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SSACP – Background / Historical Overview

Phase 1:

1. SSACP originated from FARA as an idea / concept on integrated agricultural research for development (IAR4D)

2. Goals:
   - Poverty reduction
   - Increased food security
   - Environmental conservation
   - Wealth creation (increased incomes)

3. Proposal developed
4. Proposal extensively and intensively peer-evaluated

5. Proposal funded

6. Before implementation the funded proposal subjected / underwent through science council review (SCR)

7. SCR recommended ‘proof of concept’ of IAR4D as opposed to conventionally established research – extension – farmer linear approach
Phase II:

Concepts and proposals redrafted and restructured

8. Implementation reoriented to be based on regional pilot learning sites (PLS)

9. PLS were composed of two or more countries

10. Applied research based on simultaneous evaluations and implementation of rapidly adoptable innovations that could produce tangible results / outcomes
11. Applied research / innovations were on technology enhancing productivity, NRM and markets – managed as task forces & led by TFLs

12. Work was to exploit innovations by use of multi-stakeholder engagement and partnerships

13. Before introduction of appropriate interventions, baseline surveys were carried out
Current Regional Review Meeting of LKPLS

1. Since the baseline survey, implementation has been going on, which now requires internal and external review.

2. Each yr of implementation follows a country-based operational plan (OP).

3. Participatory developed and agreed upon by all stakeholders, led by TFLs.

4. With corresponding budgets and other resources.

5. 1st and foremost issue at this point in time is thus to:

- Review the status and progress of activities in the Year 2010 OP – Country / IP-based.
Status and progress of activities of OP – country IP-based

- Where we are – milestones and outcomes (knowledge, products)
- Are there planned activities not been implemented
- Why – what have been the bottlenecks
- Any actions taken to remove the bottlenecks
- Come up with a revised version of the OP - Prepare clear timetable to complete the remaining and uncompleted planned activities during remaining time
- Come up with tangible evidence of results and areas where to take reviewers
  - both internal and external reviewers
Review of Taskforce-based Outputs (Productivity, NRM & Markets)

Outputs were to reflect:

- Technological
- Knowledge
- Institutional
- Policy
- Market

innovations

- Where we are – planned milestones, outputs and outcomes
- Are there planned outputs not been realised
Review of Taskforce-based Outputs ...

- Why – what have been the bottlenecks
- Any actions taken to remove the bottlenecks
- Come up with a revised version of the task force based outputs - Prepare clear timetable to complete the remaining and uncompleted outputs during remaining time
- Come up with tangible evidence of results and areas where to take reviewers
  - both internal and external reviewers
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