

MEETING REPORT:



Expert Consultation on Seed System Security

12-13 December 2013

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Table of Contents

ACRONYMS.....	3
INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	4
<i>Background</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Structure and Agenda</i>	<i>4</i>
SEED SECURITY CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK (SEGMENT 1).....	5
SEED ASSESSMENT(SEGMENT 2).....	6
<i>Lessons Learned: Methodology/Uptake</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Lessons learnt and systematic review.....</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Group Work (See Annex 5 for full response).....</i>	<i>9</i>
COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE: CASE STUDIES (SEGMENT 3).....	10
<i>CoP Discussion</i>	<i>10</i>
ECHO PROJECT (SEGMENT 4)	11
WRAP UP.....	12
ANNEX 1: WORKSHOP EXPECTATIONS.....	13
ANNEX 2: MEETING CONCEPT AND AGENDA.....	14
ANNEX 3: AGENDA	15
ANNEX 4: DRAFT TORS FOR GLOBAL TECHNICAL STEERING GROUP	17
1. <i>Background:</i>	<i>17</i>
2. <i>Responsibilities, membership and key roles:</i>	<i>17</i>
3. <i>Leadership and meetings:.....</i>	<i>17</i>
ANNEX 5 - GROUP WORK: DAY 1.....	19
ANNEX 6 - GROUP WORK: DAY 2.....	21

ACRONYMS

CF	Conceptual Framework
CFSAM	Crop and Food Supply Assessment Mission
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CIAT	International Centre for Tropical Agriculture
CoP	Community of Practice
CRS	Catholic Relief Services
DEV	School of International Development
ECHO	European Community Humanitarian Office
EMA	Eco Mark Africa
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
OFDA	Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance
PABRA	Pan-Africa Bean Research Alliance
SS	Seed Security
SSA	Seed Security Assessment
SSCF	Seed Security Conceptual Framework
SSSA	Seed System Security Assessment
SV&F	Seed Vouchers and Fairs
TSG	Termination <i>Seed</i> Growth
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

**MEETING REPORT:
Expert Consultation on Seed System Security
12-13 December 2013**

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Background

1. This report summarizes the outcomes of the Expert Consultation on Seed System Security held at Addis Ababa, Ethiopia in December 2013.
2. The Seed System Security Assessment (SSSA) tool was developed by the International Centre for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT), the Catholic Relief Services (CRS) and other seed aid practitioners, and went through several iterations of use and modifications before it was published by CIAT in August 2008. A meeting was held in November 2012 in Rome where the primary output was the Seed Security Conceptual Framework (SSCF). It was then decided to have a second meeting to include representatives from other organizations and agencies in order to achieve wider consensus. In an effort to achieve funding for this initiative, the ECHO (European Community Humanitarian Office) project will aid in:

Building capacity for better food security programming in emergency and rehabilitation contexts through better seed assessment, better integration of nutrition and food security and improved accountability to affected populations.

Structure and Agenda

3. The workshop was organized in four segments as follows:
 - (Segment 1). Seed Security Conceptual Framework
 - (Segment 2). Seed Assessment Lessons Learned: Methodology and Uptake
 - (Segment 3). Community of Practice: Case studies
 - (Segment 4). ECHO Project
4. Neil Marsland from FAO opened with an introduction about Seed System Security. In recent years, increased focus has been on seed systems, with the original Seed Security Conceptual Framework developed in 1990's. Recently, the Seed Security workshop took place in Rome in November 2012 and focused on mainstreaming Seed Security Assessment (SSA). The workshop examined ways to move forward, by revising the Seed System Conceptual Framework, conducting meta-analysis of assessments, examining and cataloguing methods/uptake, strengthening the Community of Practice (CoP), and developing/updating the assessment toolkit.
5. There were three main issues: Integration of seed assessment into on-going assessment processes, the development/refinement of rapid methods for different contexts and increased transparency in analysis. A concept note was then prepared with an eye on funding.
6. The end result was the support of the ECHO Project, a project with USD 2 million in funding with the specific intent of improving seed security. The funding will last from September 2013 until December 2014 and will be a Global Project with regional focus: Sahel (Burkina Faso, Chad, Mali, Niger); Horn of Africa (Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, South Sudan).

7. Neil presented the objectives of Seed System Security, objectives which have been discussed and agreed upon over the course of 2013:
 - Reach consensus on a revised Conceptual Framework for Seed System Security;
 - Build blocks/key ingredients for Seed Security Assessment tools/guidance
 - Launch a global community of practice in SSA linking and supporting existing platforms
8. James Obata, the Meeting Facilitator, then went through the workshop norms, administration and timetable. The full schedule meant that the workshop must adhere to a strict timetable if all agenda items were to be achieved. Unresolved items could be “parked” for later discussion.
9. Neil then briefly paused the workshop to have the participants write down expectations for the workshop (Annex 1).

SEED SECURITY CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK (SEGMENT 1)

10. Tom Remington and Tom Osborn then gave a presentation on the History of the Seed Security Conceptual Framework (SSCF). They gave a background to the SSCF, describing the reliance on the formal seed sector to achieve disaster recovery for the agriculture sector. They explained how the dependence on external input had become a revolving “treadmill” in which the cycle of seed co-dependence continuously repeated. In 1998, the SSCF sought to break this cycle by increasing availability, access and utilization of quality seeds. Proper availability would provide adequate supplies, proper access would decrease need for off-farm purchases and proper utilization would mean that preferred varieties would be made available on the local market.
11. **Main message:** There is a need to more effectively link assessment with analysis, interpretation, action and learning. The Conceptual Framework should be the heart of the SSSA making it easier for people to understand.
12. Their presentation then focused on the five main indicators of the SSCF:
 1. Availability
 2. Access
 3. Seed Quality
 4. Varietal Suitability
 5. Resilience
13. They gave support regarding the first four categories, and went into further detail about resilience from examples from an article by McGuire & Sperling, 2013. They addressed the six main characteristics of resilience:
 1. Productivity
 2. Stability
 3. Diversity
 4. Agency
 5. Equity
 6. Sustainability
14. After the presentation on the SSCF, there was a lengthy discussion in plenary about the Conceptual Framework (CF). The discussion included many points on seed resilience and how it must be an integral element of the SSCF. The consensus was that seed resilience covers a multitude of definitions, from resistance to mold and pests to resistance to market price fluctuations.

15. Two main points were agreed upon:

1. **Is “Resilience” a separate pillar or cross cutting?** There was a virtual consensus, with 19 out of 20 attendees voting that Resilience was a cross-cutting quality.
2. **Should Seed quality and Varietal quality be maintained as separate element?** Consensus of the attendees: maintain these as two separate elements of the CF.

SEED ASSESSMENT(SEGMENT 2)

Lessons Learned: Methodology/Uptake

What can we glean from existing methods in terms of methodology and uptake?

16. Louise Sperling, representing CIAT, discussed Seed System Security Assessment (SSSA). Louise began with a background on SSSA and how the seedsystem.org website is addressing some of the issues. She began by explaining the background of SSSA, how it is not JUST calculating seed needs, but how it means looking at the function of seed systems and assessing if there is a problem. The problem is then matched to a response, while differentiating between acute problems and chronic problems, while determining if there are developmental opportunities.
17. She presented the 7 Main Issues:
 - What should be the focus of SSSA?
 - What does “rapid seed assessment” mean?
 - Tool type and Scale
 - Tool type and User
 - Evidenced based – how to truly achieve SSSA
 - Programming capacity building has trade-offs: what are they?
 - Assessment findings must be linked to specific responses
18. **Focus of SSSA:** Care should be taken to limit the focus as purely humanitarian, as this approach cannot cover the most acute stress areas since there are many chronic stresses and it is very cost ineffective.
19. **Definition: Rapid Seed Assessment:** A common notion exists that a field assessment can be done in just 3-5 days. While assessment can be done within such a timeframe, the following items must be taken into consideration: Training, Fieldwork (actual data collection), Full data analysis and creation of an Action Plan. This generally translates to 4-5 days by site/region. For example, in Timor Leste, the start date was 7 October and the Public Report back was 25 October.
20. **Tool type and Scale:** Tool type used will greatly differ by scale. That which is used to cover a zone or region can go much more in depth and be more comprehensive across countries, e.g. in the Sahel/Horn of Africa we must look at regional flows.
21. **Tool type and User:** What NGO field staff can do differs from what NGO program managers can do and what seed system experts can do. In all cases, be careful to avoid the overly “simplistic”.
22. **Evidenced based – how to truly achieve SSSA:** Be sure to include the following types of investigation: Background information analysis, Key informant interviews, Focus group discussions, Farmer interviews, Seed/grain market analysis. Keep in mind that new software automates data analysis, generating instant result tables.
23. **Programming capacity building has trade-offs:** Assessments by ‘experts’ are quicker, as are assessments which are extractive (like NPA), but capacity-building

assessments may have longer-term benefits. Users who understand seed systems and consider diverse response options tend to make smarter decisions.

24. **Assessment findings linked to responses:** One of the weakest parts in the SSSA chain is the action plan. Specific written guidance on constraint-action links will be critical for moving this field forward.

25. AIMS of SSSA Process

- Evidence-based data (robust)
- Concrete action plans (huge gap in some)
- Tools appropriate for diverse scales
- Tools geared to different users
- Rapid 'informative' vs. rapid 'simplistic'
- If possible, factor in capacity building
- Durable results

26. **Main Message:** vulnerable farmers deserve durable results. NGO managers are to be selected to carry out implementation, and there should be a move towards more e-learning for trainers of trainers.

27. Tom Osborne and Steve Walsh, representing CRS, then presented their lessons learned via the CRS experience. The goal: to guide the analysis towards the interest of the farmers. The linkage between assessment and action is the area of response analysis; the assessment must be sufficient. If not, other tools must be found to ensure a rational informed decision; ideally a set of guidance plans for action.

28. Some of the findings:

- Farmers source seed from saved, social networks and from local market
- Quality seed of preferred varieties available; the problem is access
- Farmer seed systems and markets continue to function following disasters

29. The 5 main steps in the SSA Process

- Design
- Field Survey
- Entry and Analysis
- Interpretation
- Reporting

30. Some of the design challenges included:

- Create 'ready to fill in template' (easy-to-use)
- Combine SSA with Emergency Livelihood & Food Security Assessments
- Survey design assigned to M&E team

31. The survey challenges were:

- Survey managed by M&E team, often with limited understanding of SSSA
- Tendency of the M&E team to delegate survey work to enumerators
- Preference for focus groups rather than individual interviews

32. The data entry and analysis challenges were:

- Full responsibility of M&E team
- Tendency to trust data done by M&E team

33. Interpreting the data challenges were:

- A low 'seed security' understanding

- Temptation to connect the data to the preferred action
 - Often requires external facilitation
34. Reporting challenges
- Reports often not done (reports mentioned but cannot be located)
 - Belief that reports need to be written by a native English speaker
 - Temptation to hire a consultant
35. Key recommendations:
- Simple and focused approach speeds up analysis & interpretation.
 - Possible loss of focus when integrating seed security assessment with Food & Livelihood Security Assessments
 - Critical to distinguish between Cereal + Grain Legume – RTBs - Vegetable Seed Systems.
 - Ensure effective facilitation support
36. Making SSAs more effective:
- Use the SSCF as the foundation for assessment
 - Train staff in seed systems, seed security and seed assessment
 - Start with a simple set of assessment principles
 - Adapt the design for specific situations
 - Commit to assessment sharing and archiving
37. There is potentially some fruitful discussion between the experiences of CIAT and CRS. Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards (LEGS) is a guideline that can be useful to help write good proposals; for the seed sector, there should be the same quality tool.
38. **Main Message:** The win-win situation would be the capacity building of the right people coupled with an ability to combine all relevant experiences. Concentrating on the training of trainers seems to be the way to move forward.
39. Joseph Okidi presented the FAO experience in South Sudan and focused on the lessons learned from South Sudan, with the following objectives:
- Better understanding of seed system before and after the crisis
 - Strengthen national and humanitarian capacity in SSA
 - Define appropriate interventions
40. Assessments were done in collaboration with partners in the following countries: South Sudan (2010), Sudan – Darfur (2012), Senegal (2012), Niger (2012) and Ivory Coast (2012). Methods included: Review of existing information, Key informant interviews, Household surveys, Focus group discussions, Data analysis, Reporting and write-up and Dissemination and utilization.
41. Some of the key lessons were the Team approach, where involvement of partners created capacity building and ownership. A rapid approach in data collection was applied, providing quicker data turnaround. Making the information available to practitioner for action meant in greater accountability. As a result, the resilience of farmer seed system was well appreciated. We must be careful of an abrupt change in direction without adequate communication, and as we continue to see, training and follow-up application are crucial. Conclusions: proper promotion of these programmes is key, regular and rapid assessment is necessary, and there we should integrate with other country level assessments (IA, PDM).
42. **Main Message:** We should help farmers become more resilient – supporting them for up to 2 to 3 years – while making their seed production sustainable for the future.

Lessons learnt and systematic review

43. We should understand if there is any relationship between hazard, assessment and intervention. Dialogue should be held with policy makers and donors to ensure we target the proper resources for these assessments. We must keep in mind that institutional seed aid can be changed through the actions of entities such as FAO.
44. Recently there have been great strides in seed security. On the assessment side there is the inclusion of the informal sector, as well as the integrated sector. To note: the informal sector worldwide provides 89% of seeds. FAO should have a primary role in this, but should also be sure to include information from all allies. How can we speed up the process? Assessment must be published regularly, with rigorous parameters. Strategic interventions should be mapped showing behavioural change.
45. Issue: How do we get the evidence base in the right hands? Many farmers and entities do not use the assessments in the proposal. We must do a better job in promoting our assessments. We should also document successes and inform others about those successes. We should share lessons learnt to all those who provide funding.

Group Work (See Annex 5 for full response)

46. The plenary was then split into three groups focused on answering the following questions:
 1. What are the lessons we've learned with regards to assessment in terms of the choice of ***indicators***?
 2. What are the lessons we've learned with regards to assessment in terms of the choice of ***methodology***?
 3. How can we insure uptake of the results of the assessment made by decision-makers?

(Answers should be contextually specific)
47. **Group 1- Indicators:** How do we define SSS and are the concepts of gender, resilience and nutrition are built in it? We could be using a lens for these concepts, another reason why we are revisiting the traditional definition of SSS. Indicators must be flexible and sensitive to context and scope. A matrix would help, and – depending on the circumstances – we could include a limited number of indicators per element when time is limited (in the case of required rapid response). Since UNDP is working with the communities to define indicators, perhaps we should consider using a similar methodology.
48. **Group 2- Methodology:** Our methodology should be iterative, perhaps moving away from a single tool to a series of tools plus guidelines, to be used differently based on the different contexts and circumstances.
49. **Group 3 - Uptake by decision-makers:** We should promote information on informed consensus, as these decisions have implications for the entire population in question. We should create a list of what can the SSSA do for the ministries, e.g. stop waste of resources, provide a better understanding of current situation and possible solutions.

COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE: CASE STUDIES (SEGMENT 3)

How can we create a community of practice to help promote seed security?

50. Louise Sperling, representing CIAT, presented the website, seedsystem.org, as an example of community of practice with regards to SSSA. Specifically she covered the following:
- a) Assessment tools
 - b) Aid responsive advice
 - c) Field assessments and action plans
 - d) Research and policy resources
 - e) Events/Calendar Concept of Resilience
51. She described how the website has acted as central meeting point where documents can be uploaded, methodologies can be discussed and where knowledge can be shared.
52. Michela Paganini, representing FAO, presented ideas on a Community of Practice for Seed Security Assessment. Specifically she covered the following:
- Definition of a CoP
 - Examples of activities
 - Objective of a CoP
 - Proposal
 - Next steps
53. She described how the CoP can strengthen information management and knowledge exchange, enabling practitioners to learn from each other and hold on-line discussions.

CoP Discussion

54. One key question is the complementarity, i.e. our ability to work together as different agencies and entities. Collaboration is critical. One gap is the question of moderated discussion; there is a great potential for collaboration, as FAO has quite significant experience with e-discussions to cull more information.
55. With end-user input, one suggestion was to create a help desk to help novice users. 5-6 key suggestions from all major stakeholders would provide a better overall CoP.
56. We should extend the scope beyond the initial 8 countries. There is no shared workspace at present, as entities are currently working singularly. In the Philippines, the Food security cluster is providing a way of collaborating between the agencies. EMA is always considered a de facto standard, yet there isn't the same standard for SSA right now. While EMA is commodity-specific, if EMA works with SSA, this can create a positive synergy.
57. The private seed sector claims that "seed relief diverts from our customers". The private sector is not necessary our enemy, and involving SeedCo and Western Seed might prove useful.
58. We must remember that a voucher is a subsidy. We need to engage the private sector under the conceptual framework on the use of subsidies. We cannot ignore the private sector's involvement, as they will be present in virtually every location. Some issues: How do we have a CoP promote stories/case studies? How do we promote the lower profile stories, which may provide better insight than the higher profile stories? CoPs will allow everyone to have a voice. Done well, it becomes a democratic means of communicating, allowing even those "smaller" players to voice their opinions. But who do we include in the CoP? Including farmers can link them into this platform and

increase their involvement and personal investment. Other issues: who's going to monitor the CoP? And there needs to be an accountability mechanism engrained into the system. CoP allows us to provide broader coverage and CoP can be a way to share info and get feedback.

Group Work (see Annex 6 for full response)

59. The plenary was then split into two groups focused on answering the following questions:

- How and what would be our contribution to existing platforms as a project?
- What would be the purpose and membership of a Community of Practice for the project?

60. There should be two separate CoPs, one for the Sahel and one for the Horn of Africa.

61. The purpose of the CoP:

- Help members learn and improve their work
- Visibility and marketing tool
- Serve as a monitoring and reference function for the project
- Provide Help desk services

62. Membership should extend to Seed focused people, e.g. Community-based organizations. We should be an open-access group, adding people who are both engaged and interested. There should be a paid moderator to provide long term sustainability for the project

63. We should also link to other groups, and we should first learn about other cops so we can research some of the open source software on CoPs, including statistics in order to maximize engagement. We should only launch after a systematic review so that we can select the proper people.

64. It is important to carefully identify the members in terms of both technical expertise and know about institutional aspects. There should be regular communication (e.g. monthly call) giving advice on orientation of the project, share information to make sure there is no overlap and create synergies.

ECHO PROJECT (SEGMENT 4)

65. Neil then presented the ECHO project explaining how FAO has obtained funds from ECHO to implement a global project on building capacity for better food security. The overall objective of this project is to improve food and nutrition security of populations affected by and emerging from emergencies all over the world. The project includes three components: seeds assessment, nutrition and accountability. The seed component of the project will strengthen the capacity of humanitarian professionals to conduct high quality and accurate and accountable seed security assessments in emergency and rehabilitation situations.

66. A global level Technical Steering Group (TSG) will serve as part of the governance of the SSA component of the ECHO project. The TSG will comprise a group of knowledgeable and experienced experts capable of supporting the effective implementation of SSSAs in the field.

67. The role of the TSG will be to provide technical inputs and vetting of project products and services, principally training guidelines and SSSA assessments. Specifically the TSG will:

- Review and validate a revised Seed System Security conceptual framework
- Provide peer review on a meta-analysis of Seed Security assessments
- Develop and strengthen a global community of practice around SSA
- Review updated SSA guidelines and training materials
- Critique selected SSAs from the Horn of Africa and the Sahel during 2014

WRAP UP

68. Building on the blocks of the review, the next steps are the following:

- In spring, start the training (May at latest) before developing final material
- Foster the areas of interface identified during meeting, ideally involving other colleagues
- Next gathering: twice before the end of the year

ANNEX 1: WORKSHOP EXPECTATIONS

- Find a way to make SSA a common practice
- Contribute to mainstreaming seed security assessments
- Rapid and responsive SSA method
- Understand elements of all models and discuss what is crucial information to ensure we are thorough and transparent
- Share existing tools used by RSSA
- Define the critical timing for performing seed assessment in a crisis
- How SSA can contribute to address malnutrition causes in crises contexts
- Better integration and understanding of seed issues into food security and nutrition outcomes
- To get clear understanding of project activities and itinerary
- Identify key dates/activities/processes (and any roles) over the next 3-5 months
- Formulate concrete recommendations for next steps
- Listen and learn
- Learn about collaboration in ECHO project
- Share experience and reach a consensus
- Gather ideas on how to enhance collaboration

ANNEX 2: MEETING CONCEPT AND AGENDA

Introduction/Rationale

There has been significant progress over the past 15 years in shifting away from the direct distribution of seed that has been based on the unquestioned assumption that farmers affected by disaster were faced with a shortage of seed. Originally referred to as Seeds & Tools, Direct Seed Purchase and Distribution has been the accepted and preferred approach in agricultural recovery from disaster. However, Seed Aid evaluations starting with the response to the 1994 Rwanda war and genocide, increasingly questioned the assumption that there was a seed supply problem. The development of a Seed Security Conceptual Framework in the late nineties, helped shift the focus from seed availability to seed access and quality – a shift that highlighted the need for an explicit assessment of the target seed system and seed security. This led to the development and use of a Seed System Security Assessment (SSSA) tool by CIAT, as well as by CRS, FAO and other seed aid practitioner organizations. The SSSA tool went through several iterations of use and modification before being published by CIAT in August 2008. Over the past four years, this tool has been extensively used and further refined by users. There is a need to share the latest developments in the SSSA by various practitioners and determine the next steps to get the tool more widely used in FAO emergency operations, CRS, and national partners through National Food Security Clusters and with national authorities.

Objectives of the Workshop

1. Reach consensus on a revised Conceptual Framework for Seed System Security;
2. Build blocks/key ingredients for Seed Security Assessment tools/guidance
3. Launch a global community of practice in SSA linking and supporting existing platforms.

Venue and Date

The workshop took place in Addis Ababa, from 12-13 December 2013 for 1.5 days.

Meeting Participants

FAO

Joseph Okidi, FAO South Sudan
Neil Marsland, TCER
Tom Osborn, AGPMG
Sam Kugbei, AGPMG
Angela Kimani, FAOKE
Domitille Kauffmann, AGN
Michela Paganini, APGMG
Remi Nono-Womdim, AGPMG
Lucio Olivero, AGPMG
Roger Shongo, FAOSN
Adrian Cullis, FAOSFE

Catholic Relief Services (CRS)

Tom Remington
Steve Walsh

Others

Louise Sperling
Julie March, USAID

ANNEX 3: AGENDA
Expert Consultation on Seed System Security
 12-13 December 2013
 Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Day 1

ITEM		Resource Person(s)
08:30 – 09:00	REGISTRATION	
09:00 – 09:45	WELCOME <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introductions • Why are we here and how did we get here? • Workshop norms, admin and timetable • Expectations 	James, Neil
09.45 – 13.00	SEGMENT 1: Seed security Conceptual Framework	
09:45 – 10:30	History of Seed Security Conceptual Framework and presentation of revised Conceptual Framework	Tom O, Tom R
10:30 – 11:00	Discussion of Framework: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is Resilience a separate pillar or a cross cutting quality? 2. What are the elements of resilience in the Framework? 	James, Neil
11:00 – 11:15	COFFEE BREAK	
11:15 – 13:00	Discussion of Framework: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. What are the elements of resilience in the Framework?(continued) 3. Seed quality and varietal quality; seed quality indicators 4. What are the critical indicators for all the parameters in the Framework? <p>WRAP-UP What we agreed</p>	James, Neil
13:00 – 14:00	LUNCH BREAK	
14.00 – 18.00	SEGMENT 2: Seed Assessment: What can we glean from existing methods in terms of methodology and uptake?	
14.00 – 14.10	Introduction	Neil
14.10 – 14.50	CIAT experience	Louise
14.50 – 15.30	CRS experience	2 Toms
15.30 – 15.45	TEA BREAK	
15.45 – 16.15	FAO experience	Joseph, Lucio
16.15 – 16.45	Lessons learned from strategic review (so far) and agency interviews in Kenya and South Sudan	Steve, Tom R, Joseph
16.45 – 17.45	Group Work: What and How?	James and Neil
17:45 – 18:00	Wrap-up and conclusion	James

Day 2

ITEM		Resource Person(s)
8.45 – 9.00	Recap	James
9.00 – 9.30	Current community of practice structures / efforts: Strengths and challenges	Louise
9.30 – 10.00	ECHO project community of practice ideas	Michela, Neil
10.00 – 10.45	Group work: How to build on current efforts through the ECHO project	James, Neil
10.45 – 11.00	BREAK/REFRESHMENT	
11.00 – 11.30	ECHO project: What do we want from a governance structure for seed component?	Neil, Steve
11.30 – 12.00	What have we agreed and what are the next steps?	James, Neil
12:00 – 13:00	LUNCH BREAK AND DEPARTURE	
13:00 – 19:00	ECHO project planning (closed session)	

ANNEX 4: DRAFT TORS FOR GLOBAL TECHNICAL STEERING GROUP

for Seed Security Assessment in the Sahel and Horn of Africa.

1. Background:

FAO has obtained funds from ECHO to implement a global project on “*Building capacity for better food security programming in emergency and rehabilitation contexts through better seed security assessment, better integration of nutrition and food security and improved accountability to affected populations*”. The overall objective of this project, as defined in the project proposal, is “*to contribute to improving food and nutrition security of populations affected by and emerging from emergencies all over the world*”. The project includes three components, respectively, on seeds assessment, nutrition and accountability. The objective of the seed component of the project is to: *Strengthen the capacity of humanitarian professionals to conduct high quality and accurate and accountable seed security assessments in emergency and rehabilitation situations.*

The purpose of this document is specifically to clarify the governance mechanism for the implementation of the seed component. The project runs until 31 December 2014.

2 Responsibilities, membership and key roles:

As part of the governance of the SSA component of the ECHO project, it is intended to form a global level Technical Steering Group (TSG), The TSG will comprise a group of knowledgeable and experienced experts capable of supporting the effective implementation of SSSAs in the field,

The role of the TSG will be to provide technical inputs and vetting of project products and services, principally training guidelines and SSSA assessments. Specifically the TSG will:

- a) Review, critique and ultimately validate a revised Seed System Security conceptual framework.
- b) Provide peer review on the design and outputs of a meta analysis of completed and ongoing Seed Security assessments.
- c) Provide advice on how to develop and strengthen a global community of practice around SSA.
- d) Critically review updated SSA guidelines and training materials
- e) Critically review selected SSAs undertaken at country level in the Horn of Africa and the Sahel during 2014.

3 Leadership and meetings:

The TSG shall be chaired by FAO. FAO will organize regular Skype calls and also circulate key documents for comments to TWG members. FAO will also invite TSG members to key SSA events which are relevant for the project.

The TSG will consist of the following:

FAO....

CRS....

ECHO.....

CIAT.....

USAID.....

OTHER INGOS.....

TO BE COMPLETED

ANNEX 5 - GROUP WORK: DAY 1

Lessons Learned

1. What are the lessons we've learned with regards to assessment in terms of the choice of *indicators*?

- SMART: Simple, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound
- Indicators must relate to the specific context and be flexible
- Having guidelines on indicators
- Considerations (lenses): Gender equality, resilience, nutrition
- Revisit the definition of seed security
- Scope of indicator:

Acute/chronic

Development

- Linking the seed security indicator to food security
- Linkage an indicator and action/response
- Reliable source of data
- Specific about the scope of crops
- Clear linkage between the elements and indicators
- Having clear definition of parameters:

Availability

Access

Quality

Variety Suitability

2. What are the lessons we've learned with regards to assessment in terms of the choice of *methodology*?

- Data should be sufficient enough to develop a meaningful programme and no more
- Methodology speed should be determined by purpose
- Methodology determined by funds
- Rapid enough to respond to specific need
- To ensure ownership
- Assessment done in a respectful way

Take aways:

- What's the difference between rapid and detailed assessment?
- Give me the indicators
- Changes in:

Sourcing channels

Production

Price

Entitlements (e.g. ability to access seeds)

3. How can we insure uptake of the results of the assessment made by decision-makers?

- Direct communication of SSSA results and implications with government/high-level authorities (e.g. SS case)
- Having decision-makers take ownership of SSA process
- Donors having clear information on data collection, quality and analysis
- Scheduling public feedback sessions with donors and partners
- Linking politicians (e.g. government ministers) self-interest with an SSSA (ending the policy of free seed = more votes)
- Getting a community of practice among technical experts themselves
- Better uptake by decision makers, leverage the UN food security cluster platform to highlight seed security advances and coordinate efforts
- Consider coupling SS assessments in types of assessments donor (e.g. CSFAM + seed security)
- FAO should promote SSA at the normative level

Seed policy (2012)

Seed relief workshop (2004)

To do ->: National level support seed relief + SSSA guidelines (e.g. Ethiopia)

- For donors and gov't, packaging the results and implications

ANNEX 6 - GROUP WORK: DAY 2

Community of Practice (CoP)

1. How and what would be our contribution to existing platforms as a project?

- Sharing information
- Providing guidance and standards
- Generating interest, e.g. reaching out to NGOs
- Enhancing linkages
- Promoting informal dialogue
- Help desk
- Normative role among member states
- Value added would be:

Discussion forum

Focusing on 8 countries, helping coalesce a CoP within and between those countries

FAO with a convening role (e.g. for member states, governments, members at regional and country level)

2. What would be the purpose and membership of a Community of Practice for the project?

- Purpose:

Better FS programme via a better SSSA

In the beginning, split into two CoPs:

- Sahel
- Horn of Africa

Share ideas

- Solutions/problems
- Documents
- Visibility/marketing tools
- Referencing of project
- Help desk/advice/referral group

- Membership:

Community based orgs

National NGO's (seed focused)

Government (specify role)

International NGOs (seed focused)

Farmer organizations

Private seed company

Academic/research

- Issues:

Protocol/rules

Moderator

Paid staff/volunteer

Long term sustainability

Linking to other groups

Learning from other CoP experiences

Use open source software to manage our CoP