MEETING REPORT:

WORKSHOP ON MAINSTREAMING SEED SECURITY ASSESSMENTS

22-23 November 2012
Rome, Italy

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Background

1. This report summarizes the outcomes of the Workshop on Mainstreaming Seed System Security Assessments held at FAO Headquarters, Rome in November 2012.

2. The Seed System Security Assessment (SSSA) tool was developed by the International Center 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. The SSSA tool has been extensively used and refined in the past four years. However, further adaption and improvement may be necessary in order to enhance its use by different practitioners in varying contexts and to create a stronger link between assessments, analysis, recommendations and actions. Furthermore, there is a need to share latest developments relating to the SSSA tool with various practitioners and in this way be able to determine next steps in making the tool more widely used by FAO emergency operations, CRS, various national partners, National Food Security Clusters and other interested parties.

Objectives of the Workshop

3. Annex 1 provides the meeting concept, agenda and the list of participants. Five specific objectives were established for the workshop:

    a) Share information on current SSSA tools, recent and planned modifications and approaches.

    b) Identify the strengths and weaknesses of different tools and the opportunities for improvement.

    c) Identify how to better link seed assessments to disaster response analysis on the one hand, and strengthening seed system resilience on the other.

    d) Discuss the draft SSSA guidelines and training materials, and how these could be improved.

    e) Conduct a joint presentation after the workshop for FAO staff as a means of creating awareness of the SSSA and discussing an action plan for mainstreaming the SSSA tool in the immediate and longer term.

Structure and Agenda

4. The workshop was organized in six segments as follows:

    a) <u>Setting the stage (Segment 1)</u>. The first segment provided perspectives through brief case studies and the broader perspective on the SSSA role in disaster response.

    b) <u>Assessment, issues (Segment 2)</u>. Participants then shared views on the full and rapid SSSA – current strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats and what issues need to be addressed in order to increase its relevance and contribution.

    c) <u>Discussion of topics/issues (Segments 3 and 4)</u>. The following sessions explored the issues and opportunities identified in Segment 2.

    d) <u>Synthesis and Next Steps (Segments 5 and 6)</u>. The final two segments comprised review, validation, summarization and planning of next steps.

5. The outcomes of these segments are reported in the sections that follow.

SETTING THE STAGE (SEGMENT 1)

Development Context for SSSA

6. The opening remarks were provided by Jeff Tschirley, Chief, Rehabilitation and Humanitarian Policies Unit, TCER. He began by outlining recent changes at FAO, in particular the decentralization of field operations and the greater integration between emergency and development support. He stressed that lives are at stake when planning an appropriate seed response, and the SSSA is an important tool in making good evaluations.

7. He stressed the importance of *resilience* as a useful concept in preparedness, which is a major focus in FAO's new Strategic Objective 5 ("*Increase the resilience of livelihoods to threats and crises")*. He acknowledged that the current baseline response involves too much direct seed distribution and that the shift towards cash, vouchers and seed fairs would provide a better approach.

8. He suggested that the participants should examine both cases of (1) the slow onset, protracted crisis versus (2) the rapid onset emergency. In the latter case, the seed assessment could make a valuable contribution to the *Multi-Cluster Initial Rapid Assessment* (MIRA) and urged the participants to examine how to get seed system assessment inputs more effectively into this planning Framework.

9. Additional comments were provided by Rodrigue Vinet, Senior Project Coordinator, Emergency Operations Service, TCEO. Disaster response decisions related to seeds were often "uncomfortable" due to the lack of data, whilst having a solid seed system assessment tool would unquestionably allow actions to be supported with greater confidence. There has been a clear trend in less 'in-kind' seed interventions and more interventions that promote seed access from local sources. The new guidance from FAO is the Cash Transfer Policy, which includes Input Trade Fairs and seed vouchers.

10. Finally, a brief presentation was provided by Neil Marsland, Senior Technical Officer TCER on the broader assessment context. He reported that in line with current practice at the inter-agency and cluster levels, there are four assessment phases:

   a) Phase I. The initial assessment within 72 hours after a disaster event, to correspond with the launch of a Flash Appeal;

   b) Phase II. Up to 1 month after a disaster event, to correspond with the revised Flash Appeal;

   c) Phase III. Up to 4 - 6 weeks after a disaster event, feeding into more detailed operational planning; and

   d) Phase IV. Recovery/transition phase (anything from 3 - 12 months after a disaster).

11. There may be opportunities for using seed system assessment indicators in various phases, bearing in mind that phases I and II involve relatively rapid assessments while more detailed seed assessments could be conducted during phases III or IV. Improving the quality of seed assessments within the ongoing assessment process is important and should reduce the reliance on anecdotal evidence and/or supply driven factors in emergency and rehabilitation seed interventions.

12. An introduction to the comprehensive Seed System Security Assessment methodology was presented by Philippe Le Coënt. This presentation summarized the methodology substantially as formulated by CIAT in 2008. Philippe concluded with three observations:

   a) Learning process. Implementing a seed system security assessment is a learning process that should lead to better seed interventions.

b) <u>Trade-off between quality and timeliness</u>. The comprehensive SSSA is adapted to the slow onset and chronic seed security situations. There is a need to explore an ideal assessment tool for situations of acute crisis where rapid assessment is necessary.

c) <u>Interpreting data and formulating recommendations</u>. Despite the methodological rigor, the analysis and interpretation of data needs to be an open and transparent process in which a strong linkage to the Seed Security Frameworks in terms of interpretation and the formulation of recommendations/actions is maintained.

Rapid Seed Assessment

13. A presentation of the Rapid Seed Assessment was provided by Tom Remington, CRS. He provided his views on the challenges associated with each key component of the assessment: knowledge, assessment, analysis, interpretation, and reporting and summarized his conclusions regarding the critical success factors, as follows:

a) Develop the approach and articulate the process.

b) Train interdisciplinary interagency teams.

c) Conduct training with field practice.

d) Carry out assessments and complete the cycle.

e) Maintain databases, share results and perform meta analyses.

f) Create political will/interest on the part of host governments, farming communities, donors and practitioners.

14. He also mentioned that the CRS has completed and begun using an e-Learning course on seed systems to promote a "levelling of awareness." The larger issue of capacity emerged as a key issue – whether an assessment could be successfully completed without specialized skills or by creating basic awareness.

STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES, OPPORTUNITIES, THREATS (SEGMENT 2)

15. The objective in Segment 2 was to exchange views on SSSA, its current strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats and then to reach an agreement on the specific questions to be addressed by the participants.

Approach

16. The review was conducted on both the full and the rapid assessment, following the process through each significant step (i.e., information collection, analysis, reporting, etc.). Efforts were made to address the overall context, including links with other tools. Finally, the review attempted to maintain a distinction between the tools and their manner of application.

17. A major criterion in the brief review was the ability of the assessments to provide accurate and valid conclusions. It was also noted that there could be scope for a hybrid assessment methodology or other tools. Finally, it was recognized that the review was inevitably to be subjective to some extent and that observations should be validated by *ex-post* or in-course evaluations.

Comparative Analysis and Identification of Issues

18. Observations from the discussion were recorded in a comparative table presented in Figure 1 at the top of the next page. This table, although cryptic, as transcribed from the actual flipcharts, helped the group to identify five major areas for further discussion:

a) Seed System Assessment Framework.

b) Concept of Resilience.

c) Identification of the Assessment Tools which need Strengthening.

d) Information Collection and Analysis.

e) Turning Analysis into Action.

19. The following sections look at each of these issue areas in turn.

Figure 1: High-Level Comparative Analysis

Criterion	Full SSSA	Rapid	Comments
Context and Linkages.	Development context, slow onset, baseline?	Humanitarian assistance/cluster approach, just after crisis, could be used for a baseline?	FAO needs a SSA that can be done rapidly with low cost at any time in the agriculture season.
Information collection.	Statistically valid data, wider area? Different organization in different areas, use of enumerators, more detailed information on the seed system/ seed trade.	Timely/quick, statistically valid data can be a problem, qualitative data, Localized data collection, expert doing the interviews. Disaggregation of data.	Depends on area to be covered, representative site? Need to develop/improve information tools? SWOT of information sources? Need for scaling up (GIS?).
Analysis.	Excel software, what does the data really say, need for transparent system, lack of indicators of seed insecure HH, lack of data on seed quality.	No fixed system of data analysis.	Use SSF as a framework, need to set up the info design correct to get the right analysis, how to improve data related to seed quality.
Analysis to Action.	Data is open to interpretation.	Need to refer back to SS Framework to standardize.	What is normal what is abnormal and why? Analysis good enough for making decisions. Action depends on context and objectives.
Verification.			Both of the data and the intervention. Transparency of data and analysis. Involve stakeholders including at community level.

DISCUSSION OF ISSUES (SEGMENTS 3 AND 4)

Seed System Assessment Framework

20. The Seed System Framework was first formulated 10 years ago and one fundamental motivation to review it is to examine how the overall context has changed in that time.

Specifically:

    a) <u>Evolving needs</u>. The Framework would benefit from a review to meet current needs and to include indicators and an additional parameter such as "resilience".

    b) <u>Flexibility</u>. The value of the SS Framework and SSSA is based on its strength and flexibility to be used in different contexts.

    c) <u>Roles and ownership</u>. The participants agreed that the Framework might be able to do more to strengthen a sense of ownership among key stakeholders by developing their capacity to undertake the SSSA and be more fully involved in data analysis and the development of recommendations, in addition to a need to ensure that the recommendations are implemented.

    d) <u>Building in "quality.</u>" The participants identified the issue of a "quality parameter" in the SS Framework and how to ensure that the SSSA delivers good quality analysis and recommendations. In addition to ensure that the SSSA is generating the desired outcomes and if not, why not?

Concept of Resilience

21. Within the last ten years, *resilience* has become a mainstream emergency and development concept in the lexicon of practitioners and donors and has recently taken on heightened importance. The concept may have broad applicability in the context of seed systems, but a full analysis of the conceptual and practical implications has not been undertaken. The participants agreed that resilience could be a useful basis of analysis in explaining seed systems, their sustainability under stress and acute shocks, and could provide a tighter linkage to an overall assessment context.

22. With regard to the question of assessment tools needing strengthening, the discussion focused again on context: was the assessment dealing with a baseline survey in an area of chronic stress or immediately following an emergency? In the former case, participants noted that the process of *monitoring over time* could be strengthened to improve the formulation of options, improve seed security and monitor resilience changes over time.

Information Collection and Analysis

23. Various points were raised on this topic:

    a) <u>Minimum standards for SSSA</u>. Is there scope for guidance in the Framework such as the Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards (LEGS) in the livestock sector? What else might we learn from LEGS?

    b) <u>Tools for data collection</u>. The discussion revolved around how to improve data collection and make it more streamlined, how to focus more on key indicators and include more information on the entire traditional seed system?

    c) <u>Role of enumerators</u>. Typically, enumerators collect data, then turn them over to others for entry and analysis. Would better results be achieved if enumerators did their own data entry and analysis; i.e., to catch obvious inconsistencies and generally have greater sense of ownership and participation in the assessment?

d) <u>Capacity and competencies for enumerators</u>. In any case, the collection and analysis process would benefit from better training and support for senior enumerators, including how to expedite data collection without compromising the quality.

e) <u>Interpretation bias</u>. Participants acknowledged that cases of government bias towards certified seed made it difficult to engage in a fully objective data collection and analysis process (example: The Ivory Coast).

f) <u>Seed *requirements* vs. seed *access*</u>. A typical post-disaster analysis has been to estimate the area planted by crop, calculating the resulting requirement for the next planting season and not going deeper into the local seed access processes and their inherent resilience. Mixing food and seed assessments and ignoring the scope of farmer seed systems had been the de-facto assessment approach. This has led to vastly overstating the "need for seed" and as a result, the practice of direct seed distribution has evolved to manage this "magnitude of need".

g) <u>Seed quality issues</u>. Work may be needed here, since the concept of seed quality may not be fully defined. For example, to what extent are issues such as the subjective views of farmers, taking or looking at seed samples, issue of perceptions, examining the crop in the field? For example, how do we accommodate a situation in which the farmer may think that cassava is good but it looks terrible in the field? The *parameters* of seed quality may need review: physical seed qualities (cleanliness), varietal purity (varietal mixtures), germination quality, presence of disease, well adapted variety, crop yield, the seed farmers storing mechanisms, etc.

h) <u>Indicators in the analysis</u>. Participants noted the need to review and update a set of key indicators outlining the characteristics of seed insecure farmers, the demographics or some sort of index of seed insecure households.

i) <u>Capacity to undertake seed assessments</u>. Currently, seed assessments require seed systems experts, enumerators, analysis, and report writing. Who must provide the various competencies and how? Relatively few national partners implement SSSA projects because very few have the necessary practical knowledge and experience in, e.g., the Project Cycle. This is also true regarding the analysis and interpretation of the data. This is why mainstreaming of the SSSA is necessary and additional awareness and training is needed. Would a formal "Certified Trainer" qualification following intensive training and field experience help expand the resource base?

j) <u>Information sharing</u>. Would competencies also be enhanced through a more active SSSA community, sharing experience through networks to update products and services?

Turning Analysis into Action

24. Meeting participants agreed that there was room for improvement in formulating and implementing the assessment into policy and action. Some aspects of this issue include:

a) <u>Format and credibility of recommendations</u>. Does the analysis present a compelling case for the appropriate type of intervention? Are the recommendations convincing also in terms of the situation on the ground (i.e., timing, security etc). There was broad support among the participants for examining mechanisms that might contribute to ensuring the validity of findings and recommendations. The re-design of the SSSA would facilitate turning the assessment into action and could increase the extent to which the practitioner values the SSSA, not only as an assessment tool but as a programming tool, to impact the design of seed activities.

b) <u>Ownership/commitment to the SSSA</u>. Stakeholders for example: NGOs, FAO, local government need to be involved in the data collection and analysis. The need for political will was acknowledged by all. Is the SSSA being *really* used to inform

policy? This has been achieved with some success through the food security cluster (example: South Sudan). Perhaps some form of "carrot and stick" approach might be usefully applied. In any event, the case for action must be made together with the partners.

SYNTHESIS (SEGMENT 5)

25. The purpose of this segment was to review and confirm conclusions, so far and begin the transition into a discussion on the potential next steps and the associated opportunities and risks. The discussion was organized into the review of *strategic* considerations by revisiting the broader vision and positioning of the SSSA, versus *tactical* considerations and the opportunities to improve the performance of specific aspects of the assessment.

Rationale for Change

26. Participants concluded that the preceding segments had indeed made a strong case for investing in a broad review and updating of the seed system assessment.

Rationale for "Meta-Analysis"

27. Participants also acknowledged that this review and updating would benefit from an objective reflection on 10 years of applying SSSAs. The term "meta-analysis" and analysis of analytical processes was adopted for this theme. The objective of the meta-analysis should be a systemic review and include some basic objectives like (a) What have we learned? (b) What have we done differently? (c) What have been the challenges to increase the frequency of use and overall utility of SSSAs? d) What has been the suggested action and e) What was actually done?

28. The findings of the meta-analysis would provide a revision of the Seed System Framework and could help generate a guide on "Best Practices" for doing assessments and useful case studies.

Promoting Mainstreaming

29. Mainstreaming in the meeting's context focused on: (1) promoting greater awareness of and acceptance of seed system assessments as a policy tool and (2) tighter and more extensive integration into other policy/response analysis and decision-making processes. Mainstreaming should be driven by the Framework and target both *technical* mainstreaming and *demand* mainstreaming.

30. Mainstreaming can be approached at various levels (global, regional, national) and different stakeholders (government, food security clusters, NGOs and donors). Mainstreaming must address questions of ownership, coordination, and capacity. Again, a review of the LEGS Frameworks might be very useful, as a case study in mainstreaming.

31. In conclusion, the strategic question was summarized: what will "change the game" for SSSA?

   a) How to raise demand. Demand should be based on the economics i.e. better more sustainable interventions. With the governments, how does it affect farmers and livelihoods at a household level?

   b) Business Case. In particular for governments and donors developing the idea that SSSA gives you high returns in terms of cost benefit, lessons learned and track record through evaluation and meta-analysis, would pay for itself in-terms of better designed programs, more appropriate choices and the design of seed activities. Donors are asking for more accountability and SSSA offers accountability but there is a need to adapt/adopt SSSA, so that they it is more user friendly and can be better linked to program design.

Summary of Tactical Opportunities

32. In the discussion of tactical opportunities, participants emphasized the importance of *context*: e.g., types of crises, framing questions, targeting right stakeholders, best practices, how to generate projects and understanding trade-offs between costs and quality, etc. The brainstorming on potential tactical interventions produced the following list:

  a) Revise the SS Framework to create a common understanding and conceptual framework;

  b) The SSSA needs to be specific to the context/intervention that is needed;

  c) Outline your questions before you do the assessment i.e. analysis to action;

  d) Insure that it is useful for making appropriate, feasible decisions and demonstrate that it is effective;

  e) Implement best practices i.e., seed quality;

  f) The use of tools for more effective planning and implementation of SSSA;

  g) Revise chapters in a publication on SSSA; and

  h) Strengthen the link to Food Security.

ACTION PLAN AND WRAP UP (SEGMENT 6)

33. The final segment of the workshop focused on formulating practical next steps. Seven actions were identified.

Action 1: Prepare a Concept Note

34. This action would refine and summarize the outcomes and resulting actions of the workshop in order to present it to donors for funding. In effect, this is what we have done and what we need to do and it was agreed that this should be undertaken soon, in the coming months.

Action 2: Engage with MIRA and Other Short-Term Mainstreaming Opportunities

35. The second action needed is to immediately seek closer linkages and the participation in assessments in the MIRA process. This could be promoted through engagement with an assessment working group of the Global Food Security Cluster.

36. Another mainstreaming opportunity that could be mobilized relatively quickly is to expand the use of the CRS's course of action for Seed Systems in the Disaster Risk Management (DRM) and increase the awareness and technical capacity (5 modules). Perhaps including face to face training with the CRS in Kenya and Sudan.

37. In addition, opportunities exist for greater integration of seed security assessment into the FAO/WFP Crop and Food Security Assessment Missions (CFSAMs). This can be taken up with colleagues in GIEWS and WFP Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping (VAM) in Rome.

38. In the absence of a new, big emergency requiring a specific SSSA, we should capture opportunities of newly completed SSSAs for Meta analysis, awareness raising and building actions. For example:

  a) The SSSA being completed in Sahel: how to use mainstreaming in those countries?

  b) The SSSA in South Kivu: what are the recommendations, how is it being used and how could it be better used?

  c) The SSSA in South Sudan and Darfur.

Action 3: Analyze and Learn from LEGS

39. Participants agreed that useful insights might be obtained from a systematic review of the Livestock Emergency Standards and Guidelines (LEGS), how it was formulated and promoted. LEGS is a mainstreamed, well integrated process and learning more about how that was achieved could be useful in moving ahead with seed system assessments. This analysis also should be undertaken in the coming months.

Action 4: Update the Framework

40. The major short-term priority is revisiting the Seed System Security Framework. Participants agreed that the baseline should be the CRS's most recent project, updated to meet current needs and to analyse the experience of over 10 years of previous assessments.

41. The update should be more compelling (i.e., in policy/programmatic terms); it should retain conceptual integrity but permit flexibility; it should clarify terms, strengthen ownership, update indicators, and clarify/promote linkages.

Action 5: Conduct "Meta-Analyses" of Completed and Ongoing Assessments

42. An auto-evaluation in the form of what we have learned, what did we do differently, what are the challenges to increasing use and utility of SSSA? A meta-analysis as discussed earlier in this report should be based on the internal processes related to the completed and ongoing assessments which have been conducted by CRS and FAO.

43. In the short-term, the first steps should include drafting a Terms of Reference, but including a quick analysis to contribute to Action 4 and update the Framework.

Action 6: Strengthen the SSSA Network/Community of Practice

44. Participants agreed that every effort should be made to improve information sharing, broader participation and the provision of informational resources for capacity building. These objectives could be achieved by a targeted effort to support and strengthen the network of practitioners and other stakeholders by using *inter alia* the tools available in online communities. It is important to strengthen the community of practitioners to share innovations, successes, lessons and learned. The FSNWG and FS Cluster are good target forums for establishing and promoting a network of SSSA community and practice.

45. The network could provide a useful channel for capacity building and training through awareness workshops, training on how to conduct various aspects of the assessment and certification.

46. Finally, the network could be supported by a Website. Concepts and insights of this might be obtained from examples such as the Food for Cities network and LEGS; including practical considerations such as with who and how the website is maintained and managed.

47. Thus, the action item here could include, consulting with resources in FAO and elsewhere on network/community support processes and technology and then formulating a specific strategy and operational proposal.

Action 7: Update the Toolkit

48. There was general agreement that improving assessment tools and resources presented opportunities both in the short-and long-term. The assumptions governing the associated workplan was analyse issues at hand for example, can assessments be done by generalist development practitioners or only by specialists? As a global public good a premise should be to build awareness and capacity as broadly as possible; for this, appropriate tools are required.

49. Other related activities for the updating and extension of tools could be the promoting of ownership, developing generally accepted standards (as in LEGS), promulgating "dialects" of the assessment for different types of risks, and strengthening incentives (i.e., the "carrot and/or stick" motivators).

50. The current CRS e-learning course on seed systems is an excellent starting point. Following the updating of the Framework, other tools could include:

   a) Guidelines for conducting various types of assessments;

   b) Guidelines on *triggers* for conducting an assessment and what type is called for;

   c) How to integrate with other assessment tools such as MIRA and Food and Crop Assessments;

   d) Guidelines on best practice in linking assessment results to the potential actions to improve seed security;

   e) Awareness-raising materials: and

   f) Capacity development materials, including training curricula.

WRAP UP

51. With the elaboration of this action plan, participants provided a brief and informal summary of the proceedings. There was general satisfaction that the workshop was both stimulating and useful. The follow up on the action plan could be monitored in a subsequent gathering, either in person or through "virtual" collaboration as proposed in Action 6.

ANNEX 1:
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. Share information on current Seed System Security Assessment tools, recent and planned modification and approaches.

2. Identify the strengths and weaknesses of different tools and opportunities for improvement.

3. Identify how to better link Seed Assessment backward to Disaster Response Analysis and forward to strengthening seed system resilience.

4. Discuss the SSSA guidelines and training materials and how they can be improved.

5. Conduct a joint presentation after the workshop for FAO staff to create awareness of the SSSA and the action plan for mainstreaming developed during the workshop.

Venue and Date

The workshop was hosted by FAO in Rome, from 22 – 23 November 2012 for 1.5 days.

Meeting Participants

FAO
Paul Omanga, FAO Kenya
Joseph Okidi, FAO South Sudan
Jeff Tschirley, TCER
Neil Marsland, TCER
Rodrique Vinet, TCEO
Tom Osborn, AGPMG
Sam Kugbei, AGPMG
Remi Nono Womdim, AGPMG
Wilson Hugo, AGPMG
Lucio Olivero, AGPMG

Catholic Relief Services (CRS)
Tom Remington
Steve Walsh

Others
Matthias Mollet, M&E Expert
Philippe Le Coënt, former FAO Staff Member and SSSA Advisor.

Outputs of the Workshop

1. Develop an action plan (activities, assign responsibilities and a schedule) to further develop the guidelines, training materials and other elements to facilitate the dissemination and use of the SSSA methodology.

WORKSHOP ON MAINSTREAMING SEED SECURITY ASSESSMENTS (SSA)
22-23 November 2012
Pakistan Room (A127)

Draft Agenda

Time	Activity	Notes/Comments
Thursday, 22 November		
08:00 – 08:30	Arrival, coffee, settling in.	

08:30 – 10:15	<u>Segment 1: Welcome, setting the stage</u>
	• Welcome
	• Review of objectives/agenda (Tom Osborn)
	• Rules of the Road (Facilitator)
	• Participants introductions
	• Development context for SSSA (FAO TCE)
	• Presentations
	   o Full SSA (Joseph Okidi/Philippe le Coent)
	   o Rapid SSA (Tom Remington CRS)
		Participants provide perspectives: brief case studies using quick/full guidelines; broader perspective on SSSA role in disaster response will be provided

10:15 – 10:45	Coffee Break	Tea/coffee provided outside meeting room
10:45 – 12:30	<u>Segment 2: Assessment , Issues</u> • Views on SSSA current strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats • Reach agreement on specific questions to be addressed by workshop	Output of this segment is consensus on state of SSSA art, where/how its contribution could be increased, and what issues need to be addressed in order to get there.
12:30 – 14:00	Lunch	Lunch at FAO Restaurant
14:00 – 15:45	<u>Segment 3: Discussion of Topics/Issues</u>	As defined in Segment 2.
15:45 – 16:15	Coffee Break	Tea/coffee provided outside meeting room
16:15 – 17:30	<u>Segment 4: Discussion of specific questions</u> (continued) and beginning of synthesis	Will include wrap up of Day 1, Set up for Day 2
1930-2130	<u>Group Dinner</u>	Restaurant near FAO

Friday, 23 November		
08:00 – 08:30	Arrival, coffee, settling in.	
08:30 – 10:15	Segment 5: Synthesis • Review/confirmation of Day 1 conclusions • Potential next steps • Opportunities, Risks	
10:15 – 10:45	Coffee	Tea/coffee provided outside meeting room
10:45 – 12:30	Segment 6: Synthesis (continued) and Wrap Up • Discussion of next steps (continued) • Wrap Up	
12:30 - 14:00	Lunch	FAO restaurant
14:00- 15:00	Briefing on SSSA for FAO staff and the action plan	