina</td>
<td>Eastern Africa Farmers' Federation (EAFF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getachew Minas</td>
<td>Self-help Africa (Ethiopia), M&amp;E Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Maina</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Potato Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainza Mugoya</td>
<td>Eastern Africa Farmers' Federation (EAFF), Program Officer (Policy and Advocacy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica Parker</td>
<td>CIP-Nairobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Ng’ang’a</td>
<td>KARI-Tigoni (potato program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netsayi Mudege</td>
<td>CIP-RTB Gender Specialist, Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Amukhoye</td>
<td>GORTA-Kenya (Irish Potato Coalition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie Alvarez</td>
<td>CIAT, RTB-Facilitator/Trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tewodros Heilemariam</td>
<td>Self-help Africa (Ethiopia), Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theophile Ndacyayiseng</td>
<td>RAB-Rwanda (Potato Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Osvald</td>
<td>VITA-Ireland (Irish Potato Coalition) Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronique Durroux</td>
<td>CIP-RTB Communication Specialist, Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wachira Kaguongo</td>
<td>National Potato Council of Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Nyekanyeka</td>
<td>CIP Malawi – M&amp;E Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudio Proietti</td>
<td>Consultant CIP&amp;RTB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington Jogo</td>
<td>CIP Ethiopia - M&amp;E Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Wobill</td>
<td>IITA - M&amp;E Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietmar Stoian</td>
<td>Bioversity - Focal Point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 3. Results of Group Work: Impact Pathways by Teams

**Impact Pathway Team Pink**

Cards colored in pink: new input from the team, or strong reformulation of proposed Impact Pathway. Uncolored cards: unchanged

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRODUCTS</th>
<th>RESEARCH OUTCOMES</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robust, market demanded candidate varieties</td>
<td>FBO, Breeders, NARS and private sector actors breed, release and promote varieties in quantities demanded, using gender sensitive approaches and using adaptability trials, including evaluation and selection VITA / SHA / KARI / NPCK/EAFF/RAB</td>
<td>NGOs, universities, CBOs, producer organizations, private sector extension services and media exploit communication and awareness-raising strategies to raise awareness of robust varieties’ availability among ware potato farmers VIAT, KENAFF, NPCK, SHA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Marketing tools and gender sensitive value chain approaches for creating demand for seed and ware potato EAFF/KARI/NPCK/RAB | GOs, Private Actors, NGOs, FBOs, support marketing oriented infrastructure and technology access (development) and uptake (gender appropriate) NPCK/VIAT/SHA | Men and women farmers are aware of benefits of using high quality potato seed and improved varieties for market oriented production by NGOs, CBOs, extension services, media, ICT platforms EAFF/KENAFF/VIAT/NPCK | Private sector, CBOs, NGOs use value chain approaches to ensure consistent market supply - including potato products diversification EAFF/KENAFF/NPCK/VITA | Value chain actors develop and adopt quality control systems for different ware potato products |

| GOs, NGOs, universities, CBOs, producer organizations and private sector actors use marketing tools to raise awareness of potato’s nutritional value (including men) VIAT/NPCK/SHA | | | | |

| Potato perceived as a nutritious food and consumed as a household staple | Consumers increase potato consumption and purchases seed and ware producers experience an increase in production and income | Increased potato consumption as a result of ware market-oriented production | | |
Impact Pathway Team Yellow

Cards colored in yellow: new input from the team, or strong reformulation of proposed Impact Pathway. Uncolored cards: unchanged

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRODUCTS</th>
<th>RESEARCH OUTCOMES</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locally adapted protocols for seed quality control EAFF/KARI/NPCK/RAB</td>
<td>Regulatory and inspection agents implement appropriate quality control standards and use affordable diagnostic methods to facilitate production of large volumes of high quality seed</td>
<td>Linking traders and ware potato farmers to seed multipliers by extension agents and FOs EAFF/NPCK/RAB/IM BARAGA/KENAFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub product: NPCK, EAFF, ASARECA, Min Agr, regional seed track association, private sector and partners lobby for appropriate policy options on quality declared seeds (Advocacy)</td>
<td>Seed multipliers adopt and follow appropriate quality control standards to produce large volumes of quality seed</td>
<td>Traders and ware potato farmers have access to seed of guaranteed quality at local, national and regional levels timely and cost effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub product: NPCK, EAFF, ASARECA, MinAgr, regional seed trackers advocate the adoption and implementation of harmonized ECA seed standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence based strategies to scale out seed systems developed with women and men farmers and private sector KARI/RAB/NPCK/EAFF</td>
<td>Govt, NGO, donor &amp; research support (and promote) wide scale uptake EAFF/NPCK</td>
<td>FOs and private sector adopt best practices for wide scale uptake ENAFF/NPCK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large numbers of women and men seed &amp; ware potato farmers in vast areas produce and sell substantial volumes of potato</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Impact Pathway Team Green

Cards colored in green: new input from the team, or strong reformulation of proposed Impact Pathway. Uncolored cards: unchanged

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRODUCTS</th>
<th>RESEARCH OUTCOMES</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On farm seed quality and integrated crop management technologies, eg positive selection</td>
<td>GOs, NGOs, universities, CBOs, producer organizations (farmer organizations) and private sector actors support <em>(training, capacity building, etc)</em> appropriate on-farm seed maintenance and ICM techniques to add value to seed and ware potato</td>
<td>NARS and NGOs train men and women farmers on seed management using gender sensitive manuals, protocols and approaches.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Seed technologies and business models | Public and private seed producers increase production and sales of in-vitro, mini-tuber and early field seed generation categories using improved rapid multiplication and diagnostic technologies | NPCK and partners to lobby SDA to increase support formal seed systems *(financial, institutional, etc.)* | FO (KENAFF, EAFF, etc.) capacity enhanced to support to organize seed multipliers | Seed multipliers especially decentralized, selling affordable locally-available quality seed |

- Decentralized women seed multipliers selling affordable locally available quality seed
- Organized seed multipliers with increased voice and capacity to negotiate for better selling environment
## Annex 4. Potato Partnership Matrix Draft

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ethiopia</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Rwanda</th>
<th>Regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research/production</strong></td>
<td>EIAR, CIP, Vita, Self-Help Africa, RARIs,</td>
<td>KARI, CIP, KENAFF, GORTA,</td>
<td>RAB, IMBARAGA, IFDC, Rwanda Uni,</td>
<td>ASARECA, EAFF,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seed system (divide into 3 major components)</strong></td>
<td>EIAR, RARIs, CIP, Vita, Self-Help Africa, Seed enterprises, World Vision, FAO, Seed cooperatives/unions/primaries, BoAs,</td>
<td>KARI, CIP, NPCK, SMEs, Min Ag, KEPHIS, GORTA, SHA, STAK,</td>
<td>IMBARAGA, RAB, IFDC,</td>
<td>ASARECA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postharvest, processing,</strong></td>
<td>KENAFF, NPCK, SMEs, GORTA, SHA, KEBS,</td>
<td>IMBARAGA, SMEs,</td>
<td>EABC, ASARECA,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value chain, marketing</strong></td>
<td>NPCK, KENAFF, Min Ag, KEPHIS, KARI,</td>
<td>Min Ag, RAB, IMBARAGA</td>
<td>EAFF, ASARECA,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy, sector strategy</strong></td>
<td>Contact info</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 5. DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS

Evaluation – The systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, program or policy, its design, implementation and results.

Indicator – A quantitative or qualitative factor or variable that provides a simple and reliable means to measure achievement, to reflect changes connected to an intervention, or to help assess the performance of a development actor.

Monitoring – A process of continuous or periodic collection and analysis of data to compare how well a project, program, or policy is being implemented against expected results.

Outcomes:
Research outcomes - The likely or achieved effects from research outputs applied by next users, for instance by national partners or international research or development organizations.

Ex. NARS and private sector breeders develop, release, and promote varieties using participatory approaches

First Level Development Outcomes represent capacity and behavioral changes concerning beneficiaries. They include the adoption of new technologies (e.g. varieties, IPM technologies) by farmers or changes in competencies such as their ability to assess post-harvest losses.

Ex. Ware potato farmers increase the use of high-quality seed of robust varieties

Product – Deliverables, resulting from a research activity or a set of related activities implemented by RTB/CIP that could be used by a partner or other stakeholders. Outputs are of different types:

- Knowledge (e.g. frameworks and concepts that could change the way in which users/stakeholders think and act)
- Tools (e.g. decision-support tools, guidelines and training manuals that could change the way in which users/stakeholders allocate resources and/or implement activities)
- Data (e.g. open access databases maintained)
- Technologies and practices (e.g. agriculture-related and NRM-related technologies and innovations)
- Capacity enhancement and innovation platforms (e.g. individuals trained, multi-stakeholder research for development (R4D) platforms maintained)

Ex. Locally adapted protocols for seed quality control

Result – The output, outcome or impact (intended or unintended, positive and/or negative) of an intervention.

Results based management (RBM) – A management strategy by which an organization ensures that its processes, products and services contribute to the achievement of desired results (products, outcomes and impacts). RBM rests on clearly defined accountability for results, and requires monitoring and self-assessment of progress towards results, and reporting on performance.

Impact pathway – The causal pathway for a research project or program that outlines the expected sequence to achieve desired objectives beginning with inputs, moving through activities and outputs, and culminating in outcomes and impacts. Assumptions underpinning the causal chain and feedback loops are usually included (closely related terms include Logical Framework and Theory of Change).

---