



CGIAR

CGIAR
SCALING FOR
IMPACT

WORKSHOP REPORT

South-South Scaling Science Network (4SN)

ILRI Campus, Nairobi | October 28, 2025

Belinda Kageni, Nora Hanke-Louw, Inga Jacobs-Mata,
and Valencia Mbatha

June 2026



Authors

Belinda Kageni, Consultant, International Water Management Institute (IWMI), Nairobi, Kenya

Nora Hanke-Louw, Senior Project Manager (International); Deputy Country Representative - South Africa, IWMI, Pretoria, South Africa

Inga Jacobs-Mata, Strategic Program Director – Water, Growth and Inclusion, IWMI, Nairobi, Kenya

Valencia Mbatha, Project Administrator, IWMI, Pretoria, South Africa

Author Contributions

Conceptualization: Nora Hanke-Louw; Methodology: Nora Hanke-Louw; Writing – original draft: Belinda Kageni; Writing – review & editing: Valencia Mbatha; Supervision: Inga Jacobs-Mata; Project administration: Valencia Mbatha.

Citation

Kageni, Belinda, Nora Hanke-Louw, Inga Jacobs-Mata, and Valencia Mbatha. 2026. *South-South Scaling Science Network (4SN)*. International Water Management Institute (IWMI).

Acknowledgments

This work was carried out with support from the CGIAR Scaling for Impact Program. We would like to thank all funders who supported this research through their contributions to the CGIAR Trust Fund (www.cgiar.org/funders).

Copyright

© 2026 International Water Management Institute. Some rights reserved. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).

Front cover photo: Nora Hanke-Louw/IWMI

Disclaimer

This publication has been prepared as an output of the CGIAR Scaling for Impact Program and has not been independently peer reviewed. Responsibility for editing, proofreading, and layout, opinions expressed, and any possible errors lies with the authors and not the institutions involved.

Contents

<u>Executive Summary</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>1. Introduction and Workshop Objectives</u>	<u>5</u>
1. <u>Opening Remarks: Setting the Vision</u>	<u>5</u>
2. <u>Participant Expectations</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>2. Framing the Science and Practice of Scaling</u>	<u>6</u>
1. <u>Core Concepts: Scaling, Scaling Readiness, and Responsible Scaling</u>	<u>6</u>
2. <u>Key Insights from Plenary Discussion</u>	<u>6</u>
<u>3. Co-Designing the Network: Capacity, Models, and Value</u>	<u>7</u>
1. <u>Group Exercise 1: Capacity Mapping (Strengths and Gaps)</u>	<u>7</u>
2. <u>Presentation: Strategic Rationale, Principles, and Budget (Nora)</u>	<u>7</u>
3. <u>Presentation: The Scaling Champions Model (Nina & George)</u>	<u>8</u>
4. <u>Group Exercise 2: Defining the Network's Value (Dotmocracy)</u>	<u>9</u>
<u>4. Co-Designing the Network: Vision and Commitment</u>	<u>11</u>
1. <u>Group Exercise 3: Vision 2028 and Network Naming</u>	<u>11</u>
2. <u>Group Exercise 4: The Commitment Spectrum</u>	<u>11</u>
<u>5. Key Takeaways and The Way Forward</u>	<u>13</u>
1. <u>Key Workshop Takeaways</u>	<u>13</u>
2. <u>Agreed Next Steps</u>	<u>13</u>
<u>Appendices</u>	<u>14</u>
<u>8.2. Appendix B: Workshop Presentations</u>	<u>15</u>

Summary

On 28 October 2025, the CGIAR Scaling for Impact (S4I) Program, in partnership with the International Water Manager Institute (IWMI), the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI), and the International Institute for Tropical Agriculture (IITA), and universities from the Global South, convened a foundational workshop at the ILRI Campus in Nairobi. The event brought together university representatives from countries across Africa and Asia to co-design a South-South university network dedicated to strengthening capacity in scaling science. The primary objective was to empower universities to transition from being peripheral implementers of scaling frameworks to becoming central architects in designing and teaching the discipline.

The workshop's narrative progressed from establishing a common language to co-designing a concrete future. Key presentations on Scaling Readiness and Responsible Scaling framed scaling as a formal discipline, a process of systemic transformation, not mere replication. A subsequent Capacity Mapping exercise confirmed a universal gap: while universities possess foundational strengths in outreach and innovation hubs, they lack formal, systematic curricula for scaling science.

Participants then co-designed the network's core functions. A Dotmocracy (dot-voting) exercise delivered a clear mandate, prioritizing three value propositions: 1) Implementable Curriculum Development, 2) Exchange of Faculty and Students, and 3) A formal Knowledge Exchange Platform.

A Vision 2028 exercise imagined a future where this network had led to formalized courses, collaborative research, and a strategic shift from piloting to scaling within universities.

The day's most critical insight emerged from the final Commitment Spectrum exercise. It revealed a significant gap between universally high individual passion for the network and variable institutional commitment to resources. However, this exercise also identified the precise solution: institutional commitment was found to be high for specific in-kind contributions (like staff time or hosting workshops) and co-funding models, but low for vague, unfunded financial requests.

This crucial finding directly informed the Agreed Next Steps. The facilitation team was mandated to refine the network's concept note and circulate a formal Expression of Interest (EOI) directly to university leadership (Deans and Vice-Chancellors). This step is designed to bridge the "champion-to-institution" gap and secure the formal buy-in required to build an autonomous, Southern-led network on a foundation of co-creation and institutional ownership.

1. Introduction and Workshop Objectives

The South-South Scaling Science Network workshop brought together universities, CGIAR Centres, and partners from across Africa and Asia to co-design a collaborative platform for advancing scaling science in the Global South. Convened under the CGIAR S4I Program, the workshop aimed to move universities from being peripheral implementers of scaling approaches to becoming central actors in shaping, teaching, and applying scaling science. The workshop objectives were to build a shared understanding of scaling, Scaling Readiness, and Responsible Scaling; identify existing university strengths, capacity gaps, and opportunities; and co-design the network's value proposition, vision, and practical pathways for collaboration. Through participatory exercises and plenary discussions, participants explored curriculum development, faculty and student exchange, knowledge-sharing mechanisms, and institutional commitment. The workshop laid the foundation for a Southern-led network focused on co-creation, capacity strengthening, and translating research and innovation into sustained impact.

1. Opening Remarks: Setting the Vision

The workshop was opened by **Iddo Dror (ILRI)**, **Nora Hanke-Louw (IWMI)**, and **Ngowenani Nohayi (Nina) (IWMI)**, who collectively set the day's strategic context and collaborative tone.

- **Iddo** contextualized the S4I Program's mission to bridge the gap between research innovation and tangible, unmistakable impact. He articulated the vision for the network: to shift universities in the Global South from being passive implementers of scaling frameworks developed elsewhere to becoming central architects in designing and teaching scaling science.
- **Nora** framed the day's methodology as one of co-creation and shared ownership. She urged participants to move beyond passive listening and to act as co-designers of the network, emphasizing that the day's outcomes would be shaped entirely by their active engagement and honest contributions.
- **Nina** translated this vision into three core objectives for the workshop, framing the day's agenda around three key actions: define the network's value, vision, and practical application.

2. Participant Expectations

Following the opening, Nina facilitated an introductory exercise where each participant shared their name, institution, and primary expectation for the new network. This session was crucial for establishing the unified set of expectations.

A clear set of collective themes emerged from these introductions. The participants' expectations converged on three primary goals for the network:

1. **Collaboration and Networking:** A universal desire to build sustainable South-South partnerships that are distinct from traditional North-South models, create new avenues for knowledge production, and keep networks alive.
2. **Curriculum and Capacity:** An urgent and specific need to build institutional capacity by formally integrating scaling science into university curricula. This was the most-cited theme, with participants mentioning co-developing short courses, improving existing curricula, and creating new Master's programs.
3. **Impact and Structure:** A practical desire for the network to result in tangible outcomes, getting research "on the ground," creating real impact, and being supported by clear, localized governance structures.

2. Framing the Science and Practice of Scaling

A technical plenary session was delivered by **Esther Kihoro**, **Edwin Kang'ethe**, and **Ebenezer Ngissah** to establish a common language and conceptual foundation for the workshop. The presentation defined scaling as a formal discipline with its own frameworks and principles.

1. Core Concepts: Scaling, Scaling Readiness, and Responsible Scaling

The presentation was structured around three core concepts:

1. **What is Scaling?** (Esther Kihoro)
Scaling was defined as a transformation, not mere replication. It is the process of catalyzing systemic change to ensure solutions are adopted and sustained. This contrasts with simple dissemination (e.g., handing out flyers), which does not guarantee ownership or systemic change.
2. **The Practice of Scaling: 'Scaling Readiness'** (Edwin Kang'ethe)
Edwin introduced the 'Scaling Readiness' framework, a diagnostic tool adapted from NASA's Technology Readiness Levels (TRLs). This evidence-based approach helps innovation teams assess the maturity of their innovation and, crucially, identify the bottlenecks in the surrounding ecosystem (e.g., policy, market, social) that prevent it from scaling.
 - **Key Insight:** The framework helps teams avoid the common pitfall of perfecting a technology that is already mature while ignoring the real, non-technical barriers. As Edwin noted, working on scaling an innovation while ignoring its bottlenecks is an exercise in futility.
3. **The Principle of Scaling: 'Responsible Scaling'** (Ebenezer Ngissah)
Ebenezer presented the critical principle of 'Responsible Scaling', which demands that equity and potential harm be anticipated and mitigated from the beginning.
 - **Case Study:** He used a powerful example of new boreholes in Ghana. While technically successful (providing clean water), the innovation had unintended negative consequences: it displaced women from their traditional social spaces at the river and eliminated the local jobs of men who delivered water.
 - **Key Insight:** Responsible scaling requires moving beyond a simple do-no-harm approach to actively anticipating and addressing social differentiation. Using the metaphor of an apple tree, he illustrated the need to ensure benefits are distributed equitably.

2. Key Insights from Plenary Discussion

The subsequent Q&A session raised critical points that shaped the rest of the day:

- **Linking Innovation and Scaling:** Participants noted that responsibility must begin even before scaling. This led to a key discussion on the need to integrate Responsible Innovation (designing the innovation itself with user needs and ethics in mind) with Responsible Scaling (managing the socio-political context during its rollout).
- **The Role of Policy:** A strong theme was the necessity of policy. An innovation cannot scale in a vacuum; it requires an enabling environment created by supportive government policies.
- **From Theory to Practice:** Participants expressed a clear need for practical tools and frameworks (like Scaling Readiness) to move these concepts from theory into their own institutional practices and curricula.

3. Co-Designing the Network: Capacity, Models, and Value

The afternoon was dedicated to participatory co-design sessions, beginning with an assessment of the as-is (current capacity) and moving to the to-be (network value).

1. Group Exercise 1: Capacity Mapping (Strengths and Gaps)

Participants broke into groups to map their respective institutions' strengths and gaps related to scaling.

Strengths:

The group mapping confirmed that while formal scaling programs are rare, a strong foundation of related activities exists. Common strengths identified on the flipcharts included:

- **Existing Infrastructure:** Widespread presence of innovation hubs, entrepreneurship centers, and technology transfer offices.
- **Community & Industry Links:** Strong traditions of community outreach, extension services, and student attachment to industry programs.
- **Research & Curriculum:** Established applied research programs, familiarity with CGIAR projects, and, in some cases, modules on entrepreneurship already embedded in other courses.

Gaps:

Despite these strengths, participants identified a clear and universal set of gaps:

- **Formal Curricula:** The most prominent gap was the lack of a specific course on scaling. Existing efforts were described as fragmented and not systematic.
- **Expertise and Capacity:** A frequently cited need for capacity building, noting a lack of faculty expertise in scaling.
- **Institutional Support:** A lack of scaling policies or governance systems at the institutional level, coupled with insufficient funding and infrastructure for scaling activities.

Key Insight: The most powerful insight from this session was the collective realization that many institutions are already doing parts of scaling; they just have not been calling it that. This affirmed that the network would not be starting from scratch but would instead organize, formalize, and build upon a foundation of existing, uncoordinated activities.

2. Presentation: Strategic Rationale, Principles, and Budget (Nora)

Following the capacity mapping, Nora (Facilitator) presented the strategic vision for the network, grounding the afternoon's co-design work in a set of core principles and transparent budget realities.

Guiding Principles for the Network:

Nora outlined four principles that must guide the network's formation:

- I. **Co-Creation:** The network's outputs (like curricula) will not be transferred from CGIAR to partners. They must be co-created with the universities to ensure relevance and ownership.
- II. **Coalition of the Willing:** The goal is depth over breadth. Nora emphasized that a successful network with only four highly committed universities is preferable to a shallow network of 100. Engagement requires significant time and resources from both sides.
- III. **Transfer of Ownership:** The long-term goal is for the network to be autonomous and partner-led, not permanently run by CGIAR.

- IV. Recognizing Different Capacities:** The network must be flexible and realistic, acknowledging the vast differences in infrastructure, staff capacity, and resources (e.g., "some universities, every student comes with a laptop, and others, students fight over 10 computers").

Budget Realities (A Crucial Cards on the Table Moment):

Nora was explicit about the financial context. She clarified that the S4I program has a limited budget.

- There are no large grants for universities to implement scaling.
- The budget covers CGIAR staff time, some travel, and maybe one workshop.
- This limitation means the network must be creative, relying on in-kind contributions (like staff time or hosting) and co-funding arrangements (e.g., pairing with bilateral projects).

Key Insights from Plenary Discussion:

The Q&A session raised critical strategic questions:

- **On Governance & Legal Status:** A participant asked about the network's legal status for joint fundraising. Nora clarified that the network would, at least initially, operate under the **existing governance of the CGIAR S4I Program**. For joint proposals, a lead university or CGIAR Center would likely host the funds, as a new, formal legal entity is not planned.
- **On Networks vs. Working Groups:** A key strategic question was raised: is this a permanent, long-term "network" or an "output-specific working group" (e.g., to build a curriculum)? Nora noted this was a central question for the afternoon, as the answer would determine the required governance.
- **On Governance:** Nora parked the detailed governance discussion, stating that function should follow form. The network's vision (the next exercise) must be defined *before* its structure can be.

3.3. Presentation: The Scaling Champions Model (Nina & George)

Following the strategic framing, **Nina Nohayi (IWMI)** and **George Mahuku (IITA)** co-presented a successful, field-tested engagement model, the Scaling Champions, as a potential pathway for the network.

The Problem:

Nina opened by diagnosing a core problem identified by a scoping study:

- Many innovations are stuck between pilots and policy.
- Universities are under-leveraged and not seen as key system actors in scaling.
- The landscape is fragmented, with weak coordination, resource gaps, and insufficient capacity.
- Crucially, even a perfect innovation will fail without political buy-in.

The Solution: The Scaling Champions Guideline

The Scaling Champions model emerged as a solution. These are not new people, but existing, influential individuals and institutions.

The goal is to provide these champions with a supportive, enabling environment. George explained that instead of creating a rigid framework, they co-created a practical guideline with partners (including RUFORUM, representing universities). This guideline helps to:

- Identify champions based on key qualities (e.g., influential, trusted, good communicator, persistent, reliable, flexible).
- Provide an enabling environment for them through training, networking, and peer-to-peer mentoring.
- Connect champions who are often working in silos, leveraging networks to amplify their work.

The Ask for the Universities:

Nina concluded with a direct "ask" for the university partners. The Scaling Champions guideline is a living document that needs to be tested and validated by universities. The vision is for the universities in the South-South network to:

- **Integrate** the guideline's concepts into their curricula (e.g., short courses, modules).
- **Encourage** students to use the champion characteristics as themes for their thesis and research projects.
- **Help co-create** and refine the guideline, ensuring it is adapted locally.

Key Insights from Plenary Discussion:

The Q&A session was vital for positioning this model within the university context:

- **Suggestion for Scaling Labs:** One participant suggested an alternative model of Science Scaling Professional Development Labs hosted by professors. This would create a global network of academic labs, rather than focusing on champions like government officials who may lack a research agenda.
- **Clarifying the Model's Origin:** Nina clarified that the Scaling Champions model originated to help *extension services* get existing innovations to farmers; it was not initially a university research model. However, the *purpose of this workshop* was to co-create ways to bridge that gap and integrate these practical scaling needs *into* the university curriculum.
- **Affirmation from Universities:** Another participant from Uganda strongly affirmed this, noting their university had just established new programs for extension agents. These programs are a perfect home for a scaling course, which they currently lack, demonstrating a clear and immediate opportunity for integrating the network's outputs.

3.4. Group Exercise 2: Defining the Network's Value (Dotmocracy)


This exercise used a Dotmocracy (dot-voting) method to have participants first brainstorm all potential values the network could offer, and then prioritize them as a group. Participants wrote ideas on sticky notes, clustered them, and then voted for their top three priorities.

The Network's Mandate: The Winning Priorities. The results of the voting were definitive. The group's "winning ideas" established a clear, prioritized mandate for the network's core functions:

- **Implementable Curriculum Development:** (Highest number of votes) A co-created, modular curriculum for scaling and innovation that can be adapted and adopted by member universities.
- **Exchange of Faculty and Students:** A formal mobility program for peer-learning, mentorship, and collaborative research among South-South universities.
- **Knowledge Exchange Platform:** A shared digital and in-person platform for resources, localized case studies, and best practices.
- **Research and Publication Collaboration:** Creating a formal structure to support joint publications and collaborative research.

Key Strategic Insights from the Discussion: The discussion during and after the voting revealed critical insights and strategic considerations for the network's design:

- **Distinguishing Network Value from End-User Value:** A discussion around a Learning Model post-it clarified two types of value. The first is an academic platform for faculty and student exchange. The second is an *end-user* platform that delivers professional courses directly to farmers or the public. It was noted that CGIAR is already working on such digital toolboxes, and the network's role would be to integrate its knowledge into those, rather than build a redundant system.
- **The Value to Members vs. Value to Stakeholders Gap:** A critical observation was raised that the voting results were heavily focused on the network's value to its own members (e.g., curriculum, collaboration, exchange). What was less represented was the value proposition for external stakeholders, such as national governments or university leadership as institutions. The facilitator acknowledged this was a product of the question being posed to the university partners in the room, and that articulating this external value is a critical next step.

- 
- **Focusing on Scaling for Impact:** Another key point was that universities are *already* doing research, partnerships, and curriculum development. The network's unique value, it was argued, must be to ensure these activities are directly linked to scaling science for impact. The gap is not collaboration in general, but collaboration *on scaling*. The facilitator noted that the winning idea of an implementable curriculum is the most direct way to fill this specific gap.
 - **Building on What Exists:** The most powerful insight from the brainstorming was the collective realization that many institutions are already doing parts of scaling; they just have not been calling it that. This affirmed that the network would not be starting from scratch but would instead organize, formalize, and build upon a foundation of existing, uncoordinated activities.

4. Co-Designing the Network: Vision and Commitment

The final co-design block focused on the long-term vision and the immediate, practical realities of commitment.

1. Group Exercise 3: Vision 2028 and Network Naming

Participants were asked to envision a thriving network in the year 2028. The exercise was framed with a specific, forward-looking prompt: "It's 2028. The network is thriving... What are the universities doing that they are not doing right now?" This pushed participants to define concrete, transformational changes.

Shared Vision for 2028: The groups' visions converged on a future where the network is a fully autonomous, Southern-led, and globally recognized body. In this 2028 vision, universities are performing new and enhanced functions. The summary below is synthesized from the group presentations and the clarifying discussion that followed.

- **Institutional Transformation & Strategic Focus:** Universities have undergone a fundamental internal shift. They have strengthened internal strategies and systems for scaling, and their focus has shifted from piloting to scaling research and innovations. This includes a transformation away from traditional methodologies and a reduction in competition in favor of enhanced co-creation.
- **Balancing Research and Teaching:** A key transformation envisioned by one group was achieving a balance of funding time allocated to teaching as adequate as to how much time is dedicated to research. The subsequent discussion revealed this as a critical, nuanced issue. Participants from African Universities noted that the current balance is heavily tipped towards teaching, and the network is needed to help them move from this comfort zone toward more research and scaling. Conversely, partners from Asia (Bangladesh, Nepal) reported their institutions already have strong incentives and rewards for research, suggesting the network can serve as a platform for sharing successful models to correct this imbalance where it exists.
- **Formalized Education & Capacity Building:** Scaling is formally mainstreamed into university curricula. This is not just theoretical but practical, with universities offering new short courses, modules, and potential long courses on scaling. This new academic focus is supported by summer schools for early-career researchers and the emergence of student-led mini clubs or hubs dedicated to scaling science.
- **Systematic Collaboration & Knowledge Exchange:** The network has institutionalized collaboration. It actively facilitates academic exchange and mobility specifically for scaling science. This moves beyond simple networking to include collaborative research and publications (e.g., comparative studies) and collaborative learning hubs for lecturers to share experiences. This allows members to leverage each other's comparative advantages for new ideas and scaling.
- **Tangible Impact and Sustainability:** The network is sustainable, and its impact is measurable. It has a dedicated financial research mobilization arm that has successfully raised millions of dollars. Universities are mainstreaming extension programs and have strengthened national extension systems. This translates research into impact, demonstrated by an increase in innovations, a growing number of end-users, more published papers, and robust partnerships with the private sector.

2. Group Exercise 4: The Commitment Spectrum

This crucial final exercise provided a vital reality check, moving from vision to the practicalities of institutional support. Participants (university partners) were asked to physically place themselves on a continuum from Very Low Institutional Commitment to Very High Institutional Commitment.

The facilitator then tested this commitment by asking a series of specific questions to gauge what resources institutions would realistically provide.

Probing Institutional Commitment (The Ask):

1. **Direct Financial Commitment (Unfunded):** When asked about committing institutional money, the consensus was that this was highly unlikely.
2. **Infrastructure (In-Kind):** When asked about committing infrastructure (e.g., to host workshops), the group moved positively, indicating this was a high possibility.

- 3. Co-Funding Model (Financial):** When asked if institutions would commit to a 50/50 co-funding model (e.g., CGIAR pays 50% for a researcher to travel), the response was a decisive and collective Yes.
- 4. Staff Time (In-Kind):** When asked to commit two weeks of a senior staff member's time per year, the response was unanimous, even if it was on top of their current job description.
- 5. Data Sharing:** When asked about sharing research data with the network, the response was surprisingly high, even from private university representatives.

Gauging Individual Commitment:

In sharp contrast, when participants were asked to place themselves on the spectrum for their individual commitment and positive feelings towards the network, the response was an immediate, unanimous, and enthusiastic move to the high end of the spectrum.

Key Insight:

This exercise dramatically revealed the network's primary bottleneck and, simultaneously, its solution. The champion-to-institution gap is real: individual passion is high, but institutional commitment to vague, unfunded mandates is low.

5. Key Takeaways and The Way Forward

1. Key Workshop Takeaways

The workshop concluded with a synthesis of the day's discussions, crystallizing into four main takeaways:

- **Scaling is a Formal Discipline:** The workshop established a consensus that scaling is not an ad-hoc activity or an afterthought but a formal discipline with its own science, frameworks (like Scaling Readiness), and principles (like Responsible Scaling).
- **A Clear, Actionable Gap Exists:** The primary, universal need identified by all participating universities is the development of a formal, implementable curriculum for scaling science.
- **The "Champion Bottleneck" is the Main Hurdle:** The day's most critical insight was the disparity between high individual passion and low or variable institutional commitment. The network's first strategic challenge is to bridge this gap by empowering its champions to secure a formal mandate and resources from their university leadership.
- **Co-Creation is the Only Path Forward:** The network must be built by its members, not for them. The principles of co-creation, shared ownership, and South-South leadership must guide all future activities, from curriculum design to governance.

2. Agreed Next Steps

Based on the insights from the Commitment Spectrum exercise, the following immediate next steps were agreed upon by the participants and facilitators.

- **Refine Concept Note & One-Pager:** The CGIAR facilitation team will refine the network's vision, value proposition, and concept note based on the rich feedback from the workshop's co-design sessions. This document will serve as the primary tool for internal advocacy.
- **Circulate a Formal Expression of Interest (EOI):** To directly address the champion-to-institution gap, the refined concept note will be accompanied by a formal EOI. This EOI will be circulated by the CGIAR conveners to the university leadership (Deans, Vice-Chancellors) of participating institutions. This step is designed to secure high-level, formal institutional buy-in and move beyond individual-level enthusiasm.
- **Activate Low-Hanging Fruit Channels:** To maintain the momentum and high energy from the workshop, several immediate communication actions will be taken:
 - Share the participant list (with consent) to facilitate direct networking.
 - Connect all participants to existing S4I communication platforms (e.g., LinkedIn group, mailing list) to begin knowledge exchange.
 - Circulate the call for papers for the *Agricultural Systems* special issue on Responsible Scaling to encourage early collaboration.

Appendices

Appendix A: Workshop Participants and Expectations

The following table details the participants who introduced themselves during the opening session, including their institutions and their primary expectations for the network.

Name	Institution	Location	Email	Expectation / Key Statement
Ngowenani "Nina" Nohayi	International Water Management Institute (IWMI)	South Africa	n.nohayi@cgiar.org	<i>(Facilitator)</i>
Mohammad Alam	Bangladesh Agricultural University	Bangladesh	mjahangir.alam@bau.edu.bd	To strengthen collaboration and address the unmet potential among South-South universities.
David Spielman	International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)	Washington, D.C.		To see the start of new conversations around South-South cooperation, noting it's "really important to keep our networks alive."
Fouzia Mannan	University of East-West	Bangladesh	fouzia@ewubd.edu	Excited by the South-South focus (vs. typical North-South) and expects it will open new frontiers for knowledge production and national university collaboration.
Daniel Nigussie	University of Gonder	Ethiopia	any_266@yahoo.com	To build good collaboration and partnership with other universities and research institutes in the South-South region.
Kouadio Kouakou Parfait	Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly	Côte d'Ivoire	parfait.kouadio@upgc.edu.ci	To find innovations and share them, moving from the lab to the field.
Ebenezer Ngissah	University of the Netherlands / ILRI	Nairobi, Kenya	Ebenezer.ngissah@wur.nl	Hopes this is the beginning of seeing formal Master's and Bachelor's programs in scaling across African universities.
Sokona Dagnoko	RUFORUM	Uganda (from Mali)	s.dagnoko@ruforum.org	To have universities' capacities built in terms of teaching and applying scaling at the universities.
Eva Zulu Kangwa	University of Lusaka	Zambia	ekangwa@unilus.ac.zm	Hopes the network enhances collaboration, specifically co-developing short courses on scaling and joint applied research.
Blessing Adanta Odogwu	University of Port Harcourt	Nigeria	blessing.odogwu@uniport.edu.ng	To strengthen the network for collaboration, and is curious to know how we can improve our curriculum at the university level.
Sumitra Casey	IWMI	Nepal		To explore how CGIAR centres and universities can come together to use the knowledge...

				to bring the real impact on the ground.
Nasser Yao	BKU / CAPTCHA	(Rep. North Africa)	n.yao@cgiar.org	Hopes for something on the ground, and believes in the network to make the thing happen, and get innovations to the end user.
Esther Kihoro	ILRI	Nairobi, Kenya	e.kihoro@cgiar.org	To build the network and have tangible structures on how to better collaborate, both on the science of scaling and the practice of scaling.
Shakanye S. Ndjadi	University of Evangelique, Africa (UEA)	D.R. Congo	ndjadishakanye@gmail.com	To explore the potential of South-South collaboration to enhance our engagement in research and development in higher education.
Edwin Kang'ethe	CGIAR (ILRI)	Nairobi, Kenya	e.kangethe@cgiar.org	To learn what universities do around scaling and innovation, and see how... we can do together.
Lionel Nyabongo	ILRI	Burundi	l.nyabongo@cgiar.org	To connect with the university network and build a clear pathway for achieving our goal.
Chhengven Chhoem	Royal University of Agriculture (RUA)	Cambodia	cchhengven@rua.edu.kh	To learn... about scaling and how the network of universities, South-to-South, is working, and apply it at his university.
David Mkwambisi	Malawi University of Science and Technology (MUST)	Malawi	dmkwambisi@must.ac.mw	To see how we can conceptualize the governance of the network, and put a model to localize the network.
George Mahuku	International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA)	Uganda	g.mahuku@cgiar.org	To network and create impact on the ground by ensuring innovations reach the people they are intended for.
Bhesh Raj Thapa	Pokhara University	Nepal	bthapa.ioe@gmail.com	To network and learn what kind of scaling type of courses universities are running, and what topics can be integrated into the curriculum.

8.2. Appendix B: Workshop Presentations

All presentations delivered during the workshop are available for review. The presentations can be accessed via the following shared link: [South - South Collaboration Workshop Materials](#)



Hanke-Louw, Nora, n.hanke-louw@cgiar.org

CGIAR is a global research partnership for a food-secure future. CGIAR science is dedicated to transforming food, land, and water systems in a climate crisis. Its research is carried out by 13 CGIAR Centers/Alliances in close collaboration with hundreds of partners, including national and regional research institutes, civil society organizations, academia, development organizations and the private sector. www.cgiar.org

We would like to thank all funders who support this research through their contributions to the CGIAR Trust Fund: www.cgiar.org/funders.

To learn more about this program, please visit [Scaling for Impact | CGIAR System](#)

To learn more about this and other programs in the CGIAR Research Portfolio, please visit <https://www.cgiar.org/cgiar-research-portfolio-2025-2030/>

