



FEED THE FUTURE

The U.S. Government's Global Hunger & Food Security Initiative



Feed the Future Democratic Republic of Congo Strengthening Livelihoods and Resilience Activity

YEAR 2 WORK PLAN - EXCERPTS FOR BEAM Exchange

October 1, 2021 – September 30, 2022

March 2022 Revision



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

FIGURE 1: SLR GOAL, OBJECTIVES, AND EXPECTED RESULTS

Feed the Future, DRC, Strengthening Livelihoods and Resilience Activity

Activity Purpose: to improve resilience capacities in vulnerable households and communities and to enable people, households, and communities to escape poverty and chronic vulnerability.

USAID TO 3: Foundation for Durable Peace Strengthened in the DRC

- Sub-IR 3.2.2: Strengthened resilience through enhanced economic activity, education and health services in conflict-affected communities
- Sub-IR 3.2.3: Increased opportunities for women's participation in peace, security, and political and economic life.

Goal: Reduce the humanitarian, development, and economic costs of recurrent crises caused by land and other natural-resources related conflicts, natural disasters and climate stress, armed conflicts and food insecurity in the DRC.

FTF priority: Strengthened resilience among people and systems, especially to new and recurrent shocks

	FTF priority: Inclusive and sustainable agriculture-led economic growth	FTF priority: a well-nourished population, especially women and children
Objective 1: Strengthened Systems and Institutional Capacity	Objective 2: Inclusive Economic Growth and Diversified Livelihoods	Objective 3: Improved Availability, Access, Utilization, and Stability of Nutritious Foods
Result 1.1: Land rights, tenure, use, and governance improved	Result 2.1: Diversified and resilient market-oriented opportunities increased	Result 3.1: Diversified and market-driven nutrient-rich crop production promoted
Result 1.2: Conflict management strengthened	Result 2.2: Sustainable agricultural production and soil fertility improved	Result 3.2: Post-harvest handling, storage, and preservation improved
Result 1.3: Social cohesion and capital increased	Result 2.3: Access to quality inputs and financial services improved	Result 3.3: Uptake of essential nutritional and WASH behaviors and services improved
Result 1.4: Organizational, technical, and adaptive capacities of agricultural producer associations and other groups strengthened	Result 2.4: Private sector participation in agricultural markets increased	
Result 1.5: Risk reduction, mitigation, and management of livelihood systems improved	Result 2.5: Collaboration among VC actors strengthened, and marketing improved	

Cross Cutting Objective: Improved gender equity and empowerment of women and youth

Elements of the SLR Approach

- A successful end-state for SLR is where Ituri's households, communities, and local systems mitigate, adapt to, and recover from shocks and stresses. Given contradictory motives, confused, and shifting allegiances and hidden agendas, SLR needs to implement interventions iteratively and be ready to modify them as local circumstances change.
- The complexity of the situation in Ituri and the multiplicity of local agendas requires flexible approaches and pragmatic solutions adapted to local realities. Hence, SLR creates contingency plans and uses adaptive management.
- SLR employs a mix of push and pull strategies and tactics to guide activity implementation. If Ituri moves toward relative stability, households, communities, and firms are likely to be less risk-averse, better able to respond to more predictable market signals, and more willing to increase investments - and SLR can shift more to interventions that focus on facilitative market-oriented activities (pull activities). On the contrary, if the conflicts intensify and instability persists, then activities that strengthen resilience capacities that align with and support more market-based humanitarian assistance (e.g. like vouchers and smart subsidies) will be emphasized (push activities).
- SLR's approach aspires to be collaborative and collegial, to expand on existing successes, learn from others, draw on their experiences and networks, generate agreed-upon alternatives to pilots in specific locations. While doing so, SLR builds an evidence base to inform which activities to abandon, to adopt, to adapt, and to scale up, a knowledge which other actors can use. The regular review of results not only allows adaptive management, but also drives learning.
- The goal of SLR's approach is the identification of **specific actionable interventions** that are "owned" locally, congruent with other ongoing initiatives in Ituri, and which produce tangible observable results to encourage local adaption and duplication.
- One typology of SLR's pilot interventions consists of three main types of partnerships: a) with local communities; b) with the private sector; and, c) with local institutions and international NGOs, including other donor projects for collaboration and resource sharing. If appropriate, a combination of these three types in partnership is also possible.
- SLR's guiding principle throughout is "do no harm." The Activity seeks to identify and define systems and approaches in Ituri that ensure decisions are made by working together with everyone impacted.
- SLR's approach requires finding ways to improve access to resources for the disadvantaged, encourage inclusion, and reinforce empowerment. It also requires engaging partners to achieve common objectives through accompaniment and collaboration rather than top-down directives, as well as starting small in discrete locations to devise local solutions which help reduce dominion by powerful disruptors.
- Women and youth play a vital role in all aspects of the Activity. To promote inclusion, SLR need to ensure that women and youth meaningfully participate in problem identification and prioritization of the Activity's interventions, involving them in work planning, pilot selection and implementation, and learning through pause-and-reflect sessions. SLR has integrated Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI) considerations into activities in all three objectives, which will be refined during the conduct of the GESI field assessment and the finalization of the SLR GESI strategy in Q1/Q2 FY 2022.
- A significant part of the changes that are needed to move Ituri along a resilience pathway towards stability are simply not within the Activities mandate or power. Therefore, communicating, coordinating, collaborating, and catalyzing innovations is an important role; by being open, testing

various approaches and building local support systems SLR has the opportunity to create solutions for others that follow to adapt and adopt.

- A primary goal of SLR's AWP strategy is to find ways to achieve results in and among the rural communities; to achieve results which impact the livelihoods of the non-elites and disadvantaged of Ituri province in a *tangible* way, rather than to produce further studies, strategies, and reports sitting on the shelf. At the same time, SLR needs to convince the elite and powerful that these rural improvements will be better for them and their children in the medium-to-long term or at the very least that they do not threaten their interests.

SLR's Expected Results and Potential End-states

1) Inclusive and sustainable agriculture-led economic growth helps move Ituri towards:

- A system that reduces predation, arbitrary taxation, and shares revenues equitably.

2) Strengthened resilience among people and systems, especially to new and recurrent shocks and stresses, creates:

- Individuals with knowledge, resources, and abilities to respond to and surmount shocks.

3) A well-nourished population, particularly women and children, benefit from:

- A more abundant and diverse production of local food at affordable prices.

In this flexible work plan, SLR suggests establishing agreed upon strategies, with specific plans for locations and sectors, making gradually phased interventions at the selected pilot locations and holding regular fora for reflection on specific issues, followed by adaptive changes in programming, as necessary, to allow adaptive management.

SLR is looking to intervene in several market systems, including cacao, coffee, maize, beans, vegetables, poultry, pigs, fish, etc. The Activity is collaboratively planning activities with communities, the private sector and other organizations for the necessary human capital, financial, infrastructural, technical, social and environmental interventions required to rebuild and increase the productivity of these systems, with a bias toward generating local employment for youth and reducing conflict.

Improving agricultural market systems can expand cross-community cooperation, generate community resilience through diversified and expanded agricultural production and more efficient and more profitable marketing chains, and extend household resilience through increased revenues and expanded employment options, both on and off-farm, via service provision, contracts, processing, packing, storing, transporting, retailing etc.

However, land rights and secure access to available land goes to the heart of Ituri's current crisis. Resolving this issue locally is key for increased economic growth, attracting investment, and improving nutrition. SLR is developing pragmatic approaches tailored to finding solutions to the specific land issues in each pilot location. Specific interventions are being planned to address SLR's land tenure and inclusion goals, but all these activities are aimed at support SLR's market system activities.

Finance is another necessary, but not sufficient condition for improved agricultural market systems. In FY 2022, SLR will place more emphasis on local solutions for savings and loans for communities and loans for businesses.

As the humanitarian actors in the province have more programs targeting aspects of nutrition/WASH than economic growth programs, collaboration, and continuation with them will be SLR's primary modalities to address the nutrition and WASH needs in pilot communities.

For SLR's pilot activities to succeed, a nucleus is required of appropriately trained facilitators, trainers and change agents able to supply the management, provide clear guidance and to train others. SLR is working with local entities, including universities, to provide institutional strengthening and Training of Trainers (ToT), to build absorptive, adaptive, and transformative capacities at various levels, especially at the local community level and within local organizations.

To succeed, SLR's plan requires communicating, coordinating, collaborating, and catalyzing interventions seen as opportunities by others at the village, territorial and the provincial level, testing various approaches, building support systems, and finding and sharing solutions for others to adapt and adopt. In this way, SLR's small-scale pilot interventions could have wider far-reaching effects, for example, stimulate transformation and cause local change, which in the long run can cause incremental changes in Ituri.

The realities and complex challenges prevalent in Ituri Province can cause some SLR initiatives and interventions to fail, but such cases will only lead to Lessons Learned and adaptations. SLR is using a pathways approach to change, an iterative discovery process, focused on strengthening the resilience of specific people and systems. Working in stages at the village level, using adaptive management processes allows to build trust, make changes and learn by doing. By keeping options open and maximizing flexibility, as the situation changes and as SLR's knowledge grows, the Activity can make appropriate course corrections as and when required.

SLR's Partnership Approach

Building and maintaining strong partnerships are critical determinants of SLR reaching its stated objectives in Ituri. During the first part of Year One, SLR traveled wide across the province and worked with local administration, civil society, NGOs, and the private sector to identify communities with potential. Mid-year SLR returned to a selected number of pilot communities and began engaging, asking locals to articulate their priorities. In Ituri's fractured communities, understandably mistrust is the norm, collaboration is limited, coordination is hampered due to multiple agendas, approaches and styles, and communication is sparse and often distorted. SLR realized that what was required was significant investment of its time and energy in developing trust, a shared understanding, and eventually catalytic partnership activities at the community level. Having these strong community partnerships is a prerequisite for the success of the Activity's other activities in partnership with the private sector or humanitarian organizations.

Deploying co-creation strategically to develop partnerships

Co-creation is one essential element in SLR's toolbox. Working with deeply complex problems in an insecure, fractured socioeconomic system requires engagement with and by the actors in that system. Co-creation gives an opportunity for everyone at the table to design and buy into potential solutions that no one could have produced on their own. The extended co-creation process lets SLR facilitate the development, implementation, and adaptation of potential solutions to community priorities while providing natural checks on any donor program's biases (e.g., getting something up and running at scale in time for the next quarterly report) as well as its partners' predilections (e.g., an attachment to unsustainable solutions that do not involve their input).

Co-creation has had a disproportionate amount of attention in the Activity's internal discourse, its external communications with other partners, and its dialogue with USAID. Co-creation only formally came to ADS 201.3.3.7 in 2017 and remains experimental for both USAID and for its implementing partners. In Ituri Province, formal co-creation in the humanitarian and development sector is practically unheard of. SLR won trust and enthusiasm by simply explaining to potential partners that it was there to listen, understand their priorities, and then to co-create solutions, as opposed to arriving with a

narrowly focused and time-bound program of preconceived solutions, even as the continuing engagement with those same communities showed a limited understanding of what co-creation (“articulated ownership”) actually entailed and required.

Co-creation is a long and laborious process, and the comparison often made between co-creation and learning felt particularly apt to SLR in FY 2021 as its teams returned to the same group of community partners week after week (and sometimes month after month) to build on the same conversations and iterate and reiterate the same pilot activity plan. One requirement in SLR’s co-creation roadmap is a justification for using a co-creation approach: the Activity will consider the significant investment of time and relationship capital necessary for effective co-creation, especially with communities, before authorizing its use. Co-creation is not SLR’s prerequisite for mobilizing activity funds: sometimes, SLR has a clear, technically sound solution to a problem; in other cases, a local system actor may have a tried-and-true approach and the Activity can simply fund it and help with a sustainability plan, monitoring and learning. In FY 2022, the Activity will continue to deploy co-creation strategically, but will not hesitate to use another implementation approach when appropriate.

As another example of partnership development without formal co-creation could come through SLR’s Responsible Private-Sector Innovation Fund (RPIF), described in the SLR’s Private Sector Engagement (PSE) Strategy. SLR plans to use a mix of purchase orders (POs), subcontracts, and direct assistance under approved memorandums of understanding (MoUs) to implement the PSE Strategy which has three forms of engagement: 1) with commercial opportunities, 2) with humanitarian response and recovery, and 3) through corporate social responsibility.

In FY 2021, SLR’s field work included explaining how the Activity co-invests in partnerships, while working with communities to define their priorities and potential solutions, developing road maps using a co-creation process that identified potential ways and partners needed to implement the solutions. Then SLR worked to find an appropriate point of entry for the Activity and exactly how to engage. Based on these experiences, SLR’s co-creation process has been adapted for each of the three major categories of potential partners: communities, private-sector actors, and larger non-profit organizations and donor-funded projects (see the SLR Annual Report FY 2021 for more details, such as reflections on the process and lessons learned).

One piece of the process in a new location, or when starting a new technical activity, is a request for Expressions of Interest (Eols). In FY 2021, hundreds of local entities responded to SLR’s calls with Eols. In FY 2022, the Activity will use Eols and other methods adapted to partners who may be less literate or have less experience with donors, to identify promising partners. SLR approaches each partner with the same overarching partnership co-creation philosophy, but the specifics of engagement, what kinds of resources are deployed (and through what mechanisms), and the timeframes necessary for the partnership development and implementation phases will vary according to the nature of the intervention and the partners engaged. Often the identified solutions require more than one partner, so creative definition of roles and responsibilities and coordination is key. SLR takes a holistic approach to all its partners, whatever their role or types and will strive to ensure that working with one type of partner does not negatively affect the other partners. The commonalities and particularities of this approach are discussed below.

Common elements in the SLR partnership co-creation approach

The Activity’s FY 2022 partnership co-creation philosophy remains largely the same as FY 2021, with minor changes based on lessons learned to date. Encouraging “aid recipients” to play a leading role in defining the parameters of their aid is not common anywhere and is almost unknown in Ituri; time and effort is needed to complete the aid package and build a partnership. In FY 2021 the Activity learned that these early efforts at building agency could themselves be impactful: transformational change

requires capital in the traditional (financial) sense, but also in the intellectual and social sense, and this up-front work to develop the partnerships continues to be the locus of important investments of intellectual capital by both SLR and its local partners. Taking the time needed to reach a shared understanding is an important prerequisite for the reflection and evaluation sessions that are built into partnership implementation. An approach that prioritizes thoughtful preparation for partnerships will increase SLR's overall success rate and sustainability through a better understanding of the specific problems at the outset, garnering more buy-in from partners, and providing greater potential for learning and adaptation.

Lessons learned on partnership co-creation during the engagement process. During FY 2021, SLR needed to take time for a concerted communication effort about how SLR works, why it does what it does and what it does not do. SLR found that many potential partners, particularly small community-based organizations, do not understand the implications of activities based on co-investment, nor how to manage financial support that is based on performance milestones (e.g., firm fixed-price contracts based on deliverables). The team seriously underestimated how much time and thought was needed to present its approach and reach a collective understanding of partnership. In FY 2022, SLR's partnership co-creation initiatives will have a much stronger communication part built in.

SLR helps partner(s) to estimate the appropriate scale for initial tests of solutions, identify the resources needed for the resulting activities, calculate how much of each kind will be needed, and then identify which partners can realistically contribute what—both in a pilot phase and, after a solution is proven, in the longer term. At this stage, SLR may also reach out to other actors in the system that could play a role in the solution and try to involve them in an expanded consortium. Another lesson from FY 2021 was that the initial ambitions of many potential partners are enormous, which is risky for both co-investors (risk to the partner of going too big too fast and losing some of its limited capital and discrediting a promising idea; and risk to the Activity of squandering too much of its activity funds on a failed pilot). The team hypothesizes that this is in part because decades of traditional humanitarian assistance has not had the time to emphasize genuine co-investment, and partly because of the typically urgent and short-term nature of humanitarian funding. In FY 2021, potential partners wildly overpromised their own resources and tried to insist on year-long activities with massive budgets. In FY 2022, SLR will explore a variety of communication and negotiation tactics to sequence partnership activities, for example by splitting a year-long vision into more manageable quarterly achievements, or by taking on the responsibility for procurement of materials directly and making them conditional and proportional to partners mobilizing certain resources or achieving certain milestones themselves.

As realistic timelines, resource-allocation plans, broad goals, and management plans to reach those common goals emerge (all organizational strengthening activities in their own right), SLR documents them in memoranda that define each partners' role and contributions, and then works with each partner to facilitate delivery of the specific resources needed to meet their perceived objectives and implement their plan. Ideally, SLR may consider facilitating training support to help them create appropriate structures/mechanisms, to monitor their management of the resources, to learn from the process and to establish democratic mechanisms that allow course-corrections as needed.

In FY 2021, four internal tools emerged organically as SLR began the process of co-creating activities with partners. SLR will continue to adapt these as Best Practices and Lessons Learned accumulate:

I. Co-creation roadmaps. After targeting a location or area, defining the Activity's strategic objectives, and making initial contact with a community to learn about its priorities and potential areas of intervention, SLR develops an internal document called a "co-creation roadmap" to articulate the various procedures to follow as it engages with potential partners.

- Roadmaps address issues ranging from giving a voice to marginalized groups in the co-creation process to ensuring a suitable threshold of competitiveness and transparency.

- Each roadmap is primarily a hypothesis, one that SLR and communities can coordinate around and consult day to day during co-creation events and negotiations to ensure that they do not neglect important considerations, but something they can also revise when the creative process justifies a departure from the original route envisaged.
- In the spirit of a living document, the roadmap includes space for periodic, journal-style reflections on the evolution of the co-creation process and what parts of the initial plan have held true and exactly where the team has made changes and improvements.

2. Co-creation synopses. As SLR concludes its negotiations for one or more partnerships, it returns to the roadmap, documents the major deviations from the originally conceived route, and articulates what has been learned from that co-creation effort.

- The co-creation synopsis documents what happened and reflects on what aspects can usefully be carried forward for use in similar co-creation efforts.
- It also annexes the key documentation that shows the route the Activity followed to establish fairness and the proper level of competition for any partnerships that emerge during the co-creation process.

3. Partnership memoranda. At a minimum, each partnership has an internal memorandum (memo) that articulates the activities planned, a timeline, the roles of each partner, an approximate budget, and details of the various contributions.

- The partnership memo also includes mandatory sections connected to M&E data-collection, GESI factors, environmental compliance, and internal operational planning enabling SLR and the partner to meet the partnership milestones.
- In FY 2021, SLR realized that with some types of partners, a formal partnerships document signed by both parties was actually an obstacle to implementation since some organizations require extensive legal review by distant headquarters, but useful progress could be achieved without legal obligations; while with other partners, an MoU or other document was a tool for mobilizing resources.
- In other contexts where dozens of small organizations were involved in the same partnership, the administrative burden of creating and updating formal partnership documents made a formal partnership approach too unwieldy for good management.

Regardless of what other documents are signed, SLR shares the content of its internal partnership memoranda with its partners to ensure their commitment. In FY 2022, the Activity will evaluate several ways—formal and informal—of sharing partnership information and documenting commitments to assess the advantages and drawbacks of each method.

4. Implementation instruments: Contracts, MOUs, consultants, and direct disposition of goods. The partnership memorandum outlines the operational steps to be taken by each partner to implement the partnership activities. The implementation instruments are selected based on their efficacy in delivering on the Activity's commitment to its partners.

- All consulting agreements, contracts for goods or services, MoUs, or other instruments will be informed by the co-creation process and use good facilitation principles (for example, they may require vendors to meet certain price points that will be sustainable for local partners to take over once the Activity removes any subsidy).
- SLR follows DAI's standard procurement, recruitment, and equipment-disposition procedures to mobilize its own contributions, in line with the Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) and the Automated Directives System (ADS) requirements for USAID activity implementation.

These four tools—a roadmap, a synopsis, an internal memorandum, and a set of implementation instruments—have emerged as the common thread in the diverse types of partnerships which SLR

began to co-create in FY 2021. SLR will keep them as the foundations of its partnership approach in FY 2022, while applying the various tools very differently—and emphasize distinct aspects of the co-creation process—as the Activity engages with the three distinct types of partners.

I. Co-creating partnerships with communities

Partnerships with communities throughout Ituri are the bedrock for all SLR interventions. Rural communities are the foundations for resilience in Ituri, and any private-sector or humanitarian partnerships that do not affect communities will have limited or no impact. However, communities have serious limitations in terms of knowledge and resources, and the logistic and security concerns that plague Ituri fall hardest on them. The Activity's co-creation approach was adjusted to address the constraints of communities.

Challenges in engaging communities in partnership co-creation. Social cohesion is one important prerequisite for starting a practical co-creation conversation. **Distrust** of each other and of international humanitarian and development organizations is the norm in many communities, and while the development of activities that bring economic benefits to everyone can be a strong incentive, it is often difficult to facilitate a practical conversation when the various parties don't believe each other what they are saying. At the same time, while communities are enthusiastic about SLR's overall approach, there is limited initial understanding of what **co-creation** means: even after many days of discussions, community groups still ask SLR staff, "But what activity do you want to do? Just tell us and we can give you our budget for implement it, why do you keep asking us to decide?" They often see **co-investment** as window-dressing, or as a promise they will never be held accountable for delivering on. These mentalities are one legacy of decades of political and physical violence, leading to social disruptions followed by top-down humanitarian relief interventions.

Additionally, while community financial and material resources are usually limited, their **perception** of their ability to mobilize resources for their own economic development is even more so. This creates a tangle of problems for the Activity when negotiating the finer details of partnerships.

First, it can be a struggle to convince a community that it should contribute. If SLR does not communicate effectively, it risks seeming callous or greedy, offering to bring USAID funding to the community only if poor farmers put up their own limited resources. In time, SLR was generally successful in FY 2021 in talking about ways to contribute, about how community organizations can raise small amounts of money from their members, the importance of in-kind or intellectual contributions and how these were all investments in their own economic futures. The investments from the Activity contributed to economic futures while decades of humanitarian interventions have created challenging mentalities and offer a wealth of pertinent local examples of why persisting with short-term hand-outs without local engagement and buy-in can be counter-productive.

Second, and more complicated, is differentiating between what community-based organizations believe about their resources, and what they are willing to present to the Activity and even to others in the community. In FY 2021 SLR talked with potential partners in a variety of settings to help them better understand their capacities, but the Activity will need to explore additional approaches to uncover possibilities in FY 2022 (this is also important for the private sector).

Third, and the most challenging, is what is a fair and realistic level of required community contribution. SLR can spend activity funds to buy down the risk of new practices and alliances. The Activity can subsidize new activities that risk failure, but because communities come with a distorted idea of the resources they can provide and often struggle to articulate the risk, SLR faces both the chance of subsidizing too much (and incentivizing unsustainable practices and attracting partners for the wrong reasons) and the chance of subsidizing too little (and exposing its partners to unreasonable economic losses if a test fails). Implementing in phases and starting as small as possible is one way to mitigate this

dilemma, but better understanding how to reach a good balance between risk and reward is another priority for SLR in FY 2022.

Applying the SLR co-creation approach to community partnerships. SLR's co-creation process with communities emphasizes fairness, transparency, inclusivity, and small, rapid testing of ideas. In FY 2022, SLR will begin with a public call for Eols, public community meetings, and strategic communication and outreach efforts to help the entire community (not just potential direct partners) understand what the Activity does and how it works. Training and social-cohesion events early in the co-creation process will be used as needed to allow honest and productive conversations later. The prioritized activities will follow the Activity's overall strategy but simultaneously SLR will remain open to supporting brand-new ideas to publicly show inclusion of the communities' goals and engage as many members as possible. This approach could lead to a co-creation effort, for instance, focused initially on microfinance for agriculture, which might grow into a major microfinance intervention, with smaller secondary partnerships connected to WASH, nutrition, and youth employment, to get the larger community on board.

At the partnership negotiation stage, time and effort will be needed to rein in the ambitions of SLR's community partners to timeframes and budgets that are realistic and permit space for learning and iteration. Strategic messaging and diplomatic communications are as essential as technical knowledge and savvy negotiation skills. To that end, the Activity is hiring a Communications and Reporting Coordinator, who will be tasked with, among other things, supporting activity technical leads in their communication and outreach efforts at the community level. SLR will also examine its co-creation synopses from the final two quarters of FY 2021 to refine the guidelines on how best to negotiate community contributions and effectively use self-selection to narrow partnership activities to the best ideas while including all segments of the local communities.

2. Co-creating partnerships with the private sector

Long-term sustainability of any SLR supported economic activity depends largely on the private sector, as manifested through its interest, engagement, commitment, and ongoing expanded investment into Ituri's agricultural production, processing, and marketing systems. While SLR's co-creation with community groups starts broad, inclusive, and holistic and in time gradually narrows down, the opposite is true with the private sector. To establish trust and develop effective models with private companies, SLR has started with one-on-one interactions with the companies with interest in Ituri's agriculture already identified by the PSE Strategy. SLR aims to build up a record of accomplishment via successful pilots, and with time will begin layering in other system actors as partners, such as related businesses, community groups, government entities, or the non-profit sector as appropriate. When relevant, SLR use inclusiveness as a criterion for selecting private sector partners to promote the inclusion of women, youth, and vulnerable groups into SLR's partnerships.

Challenges in engaging the private sector in partnership co-creation. In contrast to community partners, actors in the private sector typically have adequate capital, but how they mobilize it depends on their appetite for risk and the need to keep themselves operational. Because USAID regulations do not allow direct equity investment and the SLR Task Order does not allow grants, the Activity is finding other ways to buy down risk. For example, a private-sector partner wishing to implement a new pilot activity (e.g. investing in training of cash crop producers) that implies increased costs (e.g. field technicians and travel costs), given the high uncertainty of the profitability of the innovation (e.g. at the end of the season farmers may sell their higher volumes and quality of products to another buyer instead of remaining loyal to SLR's partner), SLR may assume some of the costs related to the innovation (e.g. covering salaries of new field technicians for the first year) to make the level of risk acceptable until the concept is proven. However, these kinds of collaboration take time, and the underlying risks are very real. Consequently, SLR's candidates for partners are **inherently** limited.

Although business owners understand their financial resources and can define financial risks, they may overestimate the other risks pertinent to working with rural households in Ituri. Convincing a community to invest in its own economic development may take time, but it is comparatively straightforward—it is their own community. On the other hand, businesses rightly perceive substantial risk in expanding in Ituri, especially in violence-plagued territories like southern Irumu and central Djugu. Since risk can be understood as a lack of information about the future, sometimes SLR can reduce risk simply by conducting formal or informal studies that improve entrepreneurs' understanding of how to engage suppliers or customers in these difficult-to-reach and conflict-affected parts of the Province.

Applying the SLR co-creation approach to private-sector partnerships. Co-creating with the private sector takes a different form from SLR's community co-creation efforts. For example, instead of creating trust through large, public events, it engages with plausible partners directly, learning what they see as their constraints to growth in Ituri, and looking for ways to build on what they are already doing or want to do. With time, it may be possible to introduce greater innovations and to connect these initial partners to other market actors and to community and non-profit groups. As finance is needed for business expansions, SLR plans two initiatives in FY 2022: to serve smaller entrepreneurs, SLR is working on a program with the Multidisciplinary Center for Support to Development of Women and Families (CEMADEF) for savings and loans at the local level; and, in FY 2021, the Activity began coordinating with USAID's INVEST on referring potential Ituri-based recipients of blended-finance support or investment-readiness services. The potential for external investment in the long term will be another factor in SLR's co-creation discussions with the private sector.

In FY 2021, the Activity made an internal tentative allocation of \$500,000 of its activity funding to test or expand modern technology, unlock trade barriers, resolve access-to-market issues, and promote social investments in target communities. Sometimes, where there is pre-dominant capability, a sole source memo may be appropriate; in other cases, SLR will pre-select a compact list of potential partners to avoid unproductive applications whilst maintaining competition. In the absence of experience with partnerships in Ituri to use as a starting point, SLR will postpone larger, cross-cutting co-creation efforts, such as a consortium with multiple categories of partners.

In FY 2022 SLR expect that activities with the private sector will be fewer but larger---and designed across longer periods of time---than those with community groups. The PSE strategy has identified larger, more capable businesses with greater ability than small community organizations to plan and execute activities. This allows the Activity to plan further ahead and commit resources more aggressively. First-movers in the private sector willing to invest in inclusive growth of their businesses in Ituri will remain a high priority in FY 2022 and are expected to use this initial \$500k allocation. A combination of exploratory pilots and expansion-focused pilots will dominate SLR's PSE approach in FY 2022.

3. Co-creating partnerships with the non-profit and donor-funded sector

To date the Activity has spent limited resources co-creating partnerships with the larger local non-profits and international implementers of donor-funded projects. However, some early positive experiences with international organizations like *Action Contre la Faim* (ACF), Trocaire and local entities like the social business CEMADEF have opened the ways these co-creation efforts will follow in FY 2022.

Challenges in engaging NGOs and donor-funded projects in partnership co-creation. NGOs and donor-funded projects have very different challenges from the private sector or individual communities. Where businesses and small community groups have a relative freedom in what they engage and invest in, NGOs and donor-funded projects are bound by program areas, goals and targets, and have less flexibility on what, how and where they can spend their funding. While donor funding is substantial in Ituri, one commonality is the influence of decades of humanitarian assistance on

institutional culture and norms. That said, SLR has met with NGO staff who are eager to change tactics and employ a more long-term, development-based approach. Also, a few of the grass roots locally managed organizations have been quietly doing rural development for years. The latter are promising partners for SLR.

Applying the SLR co-creation approach to partnerships with NGOs and donor-funded projects. SLR expects its FY 2022 co-creation activities with these partners to be more bilateral and less public than its engagements with community groups, but the resultant activities to be more community focused than its private-sector partnerships. SLR will examine the relevance of co-investment in partnership activities with NGOs and donor-funded projects: local NGOs are typically fully funded through charitable contribution, grants, member contributions, and the like, and relevant donor-funded projects may face too many compliance hurdles to enter into a contract with the SLR. In these cases, SLR may simply focus on synergizing and coordination of joint activities instead of co-investment, so that each partner can leverage the contribution of the other for a greater result.

One important theme that SLR expects to emerge in these partnerships is the complementarity between SLR's technical approach rooted in facilitation and long-term resilience and the in-depth knowledge and networks that many of these organizations have built in Ituri over years and often decades. The opportunities for self-selection the Activity has built into its co-creation approach will afford more cautious organizations the ability to wait and see, but its FY 2021 experience gives grounds for optimism that many local NGOs and donor-funded activities will see strong potential for expanded collaboration with the Activity in FY 2022.

Beyond partnerships

The Activity took an inclusive and aspirational approach to the “partnership” concept in FY 2021: it considered all kinds of relationships to be “partnerships”—from coordination with the provincial government to engagement with groups of community organizations to some contracts with certain vendors of services and supplies. SLR leveraged the power of the word “partner” by using it with local system actors even before they had demonstrated a shared vision and commitment of financial and intellectual capital to SLR-supported work. This approach has been effective, especially given the importance of building relationships, trust, and mutual understanding as a prerequisite for meaningful work at the community level. Three cases illustrate the effectiveness of this approach: the Ituri provincial government continues to delegate its staff to support SLR's field work; a women's group in Kasenyi provided a forum and catering for initial partnership discussions; and, SLR's first private sector partner NASECO took advantage of the rains, planting beans in Djugu before a formal partnership was signed.

However, co-creation is not automatically a requirement for catalytic activity spending and improving the resilience of Ituri's socioeconomic system. Much still needs to be done outside of partnerships, for example, to include training programs, social-cohesion activities, and communications campaigns that do not feature bilateral or multilateral partnerships between the Activity and local system actors per se. As the project is still preparing the ground for future work, unilateral activities are an important part of this AWP. That said, towards the end of the project life cycle, as SLR ensures its exit plan and the sustainability of its work, “partnerships” will take on a new meaning as it focuses less on developing partnerships between SLR and local system actors, and more on facilitating long-term partnerships between the various actors in the local system themselves—with the changes in approaches and tools that this will entail.

Co-creation, partnerships, and adaptive work planning

While co-creation and partnerships will both remain important features of the SLR's technical design and implementation approach in FY 2022, the activities in this document follow a mix of approaches: many will depend on co-creating partnerships with local organizations, since this carries substantial promise of strengthening organizational and individual agency, and other activities will happen outside of partnerships, or without using co-creation.

This shifting mix is one of the foundations for how SLR will manage the implementation of this work plan adaptively. Some of what follows are clearly defined activities that the Activity expects to implement as described, natural disasters and the security situation allowing. Others, however, are more like first drafts—an initial idea of what might emerge from its co-creation efforts and a reflection of its overall strategy, but not a definitive prediction of what will happen and when. SLR's emphasis on partnerships and co-creation allows it to use adaptive management to rapidly adapt and iterate and reiterate ideas as it learns and the situation in Ituri evolves.

Co-creation roadmap and synopsis:

[mettre la titre de l'initiative de co-cr  ation ici / put co-creation effort title here]

1. R��sum�� d'initiative de co-cr��ation / Co-creation effort abstract
R��sum�� bref / Brief summary
[Quelle est la vision globale pour cette initiative de co-cr��ation? Sur quelles geographies et quels secteurs sera-t-elle focalis��e ? Comment est-elle connect��e avec les objectifs principaux de l'Activit�� R��silience ? Vous pouvez copier ou r��sumer du texte du plan de travail, si pertinent. / What is the overall vision for this co-creation effort? Where and in what sectors will it be focused? How does it tie in with the project's overall objectives? Consider copying or summarizing the relevant workplan text here, if appropriate.] (Partout dans ce document, il faut remplacer le texte soulign�� en jaune et entre parenth��ses carr��es avec vos id��es pour la co-cr��ation et enlever les textes de guides (comme celui-ci) entre parenth��ses ronds avant de soumettre pour approbation / Throughout this document, replace the highlighted yellow text in square brackets, and remove the guidance text (like this) in round brackets, before submitting for approval)
Objectifs globaux et impact sur la r��silience syst��mique / Overall objectives and impact on systemic resilience
[Sans des activit��s claires (et �� propos, si vous avez des activit��s d��j�� en t��te, vous devriez r��consid��rer si effectivement la m��thodologie de co-cr��ation est la meilleure ici), il est difficile de pr��d��finir des objectifs sp��cifiques. Essayez pourtant d'articuler les attentes de l'��quipe pour les aboutissements potentiels de cette initiative de co-cr��ation. Les objectifs globaux devraient ��tre connect��s clairement avec la r��silience syst��mique. / Without a clear set of activities yet (and if you have clear, well-defined activities, you should reconsider whether co-creation is appropriate), it is hard to predefine specific objectives. However, try to articulate what the team's expectations are for what this co-creation could lead to. The global objectives should be clearly connected to systemic resilience.]
Justification �� deployer des methodologies de co-cr��ation / Justification for use of co-creation method
[Fournissez une justification courte pour expliquer pourquoi la co-cr��ation sera la bonne m��thodologie pour atteindre ces objectifs, �� la diff��rence par exemple d'une s��rie de consultations avec la communaut�� suivie par un approvisionnement traditionnel dessin-offres-r��aliser / Write a short justification for why co-creation is an appropriate method to use to achieve this objectives, as opposed to example a series of community consultations followed by a design-bid-build approach.]

Approbation technique d'USAID / USAID technical approval	
[Documentez où (e.g. plan de travail annuel, concept note, etc.) USAID a donné son approbation technique pour les activités envisagées à sortir de cette initiative de co-crédation, ou expliquer en quel moment l'activité Résilience cherchera l'approbation / Document where (e.g. workplan, concept note, etc.) USAID has approved the activities expected to emerge from this co-creation effort, or explain when in the process the Activity will seek USAID approval.]	
Budget global approximatif / Approximate budget	
[Fournissez un budget global approximative (e.g. un chiffre rond du plan de travail, ou un montant maximum fixé par la direction) pour les activités qui pourront émerger de cette initiative de co-crédation / Provide an approximate budget (for instance, a lump-sum figure from the workplan, or a maximum budget set by project leadership) for the activities expected to emerge from this co-creation process.]	
Chronogramme global pour la co-crédation et réalisation des activités / Overall co-creation and implementation calendar	
[Résumez le calendrier global que vous envisagez pour le processus entier de la co-crédation, ainsi qu'une notion quand les « activités » vont commencer. La co-crédation peut être imprévisible mais c'est toujours important à commencer avec des idées comment vous comptez gérer le processus dans un temps réaliste ; suggestion : compléter le reste de cette co-creation roadmap et ensuite revenez ici pour le calendrier / Summarize the overall calendar you envision for the whole co-creation process, as well as a notional idea of when « activities » will begin. Co-creation can be unpredictable, but it's always important to start with an idea of how you plan to manage the process in a realistic amount of time; hint: complete the rest of this co-creation roadmap and then return here to do the calendar.]	
Mises à jour des hypothèses de co-crédation / Co-creation assumption updates	
<u>date</u>	<u>notes de mise à jour / update notes</u>
	(Dans chaque instance de « notes de mise à jour » dans ce document, après avoir fait approuver et signer le co-creation roadmap, vous allez retourner à cette version Word et chaque fois il y a un changement significatif (ou même un changement mineur que vous voulez documenter) dans les hypothèses du roadmap ou vos attentes pour comment allait dérouler le processus, dans l'esprit de « document vivant » vous ajoutez un rangé avec la date de l'observation et vous mettez quelques petites notes ou réflexions que vont ensemble servir comme l'éventuel co-creation <i>synopsis</i> ou résumé après conclusion du processus / In every « co-creation assumption updates » section throughout this document, after you have had the co-creation roadmap approved and signed, you will return to this in Word format and every time there is a significant change (or even a minor change that you want to document) in the assumptions of the roadmap or your expectations of how the co-creation process would unfold, you can, in the spirit of this « living document », add a row with the date of the change or observation and then add a few notes or reflections that will altogether serve as the eventual co-creation <i>synopsis</i> after the end of the process.)

2. Inclusion dans la co-cr��ation / Co-creation inclusivity	
Inclusion de la communaut�� dans le processus de co-cr��ation / Community inclusion in the co-creation process	
[Expliquez comment vous comptez inclure la communaut�� locale l�� o�� les activit��s ��ventuelles auront lieu dans le processus de co-cr��ation (n.b. leur inclusion dans la realization des activit��s appara��t en partie 7 ci-dessous) / Explain how the local community where activities will eventually take place will be included in the co-creation process (n.b. their inclusion in the <i>implementation</i> of activities will be covered in section 7).]	
L'accessibilit�� du processus de co-cr��ation aux partenaires non-traditionnels / Accessibility of co-creation process to non-traditional partners	
[Expliquez comment vous comptez rendre le processus de co-cr��ation accessible aux partenaires non-traditionnels, c'est-��-dire dans des secteurs qui n'ont pas l'habitude de travailler avec les bailleurs de fonds (e.g. certaines parties du secteur priv��) ou ne sont pas capable de r��pondre aux normes bureaucratiques des acteurs humanitaire et d��veloppement (e.g. des organisations locales sans staff d'une haute niveau d'��ducation) / Explain how you will make the co-creation process accessible to non-traditional partners, i.e. in sectors that don't usually work with large donors (e.g. certain parts of the private sector) or that are not able to respond to some of the more bureaucratic norms of the aid and development industry (e.g. local organisations without highly educated staff).]	
Inclusion des groupes marginalis��s dans le processus de co-cr��ation / Inclusion of marginalized groups in the co-creation process	
[Expliquez comment vous comptez inclure des groupes marginalis��s (e.g. femmes, jeunes, peuples autochtones, etc.) dans le processus de co-cr��ation / Explain how you intend to include marginalized groups (e.g. women, youth, indigenous peoples, etc.) in the co-creation process.]	
Strat��gies de mod��ration de r��unions pour encourager la participation des marginalis��s / Meeting-moderation strategies to encourage participation of marginalized groups	
[Consid��rez des pratiques sp��cifiques que vous allez utiliser dans des r��unions de co-cr��ation d'une ��chelle moyenne ou grande pour donner la parole expr��s aux marginalis��s qui sont souvent plus h��sitant parler dans de tels contextes. / Consider some specific tactics you commit to using during medium-sized or larger meetings to deliberately give a voice to marginalized groups when they are often more hesitant to speak up.]	
Mises �� jour des hypotheses de co-cr��ation / Co-creation assumption updates	
date	notes de mise �� jour / update notes

3. Exigences de compétition / Competition requirements
Niveau de compétition pour cette initiative de co-crédation / Appropriate level of competition for this co-creation effort : (cochez un des variants suivants ; check one of the following options) ☐ Ouverte / Open competition ☐ Restreinte / Restricted competition ☐ Sédlection unique / Sole source
Justification de niveau de compétition / Justification for level of competition [Justifiez le niveau de compétition que vous avez sélectionné. Faites référence à la partie 6 ci-dessous et, si vous avez sélectionné compétition restreinte ou sélection unique et vous comptez utiliser des contrats (e.g. PO, subk, etc.) avec des éventuels partenaires, consultez avec vos collègues dans les opérations pour assurez que votre justification sera suffisante pour les exigences du FAR 52.244-5 ("Competition in Subcontracting") / Justify the level of competition that you have selected. Refer to part 6 of this roadmap and, if you selected restricted competition or sole source and you expect to use contracts (e.g. a PO or subcontract) with eventual partners, consult with your operations colleagues to ensure your justification will be sufficient to meet the standards of FAR 52.244-5 ("Competition in Subcontracting").]
Promotion de la créativité et alliances dans la compétition / Stimulating creativity and alliances through the competitive process [Les incitations de la compétition peuvent stimuler l'innovation, la créativité, et même des nouvelles alliances pour développer une proposition gagnante. Quels sont des mesures que vous allez prendre dans le processus compétitif (en termes du format des sollicitations ou le forme de leur transmission, les critères d'évaluation et le format d'évaluation, etc.) pour stimuler la créativité et des nouvelles alliances entre les acteurs du système ? / The incentives from competition can stimulate innovation, creativity, and even new alliances in the aim of developing a winning proposal. What are some measures you will take in the competitive process (in terms of solicitation format or dissemination approach, evaluation criteria or evaluation format, etc.) to stimulate creativity and alliances between system actors?]
Promotion de la résilience dans la compétition / Stimulating resilience through the competitive process [Les incitations de la compétition peuvent aussi contribuer à certains aspects de la résilience (par exemple, un processus de compétition peuvent être un bon plateforme pour communiquer des messages aux écouteurs attentifs ; les préalables pour la compétition peuvent encourager certaines collaborations qui pourraient aboutir à une meilleur résilience ; et même l'acte de compétir peut être un moyen de répondre aux chocs et la pratique et participation dans la compétition peuvent augmenter cela. Quels sont des mesures que vous allez prendre dans le processus compétitif (en termes du format des sollicitations ou le forme de leur transmission, les critères d'évaluation et le format d'évaluation, etc.) pour stimuler la résilience dans les acteurs du système ? / The incentives from competition can also stimulate to certain resilience capabilities (for example, a competitive process can be a good messaging platform for attentive participants; competition requirements can encourage collaborations that contribute to resilience; and even the act of competing can itself be a resilience capacity, a way to respond to shocks, so practice engaging in a competitive process and increase that capacity. What are some measures you will take in the

competitive process (in terms of solicitation format or dissemination approach, evaluation criteria or evaluation format, etc.) to stimulate resilience among system actors?]	
Mises à jour des hypothèses de co-création / Co-creation assumption updates	
<u>date</u>	<u>notes de mise à jour / update notes</u>
Pour le résumé de co-création / For the co-creation synopsis : Liste de documents de compétition (e.g. AML, notes conceptuelles, évaluations, appels d'offre, propositions, etc.) en annexe / Liste of competition records (e.g. calls for EOIs, concept notes, evaluation records, RFPs, proposals, etc.) in annex	
(complétez cette liste quand vous préparez le résumé de co-création / complete this list when you are preparing the co-creation synopsis)	
•	

4. Structure de co-création / Co-creation format

Structures ou modalités de co-création anticipés / Anticipated co-creation formats or modalities

(cochez une ou plusieurs des boîtes suivantes)

- ☐ Formations ou événements de sensibilisation / Training or informational events
- ☐ Séances de co-création bilatérale / Bilateral co-creation sessions
- ☐ Séances de co-création multilatérale facilitée par SLR / Facilitated multilateral co-creation sessions
- ☐ Ateliers formels de co-création / Formal co-creation workshops
- ☐ Autre / other : _____

Détails sur les structures (facultatif) / Details on format (optional)

[Ajoutez des détails ici si vous avez des idées spécifiques sur la structure ou séquence des événements de co-création ; mais vous pouvez aussi laisser cette partie vide si vous n'avez rien à ajouter / Give details on specific co-creation structure or sequence ideas if you have them ; but you may also leave this space blank if you've nothing to add.]

Promotion de la créativité et alliances dans les structures de co-création / Stimulating creativity and alliances through the co-creation format

[La stimulation des idées créatives et des alliances non-traditionnelles a été toujours un objectif important de la co-création. Quels sont des mesures que vous allez incorporer dans les structures de co-création pour stimuler la créativité et des nouvelles alliances entre les acteurs du système ? / Stimulation creative ideas and non-traditional partnerships has always been an important part of co-creation. What are some measures you will take in the format of your co-creation events to stimulate creativity and alliances between system actors?]

Promotion de la résilience dans les structures de co-création / Stimulating resilience through the co-creation format

[L'objectif global de l'activité Résilience est de stimuler la résilience en est de la RDC. Le format du co-création devrait prendre ça en compte. Quels sont des structures ou tactiques dans cette initiative de co-création qui pourraient stimuler la résilience dans les acteurs du système ? / The overall objective of the Resilience Activity is, indeed, to increase systemic resilience in the eastern DRC. The format of co-creation events and structures should take that into account. What are some things you can incorporate into the co-creation format to stimulate resilience among system actors?]

Mises à jour des hypothèses de co-création / Co-creation assumption updates	
date	notes de mise à jour / update notes

Pour le résumé de co-création / For the co-creation synopsis :
Liste de documents de réunions, ateliers, négociations, etc., en annexe / Liste of meeting, workshop, negotiation, and other records in annex

(complétez cette liste quand vous préparez le résumé de co-création / complete this list when you are preparing the co-creation synopsis)

-

5. Critères de sélection / Selection factors	
Critères de sélection illustratifs / Illustrative selection factors	
[Mettez ici des critères de sélection que vous pourriez utiliser pour évaluer les propositions, les pitch, les discussions, les capacités, les expériences, etc. des participants dans l'initiative de co-création / Place here some factors you could use to evaluation proposals, pitches, discussions, capacities, experiences, etc. of participants in this co-creation effort.]	
Approche à l'évaluation / Evaluation approach	
[Quelle sera votre approche pour évaluer les idées qui sortent de cette initiative de co-création ? Réfléchissez quand (suggestion : plusieurs tours d'évaluation, chacun de format différent, pour permettre l'itération et la « self-selection »), comment, avec qui, et dans quel format vous allez évaluer les idées. Considérez aussi des défis épistémologiques possibles dans la tâche d'évaluation. / What approach do you have in mind for evaluating ideas that emerge from this co-creation effort? Think about when (suggestion: multiple rounds of evaluation, in different formats, to allow for iteration and self-selection), how, with whom, and in what format you will evaluate ideas. Consider also potential epistemological challenges in the task of evaluating ideas.]	
Evaluations de la capacité institutionnelle des partenaires potentiels / Institutional capacity evaluations of potential partners	
[Quand et comment comptez-vous évaluer la capacité institutionnelle des partenaires potentiels ? Comment est-ce que ça va informer la séquence de la co-création ? / When and how do you plan to evaluate the institutional capacity of potential partners? How will that inform or feed back into the sequence of co-creation events and decision-making?]	
Équité (et perception d'équité) du processus de sélection / Fairness (and perception of fairness) in the selection process	
[Comment vous allez assurer que votre approche de sélectionner des idées et des partenaires éventuels soit juste et perçu comme juste ? / How will you ensure that your approach to selecting ideas and eventual partners is both fair and perceived as fair?]	
Mises à jour des hypothèses de co-création / Co-creation assumption updates	
<u>date</u>	<u>notes de mise à jour / update notes</u>

6. Mécanismes de partenariat anticipés / Anticipated partnership mechanisms

Mécanismes de partenariat illustratifs / Illustrative partnership mechanisms

(cochez tous les mécanismes de partenariat que vous envisagez / check all mechanisms that you envision using)

- ☐ Partenariats sans accords formels écrits / Partnerships without formal written agreements
- ☐ Protocoles d'accord ou autres document non contraignant qui ne transfère pas ni fonds ni obligations légales / Memoranda of understanding or other non-binding agreements that transfer neither funds nor contractual obligations
- ☐ Achat de biens ou services d'un tiers, sur la base d'un processus de compétition *séparé de cette processus de co-crédation*, pour utiliser au cours des activités et/ou disposer aux partenaires / Purchase of goods or services from a third party on the basis of a *separate competitive process* for use in the implementation of the activity and/or to dispose directly to partners

Si oui, exemple(s) : _____
(If yes, example(s))

- ☐ Embauche de consultants indépendants pour soutenir les activités ou fournir d'appui aux partenaires / Hiring of independent consultants to support activities or coach partners
- ☐ Embauche de personnel, consultants indépendants, et/ou stagiaires pour allouer ou détacher au partenaire pour travailler au sein de leur organisation / Hire staff, independent consultants, and/or interns to allocate or second to partners to work embedded in their organisations

Si oui, exemple(s) : _____
(If yes, example(s))

- ☐ Contractualiser directement avec un partenaire impliqué dans ce processus de co-crédation pour exécuter des activités, avec ce processus de co-crédation comme base de compétition et sélection / Contract directly with a partner emerging from this co-creation process, with this co-creation process as the basis for justifying competition and selection
- ☐ Contractualiser directement avec un partenaire impliqué dans ce processus de co-crédation pour exécuter des activités, avec une *autre processus de compétition* comme base de sélection / Contract directly with a partner emerging from this co-creation process, with a *separate competitive process* justifying selection

Si oui, exemple(s) : _____
(If yes, example(s))

Mises à jour des hypothèses de co-crédation / Co-creation assumption updates

date	notes de mise à jour / update notes

7. Inclusion dans la réalisation des activités / Implementation inclusivity	
Inclusion de la communauté dans la réalisation éventuelle des activités / Community inclusion in the subsequent implementation of activities	
[Expliquez comment la communauté locale là où les activités éventuelles auront lieu pourra s'intégrer dans la réalisation de ces activités ?] / Explain how the local community where activities will eventually take place can be integrated into implementation.]	
L'inclusion des partenaires non-traditionnels dans la réalisation éventuelle des activités / Inclusion of non-traditional partners in subsequent activity implementation	
[Expliquez comment partenaires non-traditionnels pourront s'intégrer dans la réalisation des activités éventuelles ?] / Explain how non-traditional partners can be integrated into eventual activity implementation.]	
Inclusion des groupes marginalisés dans le la réalisation éventuelle des activités / Inclusion of marginalized groups in subsequent activity implementation	
[Expliquez comment des membres des groupes marginalisés pourront s'intégrer dans la réalisation des activités éventuelles ?] / Explain how members of marginalized groups can be integrated into eventual activity implementation.]	
Implications de l'inclusion dans les activités pour ce processus de co-crédation / Implications of implementation inclusivity for this co-creation process	
[Réfléchissez sur la vision de réalisation des activités éventuelles qui émerge de ces questions sur l'inclusion. Est-ce qu'il y a des aspects du processus de co-crédation (autre qu'assurer son inclusivité comme décrite dans partie 2 ci-dessus) que vous pouvez changer ou gérer spécifiquement pour augmenter l'inclusion dans la mise en œuvre des idées qui en émergent ?] / Reflect on the vision of activity implementation that emerges from these questions on inclusion. Are there aspects of the co-creation process (other than ensuring the process itself is inclusive as described in part 2 above) that you can change or manage specifically with the goal of increasing the inclusivity in the implementation of the ideas that emerge?]	
Mises à jour des hypotheses de co-crédation / Co-creation assumption updates	
date	notes de mise à jour / update notes

8. Impact environnemental / Environmental impact	
Impact positif potentiel sur l'environnement physique ou social / Potential positive impact on the physical or social environment	
[Envisagez des impacts positifs potentiels qui pourrait émerger des activités co-crées dans ce processus pourraient apporter à l'environnement / Imagine some of the potential positive impacts that co-created activities could have on the environment.]	
Impact négatif potentiel sur l'environnement physique ou social / Potential negative impact on the physical or social environment	
[Envisagez des impacts négatifs potentiels qui pourrait émerger des activités co-crées dans ce processus pourraient apporter à l'environnement / Imagine some of the potential negative impacts that co-created activities could have on the environment.]	
Détermination potentielle de l'examen initial d'impact environnemental (IEE) pour les éventuelles activités / Potential initial environmental examination (IEE) determination for activities	
(cochez une boîte pour chaque détermination pour laquelle vous pouvez envisager une activité potentielle correspondante / check the box next to each determination for which you can imagine an eventual corresponding activity)	
☐ Categorical exclusion	
☐ Negative determination	
☐ Negative determination with conditions	
☐ Positive determination	
Commentaires: _____	
Mesures de mitigation potentiels de l'EMMP / Potential mitigation measures from EMMP	
[Consultez le EMMP du projet et identifier des mesures de mitigation qui pourrait potentiellement être obligatoires pour les activités qui émergent de cette initiative de co-création / Consult the project EMMP and identify mitigation measures that could potentially need be included for activities emerging from this co-creation effort.]	
Chronologie pour la catégorisation des activités / Timing for environmental screening	
[Indiquez le moment dans votre chronogramme où vous comptez faire la catégorisation des activités en termes environnementaux / Indicate when in the process you plan to conduct environmental screening of your activities.]	
Mises à jour des hypothèses de co-création / Co-creation assumption updates	
<u>date</u>	<u>notes de mise à jour / update notes</u>

9. La co-création continue / Continuous co-creation

La co-création continue dans les activités éventuelles /

Continuous co-creation in eventual activities

Cette roadmap de co-création discute les aspects du processus de co-création jusqu'au début de la phase de « réalisation des activités » ; cependant, la co-création des solutions aux contraintes systémiques et des changements des mentalités et alliances qui aboutissent à la résilience systémique continue tout au long de « l'implémentation », grâce à l'apprentissage et adaptation. Voici nous présentons quelques moyens spécifiques qui permettent les activités qui émergent de ce processus à intégrer ce genre de co-création continue, même pendant la réalisation des activités. / This co-creation roadmap covers the parts of the co-creation process that lead up to the beginning of "activity implementation"; however, co-creation of solutions to system failures and of changes to mentalities and alliances that lead to systemic resilience continues throughout "implementation", as we and our partners learn and adapt. Here, we offer some specific ways that activities emerging from this co-creation effort can incorporate this kind of continuous co-creation, even as we implement and complete activities.

[Réfléchissez sur le paragraphe ci-dessus et essayez de proposer des moyens spécifiques de prolonger la mentalité de la co-création tout au long de la mise en œuvre des activités (et après !) / Think about the paragraph above and try to propose specific ways that we can extend the co-creation mentality all the way through activity implementation (and beyond!).]

Implications pour ce processus de co-création /

Implications for this co-creation process

[Réfléchissez sur la vision de réalisation des activités éventuelles qui émerge de cette question sur la co-création continue. Est-ce qu'il y a des aspects du processus de co-création que vous pouvez changer ou gérer spécifiquement pour augmenter cet esprit de co-création dans la mise en œuvre des idées qui en émergent ? /

Reflect on the vision of activity implementation that emerges from this question about continuous co-creation. Are there aspects of the co-creation process that you can change or manage specifically with the goal of increasing this spirit of continuous co-creation in the implementation of the ideas that emerge?]

Mises à jour des hypothèses de co-création / Co-creation assumption updates

date	notes de mise à jour / update notes

Pour le résumé de co-création / For the co-creation synopsis :

Vision de durabilité pour activités co-crées (« plan de sortie ») /

Vision for sustainability of co-created activities ("exit plan")

[Après avoir développé des activités concrètes selon le co-creation roadmap, résumez ici votre vision pour la durabilité des activités ou des mentalités co-crées, et comment l'activité Résilience peut s'en sortir en bon facilitateur / After developing concrete activities using this co-creation roadmap, summarize here your vision for sustainability of activities or mentalities, and especially how the Resilience Activity can withdraw from the system as a good facilitator.]

10. Suivi et évaluation pour l'adaptation et apprentissage / Monitoring and evaluation for adaptation and learning
Résultats anticipés des activités éventuelles / Anticipated results of emerging activities
• [Compléter en consultation avec le suivi et évaluation / Complete these with the M&E team] •
Données nécessaires pour suivre le progrès des activités éventuelles vers ces résultats / Data necessary for monitoring the progress of emerging activities towards results
• [Compléter en consultation avec le suivi et évaluation / Complete these with the M&E team] •
Outils et procédures pour collecter les données nécessaires / Tools and procedures for collecting the necessary data
• [Compléter en consultation avec le suivi et évaluation / Complete these with the M&E team] •
Etudes nécessaires / Studies or assessments needed
• [Compléter en consultation avec le suivi et évaluation / Complete these with the M&E team] •
Partenaires et autres acteurs impliqués dans la collecte de données et suivi / Partners and other actors involved in data-collection and monitoring
• [Compléter en consultation avec le suivi et évaluation / Complete these with the M&E team] •
Eléments d'apprentissage probable / Likely learning objectives
• [Compléter en consultation avec le suivi et évaluation / Complete these with the M&E team] •
Mécanismes de redevabilité probables et contributions à l'apprentissage / Likely mechanisms for accountability and their contributions to learning
[Quels sont les mécanismes de gestion, surveillance, feedback, etc. qui seront incorporé dans l'activité pour assurer la redevabilité à DAI ou (surtout) à la communauté ou aux partenaires locaux ? Est-ce que nous pouvons les adapter pour aussi contribuer à l'apprentissage ? / What are some management, oversight, feedback, etc. mechanisms that will be incorporated into the activity to ensure accountability to DAI or (especially) to the community or local partners? Can we adapt those mechanisms so that they also contribute meaningfully to learning?]
Pratiques et évènements d'apprentissage formels / Formal learning practices and events
• [Compléter en consultation avec le suivi et évaluation / Complete these with the M&E team] •

Amplification des motivations pour l'apprentissage /

Amplifying incentives for learning

Il est primordial que nous dessinions nos partenariats en vue d'identifier et amplifier les motivations naturelles de nos partenaires à valoriser l'apprentissage (les organisations qui priorise l'apprentissage sont plus flexible face aux changements et souvent plus résilient à l'imprévisible) ; nous devrions aussi éviter que nos contributions aux partenariats diminuent les motivations pour l'apprentissage (par exemple, si nos contributions voilent les réalités économiques ou permettent un partenaire de ne pas tenir en compte des informations importantes). Voici quelques façons dont nos partenariats peuvent se structurer pour harmoniser les objectifs d'apprentissage entre nous et nos partenaires, ainsi qu'avec les motivations naturelles vers l'apprentissage qui viennent du système. / It is important that our eventual partnerships be structured so that they identify and amplify the natural incentives for our partners to value learning (organizations that prioritize learning are more adaptable to changing conditions and usually more resilient to the unpredictable); similarly, we should be careful that our contributions to our partnerships do not diminish the incentives for learning (for example, by masking an economic reality or permitting a partner to ignore important inputs). Here are some ways our partnerships can be structured to harmonize learning objectives between us and our partners and align them with the natural incentives for learning that exist in the system.

[Réfléchissez sur les motivations pour l'apprentissage dans le système (et des motivations contre l'apprentissage !). Comment est-ce que nous pouvons organiser les activités qui émergent de cette initiative de co-crédation pour amplifier ces motivations ? Par exemple, est-ce qu'il y a des opportunités de montrer au partenaire la valeur de l'apprentissage et les outils et pratiques qui le permettent ? Rendre visible des bénéfices économiques ou sociales que le partenaire peut obtenir s'il adopte une culture d'apprentissage chez lui ? Et ensuite, en revanche, est-ce que nos contributions potentielles risquent de masquer ou minimiser la valeur naturelle d'apprentissage ? Comment éviter cette éventualité ? N.b. cette question est souvent plus facile vers la fin du processus de co-crédation lorsque les activités et les contributions sont plus claires ; vous pouvez compter mettre ça dans les éventuelles mises à jour des hypothèses, mais essayer de pronostiquer quelques possibilités si vous pouvez en imaginer /

Reflect on the aspects of the system that incentivize learning (and disincentivize learning!). How can we organize activities emerging from this co-creation process to amplify these incentives? For example, will there be opportunities to show our partner the value of learning and of learning tools and practices? Can we make more visible the social or economic benefits a partner can derive from adopting a learning culture? Then, on the other hand, are there potential contributions from our side that risk masking or minimizing the natural value of learning for the partner? How can we avoid that? N.b. this question is often easier towards the end of the co-creation process, when activities and contributions are clearer; you can plan on putting this in the eventual assumption updates below, but try to forecast some hypothetical scenarios if you can.]

Implications pour ce processus de co-crédation /

Implications for this co-creation process

[Réfléchissez sur la vision de suivi, évaluation, et apprentissage des activités éventuelles. Est-ce qu'il y a des aspects du processus de co-crédation qui peuvent contribuer à réaliser cette vision ? / Reflect on the vision of monitoring, evaluation, and learning for eventual activities. Are there aspects of this co-creation that can contribute to making that vision a reality?]

Mises à jour des hypothèses de co-crédation / Co-creation assumption updates

date	notes de mise à jour / update notes

11. Effets de levier en partenariats / Leverage in partnerships	
Attentes de contributions locales en expertise technique ou connaissance locale / Expectations for leveraging technical expertise or local knowledge	
[Mettez ici des attentes (si vous en avez déjà) pour les contributions locales potentielles que vous espérez avoir en termes d'expertise technique ou connaissance locale. / Place here your expectations (if you have any specifics) for potential local contributions you hope to leverage in terms of technical expertise or local knowledge.]	
Attentes de contributions locales en relations ou réseautage / Expectations for leveraging relationships or networks	
[Mettez ici des attentes (si vous en avez déjà) pour les contributions locales potentielles que vous espérez avoir en termes de relations ou réseautage. / Place here your expectations (if you have any specifics) for potential local contributions you hope to leverage in terms of networks and relationships.]	
Attentes de contributions locales en en nature / Expectations for leveraging in-kind contributions	
[Mettez ici des attentes (si vous en avez déjà) pour les contributions locales potentielles que vous espérez avoir en nature. / Place here your expectations (if you have any specifics) for potential in-kind local contributions you hope to leverage.]	
Attentes de contributions locales en termes de financement / Expectations for leveraging financial resources and contributions	
[Mettez ici des attentes (si vous en avez déjà) pour les contributions locales potentielles que vous espérez avoir en termes de financement. / Place here your expectations (if you have any specifics) for potential local financial contributions you hope to leverage.]	
Besoins de contributions d'acteurs d'extérieur / Needs for outside leverage	
[Si vous en avez déjà une idée, indiquez des besoins anticipés pour des contributions « en effet de levier » des acteurs d'extérieur / If you already have ideas about what kinds of outside leverage you may need, place them here.]	
Implications pour ce processus de co-création / Implications for this co-creation process	
[Réfléchissez sur vos besoins anticipés en termes de contributions « en effet de levier » ; comment structurer le processus de co-création pour faciliter qu'ils émergent ? / Reflect on your need for leverage; how can you structure the co-creation process to facilitate that leverage to emerge ?]	
Mises à jour des hypothèses de co-création / Co-creation assumption updates	
date	notes de mise à jour / update notes

12. Ressources de l'activité Résilience / Resilience Activity resources

Rôle des membres-clés de l'équipe dans le processus de co-création / Role of key team members in the co-creation process

- [Indiquez chaque membre d'équipe avec un rôle clé dans ce processus de co-création et décrire en bref ce qu'il va faire ; **suggestion** : valider cette responsabilité avec tes collègues avant de soumettre le roadmap pour approbation ! / Put here each member of the Resilience Activity team with a key rôle in the co-creation process and describe briefly what they will do ; **hint** : check with your colleagues on this list before you submit the roadmap for approval!]

Rôle des membres-clés de l'équipe dans la réalisation des activités éventuelles / Role of key team members in eventual activity implementation

- [Indiquez chaque membre d'équipe avec un rôle clé dans la réalisation des éventuelles activités et décrire en bref ce qu'il va faire ; **suggestion** : revalider cette responsabilité avec tes collègues à la fin, avant de soumettre le synopsis pour approbation ! / Put here each member of the Resilience Activity team with a key rôle in eventual activity implementation, and describe briefly what they will do ; **hint** : double check with your colleagues on this list before you submit the synopsis for approval!]

Budget illustratif avec désagrégation / Approximate disaggregated budget

[Jusqu'à faisable, essayez de développer un budget approximatif si possible pour les différentes activités qui peuvent sortir de ce processus, selon le format convenable / As much as possible, try to develop an approximate budget for the different activités that may emerge from this process, in any convenient format.]

Planification d'approvisionnement préliminaire / Preliminary procurement planning

Au cours de la réalisation des activités qui émergent de cette initiative de co-création, il est envisageable que l'activité Résilience va s'approvisionner de(s)... / During the implementation of activities emerging from this co-creation process, it is likely that the Resilience Activity will need to procure...

(cochez toutes les boîtes applicables / check all applicable boxes)

- [] Biens "non-consommable" / Non-expendable items (valeur par unité supérieur à 500 USD, durabilité de minimum deux ans, et pas composant d'un autre bien / unit cost above \$500, minimum two-year working life, and not a component part of another item)

Si oui, exemple(s) : _____
(If yes, example(s))

- [] Equipement ICT / ICT equipment (*défini comme "toute technologie qui envoie ou reçoit des données" / defined as "any technology item that sends or receives data"*)

Si oui, exemple(s) : _____
(If yes, example(s))

- [] Véhicules motorisés / Motor vehicles

Si oui, exemple(s) : _____
(If yes, example(s))

- [] Produits ou intrants agricoles / Agricultural commodities

Si oui, exemple(s) : _____
(If yes, example(s))

- [] Autres éléments restreints / Other restricted commodities (*Équipement militaire, équipement de surveillance, produits et services pour le soutien de la police ou d'autres activités d'application de la loi, équipement d'avortement, produits de luxe, équipement de jeu, équipement de modification du temps / Military equipment, surveillance equipment, commodities and services for support of police or other law enforcement activities, abortion equipment, luxury goods, gambling equipment, weather modification equipment*)

Si oui, exemple(s) : _____
(If yes, example(s))

- [] Achats ou contrats de grande échelle / Large purchases or contracts (*valeur par contrat supérieure à 100,000 USD / any single contract above \$100,000*)

Si oui, exemple(s) : _____
(If yes, example(s))

Approvisionnements et recrutements nécessaires pour le processus de co-crédation / Procurements and recruitments needed for the co-creation process itself

[Dépenses spéciales pour faciliter le processus de co-crédation en soi ? / Particular expenses that will be needed for the co-creation process itself?]

Mises à jour des hypotheses de co-crédation / Co-creation assumption updates

<u>date</u>	<u>notes de mise à jour / update notes</u>

SUPPLEMENTARY WORKPLAN REFERENCE:
CO-CREATION ROADMAP AND SYNOPSIS TEMPLATE (ENGLISH & FRENCH)

13. Chronogramme illustratif / Illustrative timeline	
Chronogramme / Timeline	
(Complétez un chronogramme du processus anticipé de la co-création, selon un format convenable (e.g. Gantt chart, liste d'étapes avec dates, calendrier traditionnel, etc.). N'oubliez pas inclure le lancement des processus formels de recrutement ou approvisionnement qui seront nécessaire pour permettre les contributions de l'Activité Résilience d'arriver à l'heure / Complete a simple timeline of the anticipated co-creation process in a convenient format (e.g. Gantt chart, simple list of dates and activities, traditional calendar, etc.). Do not forget to include when you may need to begin formal procurement or recruitment processes in order for Resilience Activity contributions to be ready in time for activity implementation to begin.)	
Implication des jours fériés, congé, et autres activités de programme fixées pour le calendrier de co-création / Impact of holidays, staff leave, or other fixed project activities on the timeline for this co-creation process	
[Complétez selon les informations préalables sur les fériés, congé du staff, évènements qui exigent l'implication de beaucoup de staff, livrables (e.g. plans de travail, rapports trimestriels, etc.) qui vont contraindre la disponibilité de staff pour suivre ce processus / Complete with the necessary information on holidays, staff leave, events requiring participation of many staff, deliverables (think workplans, quarterly reports, etc.) that could constrain the availability of project staff for working on this co-creation process.]	
Dates clés du calendrier agricole pendant le processus de co-création / Key dates in the agricultural calendar during the co-creation process	
[Complétez selon les informations préalables / Complete with the necessary information.]	
Impact du calendrier agricole sur le plan des éventuelles activités / Impact of the agricultural calendar on the timing of eventual activities	
[Complétez selon les informations préalables / Complete with the necessary information.]	
Mises à jour des hypotheses de co-création / Co-creation assumption updates	
<u>date</u>	<u>notes de mise à jour / update notes</u>

SUPPLEMENTARY WORKPLAN REFERENCE:
CO-CREATION ROADMAP AND SYNOPSIS TEMPLATE (ENGLISH & FRENCH)

14. Approbations / Approvals

Type d'approbation

(cochez une seule boîte, selon le type d'approbation sollicitée / check the box corresponding to the type of approval sought)

Je, sous-signé(e), soumetts ce(tte)... / I, undersigned, submit this...

()

☐ ...co-crédation roadmap...

☐ ...mise à jour au co-crédation roadmap... / ...course correction to the co-crédation roadmap...

☐ ...résumé final de co-crédation avec toutes mises à jours notées et annexes complets... / ...final co-crédation synopsis with all updates noted and annexes completed...

...pour approbation afin de passer aux prochaines étapes de partenariats et activités /

...for approval to progress to the next steps of partnerships and activities.

Nom et titre de la personne responsable pour le processus de co-crédation :

Name and title of the person responsible for this co-crédation process:

[nom/name, titre] :

(signature)

(date)

Commentaires de la personne qui le soumet pour approbation (facultatif) /

Comments of person submitting for approval (optional)

[Si utile, ajouter des commentaires pour l'approuveur ou contexte à titre de référence à l'avenir concernant l'approbation / Add comments for the approver or context for future reference if needed.]

Approbation / Approval

Nom et titre de la personne responsable pour approuver les co-crédation roadmap et résumés selon le PSOA :

Name and title of the person responsible for approving co-crédation roadmaps and synopses, per the PSOA:

[nom/name, titre] :

(signature)

(date)

Commentaires de l'approuveur (facultatif) / Approver comments (optional)

Facultatif pour le résumé de co-crédation / Optional for the co-crédation synopsis :

Liste de processus d'approvisionnement et recrutement liés à cette co-crédation, si déjà prévisibles / List of procurement and recruitment processes linked to this co-crédation effort, if already foreseen or in progress

- *[facultatif : si vous avez déjà des approvisionnements ou recrutements en cours (ou en attente d'approbation) en fonction de cette initiative de co-crédation, vous pouvez les indiquer ici pour faciliter la connexion avec le synopsis de co-crédation / optional : if you already have procurements or recruitments in progress (or pending approval) resulting from this co-crédation effort, you can list them here to facilitate the connection with the co-crédation synopsis.]*

Rubrique pour la dépense des fonds d'activités « en facilitation »

ou : comment l'activité Résilience peut-elle dépenser son argent en tant que facilitateur et catalyseur ?

But de dépense	Qu'est-ce que c'est ?	Qu'est-ce que ce n'est pas ?	Quels sont des exemples de ce genre de dépense ?	Comment justifier que la dépense se fait en accord avec les principes de facilitation ?
Dépenses non catalytiques				
Répondre aux besoins de gestion opérationnelle et technique du programme	Dépenses qui soutiennent l'infrastructure physique, contractuelle, et humaine d'un programme de facilitation pour qu'il puisse catalyser des changements systémiques	Dépenses en vue d'obtenir quelque chose (e.g. biens ou services pour réalisations d'activités) qui fait partie du cours normal de la vie des acteurs du système	- Salaires d'agents, loyer de bureau - Voyages de reconnaissance, lancement, ou gestion des activités - Suivi, évaluation, ou rapportage pour répondre principalement aux exigences du client	Montrez que nous avons besoin de cette dépense pour l'opération normale de notre programme et que la dépense ne va pas figurer dans les besoins du système après le départ de notre programme.
Développer de bonnes relations, confiance, et moment pour permettre des activités catalytiques	Dépenses petites, ponctuelles, idéalement non répétées, et surtout, <i>rare</i> s qui établissent de la confiance entre le programme et le partenaire et dynamisent les activités catalytiques qui suivent <u>sans créer des distorsions</u> dans le système <u>ni des attentes néfastes</u> dans le partenariat	Dépenses qui compensent pour des faiblesses ou manque de volonté d'un partenaire pour investir selon son propre rôle dans le système lui exige Des dépenses qui achèvent des résultats voulus par « force brute » ; ou du « free stuff »	- Communications stratégiques pour mobiliser d'intérêt dans notre programme et approche - Petits coûts de voyage pour du staff de partenaires potentiels - Quantités petites de matériaux pour concrétiser une idée pour un partenaire - Assistance technique pour aider un partenaire à développer une idée pour un partenariat à venir	Contextualisez la dépense comme acte de bonne volonté ; donnez exemples où le partenaire fait pareil pour nous. Montrez que la dépense n'est pas vue par le partenaire comme un « investissement » de la part de DAI. Justifiez que le partenaire ne va pas attendre que nous continuions à soutenir ce genre de dépense.
Dépenses catalytiques				
Réduire le risque pour un acteur de système de tester ou adopter une innovation ou nouvelle alliance	Dépenses qui réduisent le risque d'une pratique ou alliance innovatrice à un niveau acceptable au partenaire en vue que le partenaire accepte le risque une fois réduit avec plus d'information	Dépenses pour accélérer quelque chose le système fait déjà, en vue d'obtenir un résultat plus rapidement Subventions qui répliquent quelque chose qui a réussi déjà dans un milieu pareil (il y a autres manières de stimuler l'extension des innovations réussites.)	Le risque c'est l'absence d'information. Plusieurs types d'intervention peuvent faire manifester d'information : - Etudes <i>pertinentes</i> aux choix des acteurs du système - Communications stratégiques (e.g. plaidoyer) pour changer mentalités - Pilotes de nouvelles technologies, processus, ou alliances - Subventions pour expérimenter avec une innovation	Le risque d'échec ne peut pas être cent pour cent. Quantifiez le risque et insiste que le partenaire en accepte une partie. Garantissez que nos contributions ne faussent pas les incitations. Montrez vos hypothèses et un « exit plan » clairs. Envisagez comment le partenaire pourra expérimenter avec nouveaux risques à l'avenir sans notre appui.
Se substituer temporairement pour un acteur permanent du système pour catalyser des changements systémiques	Dépenses qui répondent à un besoin dans le système quand l'acteur permanent qui devraient y répondre n'est pas encore prêt mais il faut quand même faciliter le début d'un changement auprès des autres acteurs	Dépenses qui achèvent des résultats à grande échelle qui dépasse des résultats similaires mais plus modeste que peuvent réaliser les acteurs permanents avec un peu d'appui en réduction de risque ou autre facilitation	- Collecter et fournir des informations de marché - Faciliter des dialogues entre acteurs dans le système pour résoudre un problème - Subventionner un bien public pour stimuler l'appréciation du tel	Incorporez <i>toujours</i> l'acteur (ou acteurs possibles) qui va éventuellement jouer ce rôle dans vos activités dès le début. Soyez un substitut réaliste (e.g. que les prix etc. que nous allons payer sont en ligne avec ce que l'acteur permanent pourra éventuellement payer).