



PAEPARD



Findings from the sector and multi-stakeholder consultations conducted in the framework of PAEPARD between 2010 and 2012



Julie Flament, Denis Félicité-Zulma, Jonas Mugabe and Rémi Kahane

table of contents

INTRODUCTION	3	. Methodology used	20
. Toward a participatory approach	3	. Questions and recommendations	20
. The process of sector and multi-stakeholder consultations within the PAEPARD	4	. Federating themes	21
SECTOR CONSULTATIONS	5	. Concept notes presented during the workshop	21
Findings of the consultation of European NGOs	5	. Capacity building and development of North-South university networks in training on research methodology	21
. Consultation process, objectives and themes addressed	5	. Management of the contamination of the maize sector by aflatoxin	21
. Main findings	5	Findings of the first European multi-stakeholder consultation	21
Findings of the consultation of the European private sector	11	. Consultation process, objectives and themes addressed	21
. Consultation process, objectives and themes addressed	11	. Main findings	22
. Main findings	12	Findings of the second European multi-stakeholder consultation ...	27
Findings of the consultation with European research organisations	14	. Consultation process, objectives and themes addressed	27
. Consultation process, objectives and themes addressed	14	. Main findings	28
. Main findings	14	SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS OF THE CONSULTATIONS	29
MULTI-STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATIONS	15	Key elements of the consultations by groups of stakeholders in Africa and Europe: foundations for future innovative partnership processes	29
Findings of the multi-stakeholder consultations in East Africa	15	. Necessary steps for building an innovative partnership process	29
. Results of the online consultation	15	. The stakeholders in a partnership	30
. Lessons learned from partnerships with non-researchers	15	. Ways to be developed for making the partnership more sustainable	32
. Lessons learned from partnerships with researchers	15	Difficulties and obstacles facing partnerships	33
. Partnerships considered as innovative	16	. Lack of understanding of stakeholders' professions	33
. The challenge of multi-stakeholder partnerships	16	. Time constraints	33
. Areas of interest for future multi-stakeholder partnerships ...	16	. Compartmentalisation and the obligation of publication	34
Findings of the multi-stakeholder consultations in Central Africa ...	16	. Scarcity of funding	34
. Context and objectives of the Yaoundé meeting	16	. The primacy of individual over collective interest	34
. Construction and management of multi-stakeholder partnerships	17	. Availability of skills within partner organisations	34
. Priority areas for agricultural research for development	17	. Language barriers	34
. Mobilisation of non-scientific stakeholders	17	The contribution of the PAEPARD: a response to the partnership innovation deficit	35
. Identification of African institutions with which to raise awareness	18	. Operators learning about partnership	35
Findings of the multi-stakeholder consultations in West Africa ...	18	. Consultation at the heart of teaching	35
. Experiences of multi-stakeholder partnerships in the sub-region	18	. Consultation: an innovative element	36
. Mechanisms to strengthen or put in place to allow producers to control the research system	18	RECOMMENDATIONS	36
. Mechanisms and tools to put in place to ensure the funding of innovation platforms	18	. CONCLUDING REMARKS	36
. Organisation and capacity building for stakeholders	19	. Input from the PAEPARD's consultations on the construction of partnerships	36
. The role of advocacy	19	. Consultations: what perspectives for the future?	37
. Findings and lessons learned	19	LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	39
Findings of the regional African multi-stakeholder consultation ..	19		
. Context of the consultation	19		
. Objectives and expected results of the consultation	19		



Introduction

Towards a more participatory research

In 2003, African Heads of State and Government endorsed the 'Maputo Declaration', adopting the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP). This programme, aimed at the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDG), focused on food security, access to markets and reduction of poverty in Africa in general.

The CAADP is based on the strategic focuses of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), centred around the reduction in poverty and achievement of the MDGs. Research is the fourth 'pillar' of the CAADP, but its contribution remains controversial as its findings have often remained locked up in research institutions and have not always been adapted to the needs of small producers. The lack of adequate funding is another major handicap often cited to justify the failure of research to have a socio-economic impact on the lives of sub-Saharan rural communities.

The Platform for African European Partnership on Agricultural Research for Development (or 'PAEPARD' project) was designed in order to tackle these shortcomings. In particular, the second phase of the project, PAEPARD II (2009–2013, *see table 1*) aimed to involve end users in research that was supposed to be to their benefit. In order to do so, PAEPARD gathered European and African stakeholders in agricultural research for development (ARD) into multi-stakeholder partnerships around common thematic areas.

Before recruiting African and European stakeholders into these partnerships, and in order to better prepare them, the project organised, between 2009 and 2013, a series of stakeholder consultations in Africa and in Europe (*table 1*).



Table 1: Evolution of the PAEPARD project

Project phases	Timeframe	Members	Objectives
PAEPARD I	2007-2008	Research <i>Africa and Europe</i>	> To consolidate scientific and technical collaboration between Africa and Europe in the area of ARD.
PAEPARD II Period when the consultations were organised*	2009-2013	Research + POs + NGOs + private sector <i>Africa and Europe</i>	> To consolidate scientific and technical collaboration between Africa and Europe in the area of ARD. > To promote more inclusive partnerships with 'non-research' stakeholders in order to encourage more balanced partnerships that are more demand-oriented and mutually beneficial.
PAEPARD II Four-year extension. Implementation period of the user-led process (ULP)	2014-2017	Research + POs + NGOs + private sector <i>Africa and Europe</i>	> To consolidate scientific and technical collaboration between Africa and Europe in the area of ARD. > To promote more inclusive partnerships with 'non-research' stakeholders in order to encourage more balanced partnerships that are more demand-oriented and mutually beneficial. > To implement an innovative process of user-led partnership (ULP)

* List of consultations between 2010 and 2012:

- 1st Consultation of European NGOs: OP and ARD in Africa, CSA - Brussels 22 September 2010.
- African multi-stakeholder workshop, EAFF - Nairobi, Kenya 15 October 2010.
- Consultation of the European private sector within the framework of PAEPARD, COLEACP - Rungis 26 October 2010.
- National multi-stakeholder dialogue in DRC, FANRPAN - Kinshasa, 11-12 November 2010.
- Multi-stakeholder consultation on ARD in Central Africa, PROPAC - Yaoundé, 25-26 November 2010.
- Regional consultation in West Africa, ROPPA - Conakry, 1-2 March 2011.
- European multi-stakeholder consultation on ARD, IAO - Florence, 7-8 March 2011.
- African multi-stakeholder consultation, EAFF - Nairobi, 12-13 May 2011.
- African stakeholders' meeting - Accra, 9-10 March 2012.
- 2nd European multi-stakeholder consultation on ARD - Brussels, 3-4 May 2012.

The process of sector and multi-stakeholder consultations within PAEPARD

The organisation of sector and multi-stakeholder consultations was an integral part of the first phase of the PAEPARD II programme, covering the period 2009–2013. These consultations contributed to the overall objective of the programme, the reorientation of scientific and technical collaboration between Africa and Europe in the area of agricultural research for development (ARD), in order to promote the

creation of multi-stakeholder partnerships that are demand-oriented and mutually beneficial.

These consultations aimed in particular to guide the PAEPARD programme by drawing up recommendations for the establishment of partnerships that would be innovative, balanced and demand-driven.

Two types of consultation were held:

- Sector consultations, organised around groups of stakeholders, in order to highlight expectations, constraints and recommendations in the area of ARD from each group of stakeholders. Four groups of stakeholders were consulted: civil society, private

sector, diaspora and research. The consultations took different forms: face-to-face meetings, telephone calls and questionnaires.

- Multi-stakeholder consultations, bringing together Producers' Organisations (POs), NGOs, research, the private sector and diaspora, in order to share the outcomes of the sector consultations and to draw up common recommendations. All the multi-stakeholder consultations took the form of physical meetings.

Specific objectives were established for each of these types of consultation:

- For the internal consultations by groups of stakeholder, the aim was to familiarise stakeholders with the PAEPARD tools designed to bring about innovative partnership processes, to collect past experiences of partnerships between researchers and non-researchers and to identify future cooperation priorities between African and European partners. They also aimed to identify the needs of stakeholders in terms of communication, facilitation of partnerships and capacity building for PAEPARD partners.

- For the multi-stakeholder consultations, the aim was to present to the participants selected by PAEPARD partners the results of the internal consultations by stakeholder groups, to validate their mobilisation strategy, to lead a reflection around the processes of innovation in partnership and to familiarise themselves with the instruments and activities of PAEPARD. They also aimed to summarise the needs in terms of communication, facilitation of partnerships and capacity building for PAEPARD partners.

This document summarises, draws out and analyses the main findings of all these consultations in order to inform stakeholders in Agricultural Research for Development (ARD) in general and those involved in balanced and inclusive partnerships between African and European partners in particular. The conclusion highlights the way in which the lessons learned from these consultations have been used to guide the PAEPARD programme.

It should be noted that the consultations covered in this report were organised before the launch of the Users-Led Process (ULP). Unlike the ULP, which is based on a value chain, these consultations were of a general nature, i.e. not focusing on a specific sector.

With the introduction of the ULP at the end of 2011, the PAEPARD underwent a paradigm shift in which the 'end users' of the research took control of the process, on themes that best addressed their needs. The ULP is the subject of another previously published paper (Mugabe and Adekunle, 2013).

¹ The full reports of the consultations can be found at the following address: www.csa-be.org

Sector consultations

Findings of the consultation of European NGOs

> Consultation process, objectives and themes addressed

Three consultations of European NGOs¹ were organised within the framework of PAEPARD by the Collectif Stratégies Alimentaires (CSA, the European non-profit organisation partner of the programme), in 2010, 2011 and 2012. These consultations, which took the form of one-day workshops, aimed to inform PAEPARD with the experience and the thinking of NGOs in the field of agricultural research and partnerships, while promoting a shared understanding of the challenges between different groups of stakeholders. For this reason, the consultations brought together mostly European NGOs, but also several African POs, researchers and private sector stakeholders.

Each of the three workshops addressed the following issues:

- The general conditions needed for the establishment of balanced partnerships.
- The role of NGOs in the reorientation of ARD.
- The importance of including POs in ARD partnerships.
- The role of POs and their complementarity with other stakeholders.
- The mechanisms enabling the formalisation of partnerships between POs, researchers and other stakeholders.
- The existing mechanisms and forums allowing the participation of NGOs and POs in ARD.

> Main findings

General conditions for establishing balanced partnerships

Four conditions were identified for the establishment of balanced partnerships:

- appropriate funding mechanisms (eligibility and selection criteria);
- a long enough construction phase for the partnership;
- a focus on project ownership among stakeholders;
- adequate monitoring of the partnership (communication and coordination).

Appropriate funding mechanisms: eligibility and selection criteria

The establishment of eligibility and selection criteria for the funding of projects is essential to ensure favourable conditions for the partnerships. The selection of eligibility criteria should meet clearly identified and prioritised objectives. The attribution of a weighting to each criterion, according to its importance, ensures consistency between the scores obtained by the projects evaluated and the prioritisation of objectives.

The following criteria were identified as favouring the establishment of balanced partnerships:

- **Team composition:** Imposing a minimum number of different stakeholders or the presence of a particular type of stakeholder (PO, private sector, NGO) can favour the creation of multi-disciplinary teams.
- **Leadership:** Defining the type of leader, or the specific conditions that a project leader should meet, can encourage stakeholders that are typically disadvantaged in partnerships (non-traditional agricultural research stakeholders such as POs or NGOs) to take the initiative. This criterion can be used to avoid these stakeholders simply being used, making sure they don't just appear in a team in order to tick the boxes of required participation, thus promoting their genuine involvement in the project's implementation.
- **Geographical criteria:** Defining priority or compulsory zones (for example the simultaneous participation of African and European stakeholders) can favour geographical diversity within projects.

Acknowledging the importance of the construction phase of a partnership

The diversity of stakeholders and interests inherent in such partnerships is a major challenge, which should not be ignored.

With divergent interests involved, it is essential for the smooth running of the project to establish from the start a common vision, as well as agreed principles on which the partnership will be based. Reaching consensus between partners can be delicate and takes time. Yet the importance of this partnership construction phase is often not sufficiently taken into account by donors.

It is essential to recognise that the partnership itself is the first objective to be achieved and therefore properly to plan for this construction phase, both in terms of the project's work plan (allocating sufficient time) and its budget. The presence of a facilitator can support the running of this phase.



Favouring project ownership among stakeholders

It is crucial for all participating stakeholders to feel a sense of ownership of the project if we are to develop truly balanced partnerships. Joint ownership of the agenda and of the activities and taking responsibility for results to be achieved are what separate a partnership from a simple collaboration in which the organisation leading the project often appropriates it for itself.

Ownership of the project among the different stakeholders will depend on the distribution of duties, responsibilities and corresponding resources between all the parties involved. It is important to jointly define (and possibly to formalise) the roles of each organisation. In collaborative projects, this phase implies a certain devolution of authority (a reduction of the central role of the lead organisation), which is not always easy since traditionally the leading role has been held by research organisations.

This devolution goes hand in hand with a redefinition of the role of research in the projects implemented. Moreover, full ownership of the project by its stakeholders is also linked to the establishment of transparent governance, in which the decision-making structures and processes must be clearly defined between partners.

Ensuring monitoring of the partnership – communication and coordination

Effective communication is essential, as much for the transparency and openness of the project as for the implementation and coordination of its activities. The planning stage of the project must take into account the need to provide time for communication and coordination (as well as the ensuing human and administrative costs).

The facilitator often has a crucial role in the coordination of activities. It is essential to be aware of the continuous need for partnership mechanisms and the involvement of all the partners throughout the duration of the project and the necessary tools and resources must be provided to ensure this.

In addition, a communication space must be established to allow the exchange of information and the sharing of knowledge. Direct exchanges between partners should be encouraged, rather than through the intermediary of a secretariat. While ICT facilitates electronic communication, regular face-to-face meetings remain essential (appropriate provision for different modes of communication should be made in project budgets). It is important to take account of the fact that some partners may have more restricted access to ICT (such as the Internet).

In general, the facilitator is responsible for the planning of meetings and exchange of information. It is a real challenge to find the right balance between too much information and too little.

The issue of language is also a common obstacle to communication, since a partnership often involves partners who speak different languages.

The fact that English is generally the main language of communication makes it difficult to include partners who do not speak the language (in particular the end users of ARD projects, the producers).

This obstacle must be recognised and taken into account. The facilitator can contribute to overcoming these obstacles by systematically making available the necessary working documents to those 'disadvantaged' partners and by briefing them on the agenda, in advance of meetings, so as to allow them better to participate and intervene in these meetings.

The role of NGOs in the reorientation of ARD

Thanks to their long experience of collaborating with POs and/or their knowledge from working on the ground, NGOs can play several roles in the reorientation of ARD in favour of an approach more centred on the demands of African family farmers. These roles include:

- Strengthening the capacities of farmers' organisations, both in terms of lobbying and in calls for proposals, by helping POs to apply for them and to gain greater familiarity with the procedures.
- Acting as brokers between POs and researchers, or between POs and the private sector, NGOs can be an effective channel, a good interpreter, by 'translating' the language of research for the POs, and at the same

time 'translating' POs' problems into research topics. Moreover, through their long collaboration with POs and their own networking experience, NGOs can help to establish partnership mechanisms between POs and research organisations/the private sector in order to facilitate common endeavours.

Collaboration between NGOs and researchers can however be challenging. There can sometimes be a gap between the worlds of research and development. This is partly due to the lack of 'mixed' funding, which might allow, for example, a research project to unfold alongside a development project. Current funding models allow at best the integration of a research component into a development project, or a participative component into a research project.

In both cases, one of the two participants ends up being used to benefit the other. Moreover, this rift is also historical and ideological, a crystallisation of conflicts around sensitive issues (GMOs, means of production), which have resulted in a breakdown of communication between researchers and NGOs.

It is therefore important to restore this dialogue if we are to develop partnerships including both researchers and NGOs.

The importance of including POs in ARD partnerships

It is essential for POs to be included in partnerships, in order to steer ARD projects towards the demands of African family farmers. Several drivers and challenges to the integration of POs have been identified:

- The presence of well-organised and professional POs clearly favours their integration into research projects. It is essential that POs should have their own positions at the launch of a research project.
- The participation of POs in research projects implies a certain level of organisation and governance (particularly in terms of planning, prioritisation of activities, setting up and follow-through of projects). Dedicated funding for the capacity building of POs is therefore necessary.
- The involvement of POs in governance mechanisms favours co-responsibility. Moreover, including producers within a project's scientific committee can steer research questions more in favour of farmers.
- Including POs in a project requires emphasis on common interests. These common interests can be identified from concrete cases, for example concerning priority agricultural products. An interesting method of learning around a predetermined theme is the process of action learning, which is based on case



studies (past or current). This involves bringing together stakeholders directly involved in the topic discussed, to share methodologies and best practices and to identify the needs of each of them. Research areas can thus be highlighted.

- Collaboration with existing structures (networks, regional programmes, ongoing projects, etc.) can avoid overlaps and competition that might negatively impact the efficiency of projects on the ground. When looking to build a partnership with producers, a consultation process must be set up in order to identify existing structures. It is important, however, to note that these might exclude certain stakeholders, so steps should be taken to check that such organisations are representative and to ensure their independence from specific interests.

- The diversity of the farming community is important. The idea of an all-embracing farming community is an illusion, and it is important to ensure the diversity of farming interests – in particular to make sure that decision-making is balanced between umbrella organisations and local organisations.

- Dissemination of project results should be considered. We need to go beyond the preconceived notion that this is a transfer of knowledge from ‘those who know’ to ‘those who don’t know’. Moreover, consultation with POs before publishing any results makes it possible to assess the relevance of broader dissemination in each situation.

- Risk management is an important consideration in all partnerships. All innovation carries an element of risk, with uncertain results. Often this risk – which is carried by producers – is neither considered nor assessed.

The role of Producers’ organizations and their complementarity with other stakeholders

Producers’ organizations have a variety of roles to play in ARD, in line with their own diversity. African POs are diverse in many ways. In particular, there are several levels of integration and intervention: local, regional, provincial, national, international, etc.

In simplified terms, ground level stakeholders are best placed to identify producers’ research needs and to take part in the implementation of actions, while higher-level organisations can carry the voice of farmers in bodies and debates that are inaccessible to individual producers, intervening at policy level, and in the definition of priorities and strategies for agricultural research. The challenge for POs is to ensure the links between their base and the different levels of organisation.

POs can participate at various levels of agricultural

research for development, in particular:

- Development of research policies and priorities.
- Governance, implementation and evaluation.
- Dissemination of results.
- Development of research or innovation mechanisms (action-research or partnership).

Development of research policies and priorities

Since they have, by definition, a close connection with the rural population, POs are in touch with agricultural, social, economic, cultural and other realities on the ground. They therefore have a key role to play in identifying the problems to be solved and research priorities.

This presupposes that POs have a strong connection with their members and that they are all (including the poorest, women, etc.) well represented in the organisation, which is not always the case.

The experiences of Finland¹ and Senegal² have shown that it is essential to put in place proper structures at national level to ensure dialogue and exchange between government, research and farming organisations, in order to allow the latter to play their role. The issue of funding resources and governance for research – addressed later – is equally important.

Governance, implementation and evaluation

Producers’ organizations also have a role to play in research projects. Their involvement in the governance of projects is necessary to ensure successful partnerships. It needs to take place from the very outset, with them taking part in defining the project and the way in which producers will be involved. This assumes that researchers are willing to share this role with others and that POs have sufficient capacity to take it on.

Producers’ organizations can also be involved in the implementation of certain stages of research projects and in producing relevant results, in particular by coordinating stakeholders on the ground and centralising results. Finally, the involvement of POs in the evaluation of results is both possible and desirable in order to make sure that they are subsequently used by stakeholders on the ground. Joint evaluation implies that precise criteria and indicators should be defined to measure results, since producers’ criteria, based on their real-life experience, are not the same as those of researchers, often based on the need to prove a theory. The ‘levels’ of evaluation might also

Success stories come from the dynamic dialogue between producers’ organizations, research and public authorities

be different, with farmers interested in the global impact on production (‘macro’), while researchers are often more focused on ‘micro’ results (genetics for example). This issue needs to be taken into account.

Dissemination of results

The experience of the *Confédération des producteurs agricoles pour le développement* (CAPAD – Confederation of Agricultural Producers for Development) in Burundi shows that POs have – and can develop – the channels to reach a large number of producers and to ensure favourable conditions for the dissemination of relevant results on the ground. It is nevertheless important not to see POs only as dissemination channels, but as full participants in the research process from the outset.

Research and innovation

It is important to remember the fact that, beyond their role as end users of research, farmers and their experience are also the starting point for research. The example of the Réseau Agriculture Durable (Sustainable Agriculture Network) in France shows that the organisation and networking of producers can play a driving role in empirical research for new or improved practices. This network, which is made up of many farming organisations, encourages horizontal exchanges between them (exchange of experiences, best practices) and develops standards for more sustainable agricultural systems. One of the effects of these exchanges is to allow farmers to share the risk that is inherent in the development of innovations (financial risks, change of scale, diversification, etc.). Such facilitation of exchanges around the results

of empirical research, and the dissemination of innovation through ‘farmer-to-farmer’ training, is another important role for producers’ networks. The dissemination of farmers’ know-how through these networks is also possible, even though this role is often carried out by others.

Mechanisms allowing the formalisation of partnerships between POs, researchers and other stakeholders

Several mechanisms enabling the formalisation of partnerships between POs, research and other ARD stakeholders have been identified:

LONG-TERM DIALOGUE BETWEEN POS, PUBLIC RESEARCH BODIES AND GOVERNMENTS

Successful partnership experiences between POs and public sector agricultural research are the result of a historic process of dialogue between POs, government and research.

In order to achieve this, there needs to be a political will to address the needs of the base, as well as the existence of strong producers’ organisations, since political will also results from the balance of power established between the state and farmers. The existence of ‘allies’ within the research sector is also necessary.

COHERENCE BETWEEN RESEARCH PROJECTS AND AGRICULTURAL POLICIES

In order to be sustainable and effective, research projects must be in line with national and regional agricultural policies.

APPROPRIATE FUNDING MECHANISMS

Funding mechanisms have a determining influence on the direction of research. In this regard, two major aspects need to be considered: the sources and governance of funding.

- The question of the source of funding for research is important. The general trend is for a reduction in public funding for research by national governments. In Africa, this means an increased dependence on foreign and international institutions and poses the question of the definition of research priorities. These are not necessarily the same for foreign and international institutions as they are for rural populations. This also raises the question of the sustainability of the projects and partnerships developed. Moreover, the withdrawal of governments from public research runs the risk of leaving major societal challenges, such as food security and the management of natural resources, in the hands of private research. The impact of agricultural

¹ See the experience of the MTK (Central Union of Agricultural Producers and Forest Owners), presented by Kati Partanen during the 2011 consultation (www.csa-be.org/spip.php?article828).

² See the *Fonds national de recherches agricoles et agroalimentaires du Sénégal* (FNRAA), set up by the Senegalese government in 2005 with the aim of funding agricultural research, supporting POs in developing and formulating requests and ensuring the dissemination and transfer of technologies developed from agricultural research. See the case study on this subject: www.csa-be.org/spip.php?article888&var_mode=calcul



research on society as a whole is sufficient justification for the public funding of research.

- The other issue to take into consideration is the governance of funding. By convention, research funding is put into the hands of the researchers, even taking into account the recent move towards competitive funding which aims to support participative research. However, alternative funding mechanisms have been developed, both at European and African level, to ensure that the end users of the research, especially producers, are directly involved in the governance of these research funds, in the definition of research priorities and in the choice of beneficiaries.

Some initiatives are developed locally, others at national level, and are often the result of a historic process of dialogue between farmers' organisations, government and research. Several alternative ways of managing funds are possible, but the alternative mechanisms presented during the consultation are based on a fund management committee that includes producers.

FINANCIAL AUTONOMY

Even though the issue of financial autonomy is much broader for POs than for ARD, the availability of own funding is a central issue for the planning and viability of research activities initiated and funded by POs. Establishing systems that would enable greater financial autonomy for POs, such as introducing a deduction from the marketing of members' produce through the PO, could improve POs' capacities to take part in and influence ARD.

Constraints and mechanisms for improved participation of NGOs and POs in the governance institutions of ARD

Several constraints and mechanisms for improved participation of NGOs and POs in the governance institutions of ARD, at national, regional and international level, were discussed:

LEGITIMACY AND REPRESENTATIVENESS OF CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANISATIONS

The legitimacy of civil society organisations is often undermined for various reasons: insufficient structuring, difficulty in speaking with one voice because of the diversity of visions, difficulty in being taken seriously, difficulty in being heard when in a minority, etc.

In terms of organisations being representative of their members, some would like to see mechanisms and criteria in place to ensure this is the case, for example through paid membership and evaluation



mechanisms. The recognition of different levels within an organisation, the fact of being based at local level and the independence of organisations are also key factors for representativeness. Some feel the need to introduce elections to ensure the representativeness of civil society at governing level.

Others argue that elective representation does not exist in NGOs and that a world organisation of NGOs will never exist, but that what matters is to be answerable in relation to other NGOs, to members and to ensure feedback and transparency through an independent process. Transparency and independence are cited as essential for the legitimacy and representativeness of civil society organisations.

LACK OF INTEREST FOR ARD AMONG CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANISATIONS

Many organisations fail to see any link between their activities and the world of research, and cannot imagine that their participation in ARD is possible. It is important to mobilise civil society by insisting on these links and on the role that it can play in ARD. It must also be underlined that public funds are invested in research and that they need to be steered.

One possible way to promote this participation is to focus the debates, not on structural and procedural issues but rather on concrete objectives and projects. In this context, it may be appropriate to focus on a local and national basis before moving up to the higher levels.

FUNDING AND THE DEFINITION OF RESEARCH

Funding steers research and favours a certain type of research that is not always favourable to the participation of civil society. The establishment of forms of 'incentive funding' (seed money, venture capital),

the orientation of funds towards national research systems and the setting up of a monitoring system for budgets allocated to ARD ('budget-tracking', Paris Declaration) are among the possible options proposed by the participants in the consultations.

RESOURCES FOR PARTICIPATION

Opportunities do exist at different levels for the participation of civil society in ARD, but this requires resources, both financial and technical (in particular interpretation), and for capacity building.

A SHARED VISION

The need for a shared vision between NGO/POs and the research sector has been mentioned. Some have insisted on the importance of mechanisms for participation and dialogue, which, beyond a shared vision, would deliver the objective of improved participation of producers' organisations.

THE INVOLVEMENT OF CIVIL SOCIETY AT GLOBAL LEVEL (CGIAR, GFAR)

For some members of civil society, the dominant vision at the level of these institutions is too far removed from their own to allow their participation. For others, the level of public resources that they attract and the fact that they establish the directions that will steer action at government level mean civil society should definitely take an interest in them.

Findings of the consultation of the European private sector

> Consultation process, objectives and themes addressed

In the framework of its participation in the work package one of PAEPARD, COLEACP had a mandate to mobilise and coordinate (non-scientific) European private sector stakeholders with a view to taking part in the development of priority agricultural research and development activities for Africa and Europe that would be beneficial to all. The mobilisation of European private sector partners involved in Africa was organised around an online internal consultation (September to November 2010) and a meeting between stakeholders (October 2010). This process allowed the validation of a mobilisation strategy proposed by PAEPARD partners and to prepare for future partnerships. This internal consultation also aimed to identify specific needs among private sector operators, to which the other pillars of the PAEPARD

programme might provide answers.

The internal consultation was set up in two phases: a preparatory phase and an action phase, each including two stages. The preparation thus took place over two periods, aiming respectively at:

- Mobilising the network of COLEACP's European members and partners in the fresh fruit and vegetable sector, based on contacts in the internal database. This stage allowed the identification of fruit and vegetable importers active in Africa who might be interested in PAEPARD and willing to cooperate.

- Categorising importers according to their specialisation in the trading of goods (conventional, organic, fair trade) in order to better understand their specific needs.

The two stages of the action phase were as follows:

- Sending out a questionnaire by email in order to identify the needs and expectations of each operator.
- Organising an exchange meeting.

The whole process was conducted between October and December 2010 and the results were returned before the first European multi-stakeholder consultation in Florence (Italy) in March 2011. It should be noted that even though this combination of real and virtual conversations proved necessary, the timing of the internal consultation was not the most appropriate, as it coincided with numerous international events which restricted the availability of targeted stakeholders.

COLEACP took the opportunity of the online consultation of its network of European operators to broaden the consultation to other members based in Africa (producers/exporters, professional organisations, experts/consultants). This allowed it to reach more operators and to cover a wider range of needs.

The questionnaire was drawn up with the aim of better understanding the interest of European private sector stakeholders in collaborating with researchers and universities, in order to achieve three sub-objectives:

- To optimise companies' economic performances all along the value chain.
- To meet societal demands.
- To learn the lessons of the past in order to establish more interactions between the private sector and ARD institutions, thus contributing to a reduction in hunger and poverty and to the sustainable management of natural resources.



The questionnaire was designed in a first stage to better understand the involvement of each operator in the area of production and marketing in the case of African operators and import and distribution for the European operators. It also asked for details about the type of commercial activity for European operators (traditional, organic and/or fair trade) and about private certifications required by distributors from their African suppliers.

It also met the first sub-objective on the optimisation of economic performance by detailing the innovative techniques and practices that would be desirable in Africa, and at which point in the value chain; the types of partnerships or relations, or innovative organisations to establish in specific sectors, and with which research institutions and universities, and at which stage along the value chain; and the technical and technological problems to be solved with the support of research.

As for the second sub-objective on societal demands expressed by consumers or corporate social responsibility, stakeholders were questioned about their assessment of the possible lack of independent scientific and technical references in Africa. They were also asked how African universities and researchers could usefully contribute in areas related to organic farming, environmental protection, optimal water management, renewable energy, social conditions of employment for local workforce, etc.

Finally, in relation to the third and last sub-objective, the private sector was asked to reflect on the successes and failures of past collaborations with universities and researchers in order to better prepare for future partnerships. The questionnaire took into account the profile of research partners in Africa and Europe, the objectives of collaboration, expected results, the nature of mutual commitments, results achieved and the new types of partnership to be established between the private sector and research.

Participation in this online consultation of network members was low (15%), with low participation among European importers (20%) and African expert consultants (26%) but more sustained interest among African exporters (54%).

The face-to-face consultation took place in Brussels in October 2010. Few private operators were able to take part due to other commitments. Only two European importers, one exporter from Senegal, two COLEACP/PIP programme experts and five representatives of the European partners of PAEPARD

were present (CSA, ICRA, AGRINATURA and COLEACP). The meeting, chaired by COLEACP, was facilitated by a professor from the Belgian University of Gembloux, reflecting the experiences of collaboration between the private sector and research. COLEACP had wanted to involve European partners from PAEPARD in this consultation. Thus, a representative of the CSA was able to share the results of the first consultation of European NGOs and a representative of ICRA presented an innovative partnership approach aimed at facilitating African innovations.

> Main findings
State of play of relations between the private sector and research

The consultation found that the relationship between private European operators in the fresh fruit and vegetable sector and the world of research is weak. Indeed, private operators mostly expressed either total ignorance of research activities from which they could benefit or reservations at the idea of establishing relationships with research organisations.

Time constraints

The time that is available to private sector operators, both in Europe and Africa, is not the same as that in the world of research. Fruit and vegetable businesses face constant pressure from market competition and need to adapt in a very short timeframe to any changes in regulations or quality requirements. This means they need to be able to introduce reliable and expensive new technologies as soon as possible.

This rapid pace of change weakens the sustainability of African operators upstream in the sector, between production and export. The demands imposed by the people placing the orders on the European market cascade down onto African producers.

Private sector operators seem to think that researchers are not submitted to the same time constraints for responding to issues and that they do not measure the economic and financial impact of a result.

A preliminary analysis of the impacts associated with a research topic could lead to a different approach to the research process. For example, at a time when environmental topics (carbon footprint, environmental protection, water management, etc.) and corporate social responsibility are becoming important elements in the market positioning strategies of businesses, scientific research appears to bring few practical answers.

 **The time for private operators is not the same as for research**



Yet these could allow companies to better meet the short- and medium-term expectations of retailers and therefore of consumers.

Fragmentation and opposing interests

Private operators in the fresh fruit and vegetable sector, by the nature of their business, act individually and want to stand out from the competition by exploiting, without sharing, the benefits resulting from any research. Access to research

is restricted to those private operators with a sufficient critical mass to invest in new technologies or exclusively appropriate the results of research within the framework of specific agreements. Moreover, such contractual relations between private sector and research organisations are very limited due to the lack of available financial resources on either side. One solution could be to pool financial resources in order to transfer new technologies within a specific sector, through a platform shared by multiple operators and researchers.

With no real interaction between private operators and research, both sides tend to see problems from a different perspective and propose different solutions to resolve them. At this stage, it is clearly necessary to establish platforms between private sector operators and research around clearly identified themes. In order to do so, it is essential that stakeholders first discuss the challenges to be overcome together and then define a common basis for action in order to find the necessary solutions.

Research stakeholders themselves acknowledge barriers between disciplines. They may thus consider some issues to be 'negligible' or lower down the order of priorities. So-called 'minority' crops (traditional African plant species in particular, such as taro, okra or plantain) can thus be seen of minor importance compared to so-called 'major' crops such as maize, cotton or bananas. Teamwork that brings together researchers from different disciplines must be encouraged and organised in order to better target research questions linked to the real challenges facing agriculture.

Bringing private sector and research stakeholders closer together

Private operators and research institutions must find common interests. Research seeks to advance knowledge and provide solutions to practical problems, while private operators want to master the technology to better meet market challenges. Private operators and researchers have a common goal of being useful to society and both face a common constraint in the funding of their activities.

Indeed, researchers must obtain publishable results, their reputation being a potential means of ensuring access to financial resources other than from the public purse, with state research budgets increasingly limited. As for private operators in the market sector, they seek to maintain or even increase their market position through a range of products with high economic impact to sustain investment in new technology and thus ensure the satisfaction of their clients.

For private sector operators, the development of a partnership with public research bodies represents a potential of interests:

- If technology transfers are associated with a transfer of know-how towards enterprises, covering multiple topics and research areas.
- In the application of solutions and the implementation of prevention strategies (risk analysis) in the case of problems related to pests, diseases and contamination.
- A particular interest, such as the use of alternatives for plant protection (bio-pesticides), the use of certain environmental and social indicators in Africa or providing added value to agricultural by-products or the processing of products in the framework of small or medium-sized farms.
- The secondment of young researchers to businesses in the framework of an agreement between a research institute and a private enterprise.

One benefit of the consultation was the highlighting of practices and experiences that do not – in most cases – point towards synergies between stakeholders. Few researchers and few private sector operators are willing to work together and to share knowledge and methodologies in the framework of a common platform to find solutions to the general problems facing agriculture in Africa.

> Recommendations

In order to reach the point where resources could be brought together, the consultation process led to a number of recommendations:

- The private sector and research institutions and



universities must learn to work together on clearly identified issues.

- PAEPARD must continue its facilitation role to raise the needs expressed by its partners, while making the distinction between individual and global needs.
- PAEPARD must encourage stakeholders to work together to develop appropriate methodologies and tools, which will ensure the sustainability of cooperation between researchers and end users of the results of the research in a post-project phase.

Findings of the consultation with European research organisations

> Consultation process, objectives and themes addressed

In 2008, PAEPARD I organised an online consultation and a workshop, which brought together about 50 participants. The online consultation identified ten major 'priority areas in Agricultural Research for Development (ARD)' and 83 sub-themes. These were then analysed during a meeting held in Brussels, with a view to identifying priority themes for the Food Security Thematic Programme (FTSP) and the EU's Seventh Framework Programme for research and development (FP7).

In 2009, European research organisations took part in the preparatory phase of the Global Conference on Agricultural Research for Development (GCARD), through an online consultation in September, followed by a meeting on 1 October, which brought together 193 participants from 50 countries.

GCARD's regional examination for Europe concluded that, on the basis of recent ARD studies at international and European level (in particular ERA-ARD and PAEPARD I), there was a general consensus on the main factors and the future challenges for agriculture and agricultural research. The hypothesis for the agricultural research sector was that stakeholders were already 'mobilised' and ready for active participation in partnerships.

Taking into account past experience, the consultation of researchers in the framework of PAEPARD II was planned as an online consultation without organising a meeting, considering that it would be possible to build on the results of the consultation and meetings held under PAEPARD I and GCARD.

For the consultation, a list was made of the addresses of 211 experts drawn from European research, higher education and organisations devoted to capacity building.

The consultation, which took place between October 2010 and January 2011, was based around five issues:

- Challenges in the area of innovation.
- A case study on the Africa-Europe multi-stakeholder partnership.
- The need to strengthen capacities among researchers in order to enable the establishment of balanced partnerships with non-scientific stakeholders.
- Priority needs for information.
- Comments and recommendations for new innovation partnerships.

The rate of response was weak, both in absolute terms and in relation to expectations. This is probably due to fatigue at the increasing frequency of online consultations in recent years.

> Main findings

The main finding of this consultation is that more needs to be done to communicate the concept of facilitation by PAEPARD and to make European research organisations more aware of the concrete opportunities offered by the programme.

There are many research topics that can mobilise both Africa and Europe; it is worth grouping them into four main areas in order better to attract non-scientific stakeholders, as well as researchers in the social sciences studying the impact of innovation and public policies:

- Value chains.
- Water.
- Agricultural policies.
- Macro-economic questions.



Multi-stakeholder consultations

Findings of the multi-stakeholder consultations in East Africa

The Nairobi multi-stakeholder consultations organised by the East African Farmers' Federation (EAFF) took place over two phases.

In the first phase, the EAFF sent a questionnaire to potential participants and to various East African institutions not involved in research but who might have collaborated with African or European research partners. A second phase saw the organisation of a physical meeting with different stakeholders in order to validate the results of the questionnaire and to draw out the priority themes for collaboration between researchers and end users of research results.

> Results of the online consultation

A questionnaire was sent out on the experience of past partnerships and the different activities in which partners were involved. The following areas were covered:

- Sectors of activity.
- Services rendered to the community.
- Extent of the partnership.
- Partnerships with other stakeholders in general and non-researchers in particular.
- Partnerships considered as innovative and their reasons.
- Challenges met in the management of partnerships and conflict mitigation measures.
- Areas of interest for new partnerships.

The results of this survey highlighted the gap between organisations involved in agricultural production activities, agribusiness, value chain development and food security, and those in higher or academic education. Organisations that responded to the questionnaire represented producers, private sector stakeholders and development NGOs working at local, national, regional and even international level.

Among the services that these organisations provided to beneficiaries, we can include advocacy, capacity building of stakeholders, value chain development, product certification, the mobilisation of producers and the structuring of their organisations,

as well as empowerment, training of groups, gender mainstreaming, market research and marketing of products, agricultural inputs, agricultural credit and finance, research, technology transfer, etc.

> Lessons learned from partnerships with non-researchers

Those development organisations that responded to the survey expressed their satisfaction in the domains where partnerships had made a contribution. They said that these had given them:

- Greater visibility at local, national and international level, and exposure to different opportunities (in particular participation in seminars, workshops and forums).
- More advocacy and lobbying for the development of small producers.
- More good governance, good management and capacity building.
- More capacities for mobilising resources and formulating development policies (including around HIV/AIDS).
- More possibilities for transforming producers' organisations into collection centres for farming information, useful for the development of agriculture.
- The possibility of establishing links and building bridges between organisations.
- The possibility of improving communication between different organisations.

> Lessons learned from partnerships with researchers

From the answers received from respondents in the research category, the main points outlined below should be retained:

- The need to involve non-researchers in work on agriculture in order to promote balanced partnerships.
- The need to conduct impact studies on technologies emerging from research.
- The importance of monitoring, evaluation, and collective learning in the implementation of projects in the field of agricultural research for development.
- The need to disseminate information about agricultural technologies to the end users.
- The need to clearly define the roles and responsibilities of partners.
- The need to ensure transparent, interactive communication, based on mutual respect and the sharing of lessons learned from the implementation of partnerships.

There is a gap between non-scientific stakeholders and researchers

> Partnerships considered as innovative

According to the responses received, the following partnerships are considered as innovative: (i) research partnerships on soil structures aimed at developing fertilisers applicable to different soil types; (ii) partnerships that link producers and financial institutions; (iii) partnerships that facilitate the processing of products and add to their value; (iv) partnerships that might facilitate the marketing of products.

> The challenge of multi-stakeholder partnerships

Multi-stakeholder partnerships face many challenges, due in particular to their complexity:

- Involving all the partners that are essential for an action requires a lot of time. Some partners need capacity building to be able to participate fully in a partnership and make a real contribution. This means immediately starting capacity building activities in parallel as soon as a partnership is set up.
- It is not easy to bring together all the essential partners for an action. Hence the importance of involving senior managers from partner institutions, able to take decisions and to designate the institution and the person who will coordinate the partnership. When organisations are represented by people who are not in a position to take decisions, partnerships can stall.
- Lack of commitment from some partners can complicate decision-making.
- Lack of transparency in financial management and poor communication between partners does not contribute to strong and lasting partnerships.
- The absence of involvement from producers in most partnerships results in a lack of ownership among stakeholders and therefore a lack of sustainability of research and development actions.

> Areas of interest for future multi-stakeholder partnerships

The survey also explored areas of interest likely to promote multi-stakeholder partnerships in agricultural research and development between European and African partners. Respondents identified the following as priorities:

- Strengthening of capacities among producers and their associations in order to allow them to mobilise and manage the necessary resources.
- Development of 'agribusiness clusters', especially for revenue-generating crops, in order to transform agricultural holdings into real businesses, able to generate income, create jobs and reinvest in research and innovation.

- Institutional support to farmers' organisations, helping them to become bodies able to engage in dialogue with political stakeholders and development partners.
- Research on soils and fertilisers in order to determine the necessary dosage for application and the production cost of different crops.
- Creation of an information system in support of cooperatives and cooperative groups.

Findings of the multi-stakeholder consultations in Central Africa

> Context and objectives of the Yaoundé meeting

The multi-stakeholder consultation in Yaoundé was organised on 25–26 November 2010 by the *Plateforme régionale des organisations paysannes d'Afrique centrale* (PROPAC - Regional Platform of Farmers' Organisations of Central Africa) around the theme: 'A balanced and inclusive partnership between Africans and Europeans in agricultural research for development: constraints and opportunities for stakeholders in Central Africa'. About 20 people took part in the meeting, drawn from farmers' organisations, non-governmental organisations, universities and research institutions, from seven countries – Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Congo-Brazzaville, Gabon and Chad for Central Africa, Senegal for West Africa and Kenya for East Africa.

The Yaoundé meeting took place within the framework of promoting the development of balanced and inclusive multi-stakeholder partnerships between African and European stakeholders. It aimed to offer a forum for exchange and discussion on the challenges facing African stakeholders in agricultural research and development in the mobilisation of funding offered by the European Commission in order to support agricultural productivity in Central Africa.

More specifically, the meeting aimed to:

- Analyse existing and emerging funding opportunities.
- Determine priority areas in which joint research themes between European and African ARD partners can be defined.
- Identify constraints and obstacles to the creation of inclusive and balanced partnerships between Africans and Europeans in the field of ARD.
- Share partnership experiences (successes and failures) between African stakeholders and their European counterparts in the field of ARD.

To foster partnerships, key stakeholders must be involved during national consultations

- Identify African institutions to make them more aware of the improved funding opportunities for agricultural research for development. Discussions within the groups and in plenary revolved around four main themes:
- The construction and management of multi-stakeholder partnerships.
- Priority areas for research.
- The mobilisation of non-scientific partners.
- The identification of African institutions to make them more aware of the increase in funding for ARD.

> Construction and management of multi-stakeholder partnerships

In order to keep things simple and more realistic, participants focused on the two most common types of partnership in agricultural research for development in Africa: partnerships between African stakeholders and partnerships between Africa and Europe. They then identified the constraints and obstacles faced in the construction of partnerships before finally proposing strategies to overcome these obstacles.

Among the constraints identified were:

- A lack of awareness of the various stakeholders likely to participate and contribute to partnerships, a constraint which does not help in the construction of sustainable partnerships.
- Low appreciation of the skills of African stakeholders. They often play subsidiary roles with few prerogatives, while all the authority rests with their European partners who do the real management.
- Weakness and lack of transparency in communication among different stakeholders.
- The almost systematic absence of collaboration framework.
- The insufficiency if not virtual inexistence of national budgets devoted to ARD, which results in another constraint in the form of financial dependence on external stakeholders. When the funding of a project stops, the partnership activities also stop or are severely affected.
- Low skills development and human resources in the partner institutions



with this instead going to people who do not know the situation on the ground. This takes up a lot of time for adaptation and slows down partnership activities.

Participants in the consultation reflected on proposed strategies to overcome these obstacles and agreed on the need to:

- Have a database of stakeholders and their areas of expertise. Having such information available would make it easier to build partnerships involving reliable partners.
- Create an effective communication system for disseminating information and sharing experiences on EU calls for proposals, in order to provide sufficient time to prepare ahead of the publication of the calls. This requires an intelligence service that would have the information as soon as it is published.
- Capitalise on and promote good practices drawn from past partnerships so that subsequent partnerships can benefit from their experiences.
- Conduct advocacy and lobbying of states and regional institutions for greater ARD funding.

> Priority areas for agricultural research for development

Participants in the 2010 Yaoundé consultations also considered the priorities for agricultural research for development and identified the following priority areas:

- Food security (agriculture and agro-industry).
- Post-harvest losses.
- Livestock and fisheries.
- Production and productivity of family farms.
- Value of agricultural produce.
- Conservation of forests and climate change.

These are the areas in which stakeholders in agricultural research for development in Central Africa would like to see PAEPARD consortia being built.

> Mobilisation of non-scientific stakeholders

The philosophy of the PAEPARD II programme is to involve non-scientific partners in the multi-stakeholder partnerships between Africa and Europe. Their presence at the heart of these partnerships is a precondition of their sustainability. However, national consultations are necessary in order to achieve mobilisation of key stakeholders. It is important to have a communication strategy highlighting this vision of PAEPARD. The messages sent by PAEPARD must take into account the diversity of stakeholders involved.



> Identification of African institutions with which to raise awareness

Multi-stakeholder partnerships between African and European partners in ARD will only work and be sustainable if they have the necessary financial support. To this effect, a list of institutions was drawn up with which to raise awareness of the importance of increasing funding for ARD. The list is not exhaustive, but these are the institutions identified by the participants:

- Development banks (AfDB, BDEAC, Equity Bank, etc.).
- Regional economic communities (ECCAS, ECOWAS, CEMAC, EAC, SADC, WAEMU, etc.).
- Bilateral and multilateral development agencies based in Africa (AFD, embassies, World Bank, IFAD, UNDP, SNV, EU, USAID, etc.).
- CORAF/WECARD.
- FARA.
- African Capacity Building Foundation (ACBF).
- Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.
- National governments.
- NEPAD/CAADP.
- Parliament of the African Union.
- Parliaments of the regional economic communities (CEMAC, ECOWAS, EAC, etc.).
- National parliaments.
- Private sector.
- African Union.

Findings of the multi-stakeholder consultations in West Africa

On 1-2 March 2011, the ROPPA, with the help of CNOP-Guinée, organised a consultation in Conakry of West African stakeholders involved in ARD. These included representatives of producers' organisations from the 13 national platforms that make up the ROPPA, a representative of the Eastern Africa Farmers' Federation (EAFF), representatives of institutes and national research centres from Ivory Coast (CNRS), Burkina Faso (INERA), Niger (IRAN), Guinea (ANPRO-AC), Togo (DAS), Mali Katibougou IPR/IFRA), from FARA and from AfricaRice.

> Experiences of multi-stakeholder partnerships in the sub-region

In total, participants presented 19 partnership experiences, 12 of which were based in the ROPPA's national platforms and 7 others in institutes and national research centres.

The presentation of these experiences was structured around the following points:

- Nature of the experience (dissemination of technology, management of natural resources, access to funding, etc.).
- Approach and implementation strategy.
- Results and experience acquired.
- Findings and lessons learned from the experience.
- Capacity building needs for various groups of stakeholders.
- Sustainability of the experience, highlighting the conditions for its replication in a similar environment or its application in different conditions.

The presentation of these experiences was followed by a high level of debate and contribution during the seminar. It is worth noting a number of existing initiatives which, if taken into account and further pursued, will contribute to strengthening existing partnerships or building new ones...

> Mechanisms to strengthen or put in place to allow producers to control the research system

Stakeholders in agricultural research for development recognise that the primary objective of multi-stakeholder platforms is to involve more producers and the private sector in the innovation process. Participants in the Conakry seminar-workshop wanted producers to control the research process. ROPPA has planned to set up a framework for dialogue between researchers and producers so that research can be led by users.

This reflection marked the birth of the user-led process (ULP), which PAEPARD has implemented since late 2011. This concept was born following a consultation of non-scientific partners from PAEPARD. They felt that non-thematic calls launched by the programme were not based on the real needs of beneficiaries. They regretted that beneficiaries had not played a significant role, lacking the time to get involved in the drafting of concept notes, and had been co-opted by researchers, who had been alone in finalising the concept notes.

This highlighted the need to design a mechanism that involved non-researchers in the process, right from the stage of the selection of research topics.

> Mechanisms and tools to put in place to ensure the funding of innovation platforms

We know that multi-stakeholder platforms are only functional if they have the human and financial resources without which meetings and other



activities, including important research activities, are not feasible. This is why participants expressed the wish to see a clear strategy of communication and mobilisation of resources, enabling them to function normally.

> Organisation and capacity building for stakeholders

The different parties involved in multi-stakeholder partnerships are used to working in isolation and need training to work in partnership. We also know that current funding mechanisms based on competition mean that non-researchers are excluded from the outset.

Training in human resources is necessary and clear capacity building programmes are needed to help partners in the development of research proposals.

> The role of advocacy

Participants insisted on the need for PAEPARD to play an important advocacy role for greater funding and changes to national and international policies.

> Findings and lessons learned

In the course of the presentations and discussions, participants drew out two major findings, which can be summarised as follows:

The producer is not just a client, but a real partner

The linear approach to research has proved incapable of integrating the producer as a partner who can participate in the process of generating knowledge or technology. The multi-stakeholder partnerships that PAEPARD advocates are real spaces for dialogue and consultation between the different stakeholders

involved in ARD, spaces where the idea is being forged that the producer – like all the other partners – is a stakeholder who contributes to the production of results, and not just a client.

The multi-stakeholder platform as a forum for expressing needs

Multi-stakeholder platforms are places for the expression of legitimate needs and demands from the end users of research. However, without capacity building, producers risk being manipulated or used as an excuse for research.

Findings of the regional African multi-stakeholder consultation

> Context of the consultation

Even though all the individual consultations organised by the various partners in Africa were multi-stakeholder in nature, a regional multi-stakeholder consultation was planned, bringing together African stakeholders from all the different sub-regions.

The consultations took place in the Hill Park Hotel in Nairobi on 12-13 May 2011, bringing together some 40 participants representing the different stakeholders involved in ARD.

> Objectives and expected results of the consultation

The objectives of the seminar were defined as follows:

- To exchange and consolidate the information and findings of the sub-regional consultations and of the experience of previous partnerships.
- To discuss the results of the European consultations.
- To look ahead to the continuation of the process at pan-African level.

In his opening address, Steve Muchiri, executive director of the EAFF, spoke of the vital importance of the participation of non-scientific partners in ARD. He underlined that this had faced many obstacles in the past, including the lack of information, the capacity of farmers' associations to organise themselves as worthy participants in research and the representation of non-state stakeholders, particularly in questions relating to food security. The delay in creating non-governmental platforms at pan-African level (including the PAFO, PANGOC

 **The innovation process should involve producers and private sector more deeply**



and PANAAAC) was a sign of the weakness of non-state stakeholders and the difficulty of integrating them into the heart of ARD debates. This is why, even though it only operates in East Africa, the EEAF has been mandated to represent the PAFO in the activities of PAEPARD. The question of the participation of non-scientific stakeholders in ARD thus becomes an institutional challenge. This is why PAEPARD's approach of integrating non-researchers at the heart of the ARD process has been welcomed with enthusiasm.

> Methodology used

The summaries of the various European and sub-regional consultations were presented by their respective representatives. The coordinators of the two consortia selected in the first call for concept notes then presented their projects. Questions and answers on the various presentations followed each session. Finally, participants were divided into working groups, in which various issues were explored, such as: the federating themes that had emerged from the internal consultations, and how the consortia selected in the first call could provide solutions to them, how to improve the modus operandi of PAEPARD, etc.

> Questions and recommendations

After presentations by representatives of the EAFF, ROPPA, PROPAC, FANRPAN and the two consortia, participants raised some questions and comments, which can be summarised as follows:

- How to meet the expectations of partners created by the internal consultations? Without this, they will lose interest in the activities of the project. It is also important not to promise too much, so as not to create false expectations.
- How to motivate young researchers, in particular young Europeans, so that they agree to work on African agriculture? In order to encourage them, participants proposed providing small grants for placements in African organisations.
- How to use the capacity building tool to build lasting partnerships in ARD between Africa and Europe. Participants suggested capacity building in different areas and the creation of a pool of experts who would support stakeholders.
- How to take advantage of local knowledge in the different sub-regions in order to build sustainable partnerships?
- How to explain the role of an innovation facilitator to make it a means to achieve the goal of building partnerships, without this objective being an end in

How to motivate young African and European researchers to work on African agriculture?

itself? It is necessary to develop a common vision on the role of an agricultural innovation facilitator.

- How to involve political decision makers in the ARD process given their essential role in multi-stakeholder partnerships?
- How to communicate effectively given the fact that the group is made up of both English- and French-speaking partners?

> Federating themes

The concept of 'federating themes' was discussed to ensure that all participants understood it in the same way. By unifying theme, PAEPARD partners mean a theme around which stakeholders can gather to solve a problem that a single stakeholder alone would not be able to resolve, or would have trouble in resolving. The working groups on the internal multi-stakeholder consultations organised in Africa identified the unifying themes (*table 2*).

Participants agreed that if PAEPARD launched a new call, the themes for the creation of multi-stakeholder partnerships should be those identified by participants and expressed during the internal consultations.

However, in light of new developments in the project, the facilitation mechanism of initiating the call was abandoned in favour of the user-led process (ULP), in which users lead the process of ARD and have sufficient time to consult with a view to hiring researchers.

While this process organises the search for funding, it does not provide funding: we are moving from a passive mode of waiting for grants and subsidies, to an active mode of working together in the search for funding sources.

> Concept notes presented during the workshop

Since the consultations were pan-African, it was important to invite some of the coordinators of the consortia to take part and testify, in order to see to what extent their projects were tackling the problems identified during the national and regional multi-stakeholder consultations. The two projects that were presented are summarised below.

> Capacity building and development of North-South university networks in training on research methodology

This project, presented by coordinator Susan Balaba Tumwebaze of Makerere University, aims to strengthen the biometric capacities of university and research training institutions. It was criticised by

participants, who saw no link with producers, who are nevertheless central to the PAEPARD process.

This partnership is built on the traditional model of cooperation between European and African universities. Participants did not see any room for small producers because the project was geared towards improving North-South academic collaboration. They also questioned the participation of a partner such as PricewaterhouseCoopers in a partnership for North-South collaboration.

> Management of the contamination of the maize sector by aflatoxin

This project, which aims to reduce losses due to the contamination of maize grains after harvest, is led by the Kenya Agricultural Research Institute (KARI, now KALRO).

Unlike the previous project on research methodology, it was considered demand-oriented and fully in line with the objectives of PAEPARD.

Overall, participants wanted to see multi-stakeholder partnerships created around issues on the ground and involving beneficiaries for the sustainability of these partnerships.

Findings of the first European multi-stakeholder consultation

> Consultation process, objectives and themes addressed

The first European multi-stakeholder consultation took place in Florence in March 2011 and brought together around 40 participants representing research, NGOs, POs and the private sector. Its objectives were, (i) to allow participants to familiarise themselves with the PAEPARD project, its opportunities and achievements, and (ii) to share experiences and reflections between different groups of stakeholders in order to explore the potential for establishing inclusive and balanced partnerships in ARD, and to make recommendations for future activities and directions for PAEPARD.

The consultation was organised over two days and around three main axes:

- Processes and mechanisms for establishing balanced partnerships.
- Federating themes that were promising for partnerships.

Table 2: Priority unifying themes identified in multi-stakeholder consultations

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Food security > Management of knowledge and development > Post-harvest technologies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Food security > Access to markets, value chains, cost of food products > Value chains in agriculture > Post-harvest in agriculture > Management of information and knowledge > Water management > Funding mechanisms, access to credit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Food security and climate change > Management of knowledge and integration of local knowledge > Capacity building and institutional development



- Collective and individual needs of each group of stakeholders in terms of information, capacity building and advocacy. The exchanges enabled a cross-cutting discussion of incentives, motivations, constraints and expectations among the different groups of stakeholders around ARD and identified ways to meet those expectations.

> Main findings

The expectations of POs and the private sector and the constraints faced by research in responding to them

POs and the private sector have expectations from ARD that are common but also specific to their own group. Research faces a number of constraints in meeting these expectations (table 3).



In addition, researchers face two 'meta-constraints':

- Funding opportunities. On the one hand, the search for funding takes up considerable time for researchers, and on the other, the funding available inevitably steers the direction of the projects conducted by researchers, both in terms of the themes that are chosen and the work methods used. In developing countries, the focus is rarely on applied research. Moreover, in Africa, research institutes are heavily dependent on foreign funding. In some countries, such as Mali for example, a major part of research is funded by foreign multinationals and is thus geared to their requirements rather than those of producers.
- The lack of incentives for researchers to work in ARD, which is often not particularly compatible with their career and publication objectives.

Possible approaches for a better response from the research sector to the expectations of POs and private sector

POSSIBLE APPROACHES APPLICABLE IN GENERAL

- Develop specific incentives for researchers to get involved in ARD, other than scientific publications. We need to find ways to stimulate and reward the benefits to society, rather than just scientific excellence. Among the possible solutions are the capitalisation and publication of results through specific channels or the recognition of acquired experience through a process leading to a certification.
- Mobilise researchers around ARD. The benefits for researchers and society of 'business unusual' should be highlighted, including through the dissemination of experiences. This dissemination of experience can show that such applied research is not necessarily incompatible with the publication of results and that it can lead to the identification of more fundamental research topics. Efforts should also be made to bring universities and other organisations to consider ARD in their research and teaching. New teaching and learning methods and changes in curricula can be considered; young people's interest can be stimulated by field internships and applied research.
- Appropriate funding should be developed. Advocacy must be conducted with appropriate institutions. Some ideas discussed include the use of criteria favouring inclusive partnerships and the taking of initiatives by the end users of ARD, or the establishment of more contractual funding

arrangements defining specific services (including quality control) to be delivered by researchers.

POSSIBLE APPROACHES SPECIFIC TO THE PRIVATE SECTOR

- Establish internships in private sector firms for young scientists and doctoral students. This would allow the private sector to access new knowledge and the expertise of senior supervisors. At the same time, young researchers would have access to a rich learning environment and to concrete and interesting topics for analysis. Internships may also be beneficial to research institutions through feedback that would allow them to modernise their teaching.
- The involvement in networks of experts who face similar problems could be useful for improving production.
- Databases of local consultants on which the private sector could call could be useful to identify potential intermediaries between producers and researchers.

POSSIBLE APPROACHES SPECIFIC TO POS

- Develop mechanisms that could translate the needs of producers into research topics. In a more general way, there is a need to put in place mechanisms to systematise the involvement of POs in the definition of research projects.
- Develop participatory research around innovation, which can bring together the local knowledge of farmers and the scientific knowledge of researchers. Innovations must be better identified, capitalised, scientifically validated and disseminated.

Processes and mechanisms for establishing balanced and inclusive partnerships

Partnerships are essential for aligning different institutions and creating synergies. But we know very little about the development of partnerships, the ways of making them work and ensuring that they are balanced.

In the past, partnerships were not always effective and there is very little literature on how to organise effective partnerships. The growing insistence among agricultural research and development partners on the need for accountability to beneficiaries and other stakeholders has generated the need for balanced partnerships.

Connections cannot be created automatically: there needs to be some kind of brokerage or facilitation mechanism. A joint analysis of shared problems and objectives is essential. European and

Table 3: Relation between the expectations of (non-scientific) stakeholders from the world of agriculture and agro-industry and the constraints identified by researchers

	Expectations of pos and private sector from ARD	Constraints faced by researchers in responding to those expectations
Common expectations (private sector and pos)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Usable results. Results must translate into usable instruments or technologies. This often implies planning to disseminate results and/or a transfer of human resources in parallel to the transfer of technology. > Multidisciplinary responses. > Permanent collaboration and dialogue with research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Publishable results. Researchers from universities and institutions are guided by the need to publish in journals, which is the primary – and sometimes only – way to progress in their careers. The production of publishable results is often not compatible with the production of useable instruments or technologies. > Compartmentalisation of research. Researchers are often specialised in a particular area and there is little cooperation across disciplines. > No culture of collaboration, lack of tools and time.
Expectations specific to the private sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Short-term results are necessary to respond to market demands. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Different time-scales: research is often conducted over the medium-term.
Expectations specific to pos	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Taking local conditions into account. > Prioritisation of research according to producers' needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Lack of knowledge of and failure to acknowledge mechanisms for participative research. > Prioritisation of research according to calls for projects and available funding.

Developing participatory research is bringing together farmers' and researchers' knowledge around innovations



African organisations, with different interests and motivations, must meet around the table to both contribute and listen. This requires (intercultural) brokerage and negotiation skills that researchers do not always have.

By ‘inclusive partnerships’ we imply that all stakeholders who have an interest in the partnership are associated. All partners must be held responsible and have accountability in the building of the partnership.

There is a risk that the number of organisations involved in a partnership can reduce its effectiveness if its mission (operational or strategic) is not clearly defined. There has to be a balance between inclusivity and operational efficiency, just as the role of every partner must be clearly defined.

It is important to make clear if the partnership is focused mainly on research or on development. The partnership must overcome mutual suspicions and prejudices, while partner organisations need support and guidance.

The groups also underlined the following principles in relation to partnerships:

- Partnerships should be organised around specific development issues that meet a clear demand and, for PAEPARD, they should refer to African family farmers. The problems and demands should focus on systems or be based on a product or any other problem according to the context.
- Stakeholders should have a common vision of objectives and results to be achieved.
- Partnerships should be opened to many stakeholders.
- Stakeholders’ roles are not set in stone and can differ from one partnership to another, according to the topic. For example, according to the specific context or issue, an association of village farmers could be seen as an NGO or as a private sector organisation.
- Tools such as value chain analysis can be used to identify stakeholders.
- Partnerships must be fair – a partnership is not just about numbers – irrespective of how many partners there are. However, it must be based on a fair balance between roles and functions.
- A partnership is not a sub-contracting arrangement.
- A partnership is not an end in itself but rather the means to achieve an end.
- A partnership needs to be built.

It was stressed that an inclusive, multi-stakeholder and balanced partnership should not be an end in itself. Partnerships should be formed only when they are an effective way to meet the demands of end users through research. Their composition should be defined by the need for efficiency: this means that when research can meet the demand of end users without the participation of all stakeholders, partnerships do not necessarily need to be balanced and inclusive.

Federating themes for partnerships

WHAT IS A FEDERATING THEME?

Researchers and non-scientific stakeholders can have different interests as regards unifying themes. For non-researchers, a unifying theme is a theme that emerges from a need connected to a specific area of development.

The aim is to fill a knowledge gap and to generate economic benefits. For researchers, the aim is to obtain results that can be published in a scientific journal in order to become recognized by their academic peers.

In the first group, a consensus was reached between farmers’ organisations, researchers and the private sector, around a general topic which could mark a first step towards ARD: ‘The conquest of markets for African family farmers’. This conquest of markets should first concern local, national and regional levels, but also international markets. More specific unifying themes should be in line with the general theme.

A grid was proposed to group themes based on value chains and operations of the sector, from supply and production of inputs to marketing and consumption, also including processing and storage.

HOW TO DEFINE A FEDERATING THEME?

In response to the question of how and by whom the unifying themes should be defined, it was suggested that the mechanism to define a theme is probably more important than the theme itself. The importance of finding a mechanism that allows researchers to meet the specific needs of end users and also provides a way to translate these needs into research topics was emphasised. Some participants asked PAEPARD to define these mechanisms.

Some ideas areas worth exploring, following participants’ suggestions, are listed below:

- All participants should express their ideas.
- It is important for the right people to be working on the solution of problems.


 Partnership is an efficient means to address the needs of users through research

Table 4: Positive and negative factors for the establishment and sustainability of partnerships

Main factors of success for partnerships	Main factors of failure for partnerships
> A shared vision is more important than the balance of the partnership. The federating theme must be important for all the participants, but the partnership is not an end in itself. It is a tool to achieve defined objectives. Common reflection between researchers and end users allows all parties to share a future vision and set common goals. It is therefore important to have sufficient time to develop a common knowledge base and shared points of view.	> Poor or inefficient communication and poor understanding of objectives.
> An attitude of mutual respect and dialogue, clear responsibilities and organisational relations.	> Lack of coordination and inter-cultural sensitivity.
> Need for a high level of management and coordination. Clear mutual advantages: the ‘win-win’ approach must be understood by all partners. Facilitate to inspire: one of the partners must be accepted by all the others as being responsible.	> A top-down approach: reflection and sharing of knowledge imposed from above.
> The association in partnership must be cost-effective. A suitable budget is needed to organise meetings and discuss issues; (balanced) investments are required.	> Resources: the partnership is not viable beyond the funding period, in case of an interruption of funding or credits or lack of own resources.
> Achieving tangible results: they must be clearly accountable at the end of the project. > Making clear who benefits from the results (ownership of results).	> A lack of targeted results beyond research or laboratory results.
> Justification (technical and social) for each partner. The character and experience of the partners should correspond to the objectives of the consortium.	> Too many partners: too many partners from the same category, partners who lack motivation, the domination of one or two partners, unbalanced power relations, partners with unequal or very limited (absorption) capacities.
> Respect for deadlines.	> Deadlines that are too tight, no long-term perspective on which to build the partnership.
> Clear and shared risks and market analysis.	> External socio-economic and political risk factors.
> Ensuring personal involvement in a consortium..	> Excessive turnover of staff within an institution/organisation.
> Access to information, sharing of communication tools, common language.	> Digital divide, excessive use of scientific jargon



- The themes should take into account not only the problems, but also the opportunities offered by defined themes, around which stakeholders could build innovation partnerships.
 - It is difficult to take part in a meeting like this and to define unifying themes, because one group/stakeholder might push their own interests without taking into account the interests of African smallholders.
 - We should not reinvent the wheel, but build on the work already done by other institutions/processes, such as CORAF/WECARD, ECOWAS, PAEPARD, ASARECA, AFRICA-BRAZIL or GCARD, which have set out priorities for ARD. One solution could be to bring these themes up to date through a consultation process.
 - PAEPARD's calls should insist more on principles (inclusivity, multi-stakeholder nature, etc.) than on themes/priorities. Some priorities can be defined, but if a project is truly worthwhile (in terms of the various PAEPARD principles), it could be selected even if it is not related to the defined themes.
- One type of approach for identifying themes was proposed: this would initially explore the different priorities identified by African stakeholders, in order to select the themes likely to be the subject of a partnership with the EU, particularly those that have been left behind (areas where requests have been made for years, but have never really benefited from research investment). This would involve examining levels of investment.

A FEW SUGGESTED THEMES

The themes suggested and discussed by participants during the discussions were:

- Conquest of markets by African smallholders. This conquest of markets should first concern local, national and regional levels, but also international markets. More specific unifying themes should be consistent with the overall theme, grouping them on the basis of value chains and sector operations, from supply and production of inputs, to marketing and consumption, including processing and storage.
- Food security: this definition is far too broad, but it can be approached by sub-themes related to productivity, production, market access, etc.
- Governance of ecosystems: management of natural resources for sustainable use.
- Autonomy of farmers: strengthening farmers' capacities for better production and management of natural resources.
- Genetic improvement of seeds and livestock breeds: obtaining seeds that are adapted (to climate change, etc.), as well as selection and improvement

- of livestock breeds (including fish).
- Regulation of agricultural markets and price volatility.
- Innovation and change: application of new developments (ideas, technologies, processes) in order to generate economic and social advantage and reduce poverty.
- Information and communication: development of tools to disseminate ARD information to all partners.
- Connection between agriculture and nutrition, food quality, healthy and nourishing produce.
- Productivity: increase the productivity of factors of production.
- Crop protection and management of animal health: to reduce crop and livestock losses and increase the availability of animal protein.
- Post-harvest operations, processing and preservation: to reduce post-harvest losses and diversify products. This theme should also include food safety and competitiveness on regional and international markets.
- Management of water resources: the use of water in agriculture, and particularly rainwater harvesting and irrigation techniques.
- Promotion of sustainable seed: big seed companies like Monsanto, Syngenta and others who market GMOs are acquiring an important position in the marketing of seed in Africa, pushing small farmers into a situation of dependency on these companies. National research institutions can establish strong partnerships with the African Agricultural Technology Foundation (AATF) to benefit from patents from advanced laboratories and control genetic engineering technologies. PAEPARD can contribute to the formation of such partnerships.
- Some value chains could be developed around themes such as fruit and vegetables, livestock and cereals such as maize. The problems encountered in these value chains can be turned into research topics. It was noted that the fruit and vegetable sector might be appropriate for PAEPARD, since it is linked with both the needs of farmers in terms of food security and income and the needs of the private sector in terms of export.
- Bio-pesticides can be of great interest to African and European partners.

In Africa, the interest may come from users (food safety issues related to the misuse of pesticides on the continent), while in Europe, the results of research can lead to the filing of a patent, which may deliver economic benefit. The issue of bio-



Table 5: Recommendations for PAEPARD: necessary information for setting up a partnership

Stakeholders	Information needs
All stakeholders	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Understanding of the context 2. Funding opportunities 3. Motivations of other stakeholders in the partnership
Farmers	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the risks and benefits? Why is the research necessary? 2. What are the expectations of the other stakeholders? 3. How to obtain the desired advantages?
Researchers	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What can be turned into a research topic? 2. Funding opportunities
Modalities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Platforms for matching counterparts 2. Exchange of information 3. Joint planning (who does what, where?) 4. Market information 5. Existing platforms/databases

pesticides was discussed by the last group, and two positions emerged. For 'opponents' to the theme of bio-pesticides, the question is not of great interest in Africa now, because the problem is more the increase of production in order to reduce hunger, rather than concern for consumer food safety.

They also noted that the total amount of pesticide used across the continent is less than that used in a country like France. For their part, the 'supporters' of the bio-pesticide theme acknowledged that this topic might not be a priority today, but since they were discussing export-oriented value chains, bio-pesticides should be considered to increase the competitiveness of African products.

Collective and individual needs of stakeholders groups in terms of information, capacity building and advocacy

The question of a platform for matching counterparts was backed up with examples:

- The failure of a database project was cited, because it was too burdensome in terms of data and time, and moreover it had not been constructed on the basis of existing databases or initiatives.
- It is not advisable to build complex systems.

- The matching of counterparts should be built up in a targeted manner with a pre-selection system.
- The main constraint for such a platform is the need for a contribution from the targeted stakeholders themselves.
- It is important to be willing to adapt the technology to the needs – projects should be optimised.

Findings of the second European multi-stakeholder consultation

> Consultation process, objectives and themes addressed

The second European multi-stakeholder consultation took place in Brussels in May 2012 and brought together some 40 participants representing research, NGOs, POs and the private sector. Its main objectives were (i) to share the lessons of the experience of PAEPARD and other initiatives, and (ii) to provide key elements to guide PAEPARD in the short- and medium-term.



Table 6: Recommendations for PAEPARD: main information needs

Type of information	Information needs	Methods
Why PAEPARD?	Communication on PAEPARD and explanations.	Website, newsletter.
Matching of counterparts	Database with institutions and profiles including functions, skills, experiences, disciplines and activities.	Description of stakeholders, minimum information for maximum efficiency.
Opportunities	Funding, partnership and project opportunities.	Passive: consultation of information. Active: receiving information by email, key-word searches.
Responsibilities	Case studies, evidence/information for the promotion of PAEPARD.	

The consultation was held over two days and addressed three major issues:

- The difficulties, benefits and success factors of multi-stakeholder partnerships.
- The characteristics of existing funding mechanisms.
- Lessons for PAEPARD.

> Main findings

Difficulties, benefits and success factors of multi-stakeholder partnerships

The evaluation of several experiences allowed participants to identify the general obstacles and benefits of multi-stakeholder partnerships:

Obstacles	Benefits
> Lack of skills within the partner organisations for the coordination and management of the partnership.	> Acquisition of new skills by partners.
> Tendency among researchers to focus on their specific discipline.	> Collaborative work leading to the identification of new opportunities.
> Reluctance by the 'users' of research to collaborate with researchers.	> More sustainable research results better reflecting the needs of 'users'.

Certain success factors were also identified:

- Involvement of facilitators in the partnership.
- Involvement of senior managers in the partnership.
- Transparency of communication around planning and decision-making.
- Dedicated resources to build capacity for working in partnership.
- A clear definition of the roles of each partner.
- Early involvement of 'users' in research partnerships for the definition of needs.

Influence of funding mechanisms on partnership models

Multi-stakeholder partnerships are heavily dependent on outside funding. Yet this funding is rarely adapted to the needs of such multi-stakeholder partnerships, often restricting partnerships to formal research organisations (rather than opening out to other innovation stakeholders), and demanding a multi-country partnership that might be difficult to manage. Moreover, funding tends to be short-term and does not offer sufficient time for a partnership to develop.

Lessons for PAEPARD

Several recommendations were addressed to PAEPARD:

- Sufficient time must be dedicated to the sharing of ideas and information in the creation of consortia.
- PAEPARD should disseminate information about funding opportunities.
- The capacities of facilitators for finding funding for partnerships should be improved.



- Each member of a consortium should be encouraged to bring their own resources and bilateral funding opportunities should be sought.
- PAEPARD should pursue its advocacy activities in favour of research projects

that have a stronger ARD direction and in favour of funding mechanisms that are more appropriate for multi-stakeholder partnerships.

- One of the main challenges for PAEPARD is to allow POs to play a more central role in the definition of research topics and in the development of research projects, through support for a user-led approach.

Summary of the findings of the consultations

The lessons drawn from the multi-stakeholder consultations cannot deliver ready-made solutions that can be applied to every circumstance. On the contrary, we saw the degree to which specific contexts (socio-economic, geopolitical, historical and socio-cultural) influenced relations between stakeholders as well as the innovation process. A research result, however important, will not be adopted if it does not take root in a favourable environment, unless either the environment, or the result, changes.

We tried to list and to assess the principles drawn from the examples cited in this work, in order to improve the production of research results, but also to make the environment favourable to their adoption and to the continuation of the process.

This document aimed to summarise the different stakeholder consultations organised by PAEPARD in Africa and Europe between 2010 and 2012. Without repeating all the results of the exercise, it is important to draw out the main outline.

In the course of the consultations, the foundations were laid for the construction of partnerships. The adopted approach reviewed the different steps necessary to create a sustainable multi-stakeholder partnership.

Key elements of the consultations by groups of stakeholders in Africa and Europe: foundations for future innovative partnership processes

> Necessary steps for building an innovative partnership process

Based on the experiences of past partnerships, participants in the consultations (particularly during consultations among NGOs) stressed that the construction of a shared vision and of common principles³ is the basis for any balanced partnership, in order to bind together the members of the consortium. A partnership-building phase is therefore necessary to enable partners to develop a reflection and consensus on several items summarised below:

- A process of identification and targeting of issues that can open out into research topics and should respond to real needs expressed by those standing to benefit from the results of the research.
- A methodology that includes several phases of different lengths in order to arrive at applicable solutions.
- Opening the partnership to other members who could contribute an expertise useful to the search for solutions.
- Internal working rules ensuring a constant balance between research partners and 'non-researchers' in the distribution of roles and responsibilities, where the common interest is a factor of cohesion and motivation.
- Balanced sharing and application of the results of the research among all the partners.

In order to create a consensus around common goals, this construction phase is vital for the partnership and is variable in time but often lengthy, in order to allow time to develop a common vision. This notion of a lengthy process was cited as a challenge during the East African partner consultations, in order to ensure a better involvement of all partners⁴.

In addition, a permanent framework for dialogue between researchers and producers was proposed during the consultation between West African partners in order to build a consensus around common research topics⁵. The process should indeed meet the requirements of planning that takes into account the project's construction phase and the financial resources necessary for this phase. The question of a facilitator is raised right from this first stage. This role would facilitate the cohesion of the partnership by

Running sustainable partnerships depends on external financing and the own resources of partners

³ European NGO consultations on 22 September 2010 and 27 September 2011, in Brussels.

⁴ East African multi-stakeholder consultations on 15 October 2010 and 12-13 May 2011, in Nairobi.

⁵ West African multi-stakeholder consultation on 1-2 March 2011, in Conakry.



even though they may not have innovative ideas or abilities to match.

- Appropriate and varied funding mechanisms¹¹. Funding mechanisms can favour multi-stakeholder partnerships by having appropriate eligibility and selection criteria. The opening of a consortium to multiple and varied partners as well as a sufficiently long period of funding are all elements that will favour the creation of sustainable multi-stakeholder partnerships.

During the consultations, some partners expressed reservations about current funding mechanisms that fail to take into account the specificities of agricultural research for development (in particular the number and balance of stakeholders involved) and as a result undermine the balanced partnership model proposed by PAEPARD. The competitive calls for proposals that are predominant in many funding mechanisms therefore favour researchers to the detriment of non-researchers, who are not used to this kind of competition and do not have access to the best project writers.

The average three-year duration of European Commission projects reinforces this concern. Beyond grants and subsidies, a favourable economic and financial environment (reliable and healthy banking sector, political stability, corruption under control) would also allow the possibility of investment, venture capital and attractive investment returns, stimulating private initiative, entrepreneurship and innovation, as well as the involvement of public institutions in partnership platforms (start-up clusters, incubators).

> The stakeholders in a partnership

The success of a partnership also lies in bringing together stakeholders with different profiles. The profile of the partners and the responsibilities they bring were also highlighted as determining factors in the success of a sustainable partnership.

- The consultations with European NGOs¹² stressed that producers' organisations are essential to any partnership. Indeed, they are the best placed to organise and structure the research needs expressed by their members.

They can moreover identify those producers and processors capable of joining a partnership. Around a research project, they can ensure communication and complementarity between the local, national and regional levels, while maintaining consistency in the partnership process. They can thus act in a network and in a devolved manner, strengthening their credibility and the relevance of their role in

 In a partnership, the project ownership is facilitated through an efficient internal and external communication that integrates the language barrier

relation to other partners.

The PO must be involved, from the initial process of setting up a research project all the way to the application of results for the final beneficiaries. Its role in ensuring the relevance of research projects to emerge from the dialogue between POs, other private sector operators, research and government, underlines the need for a PO to create a permanent exchange process with these stakeholders, to ensure that the research needs of beneficiaries are taken into account.

This means the PO needs to be capable of articulating the demand for research, while conducting an internal analysis of existing expertise and, when necessary, building the capacities of its members (partnership facilitation, communication management, mobilisation and management of financial resources, translation of needs into research proposals, etc.).

This may be a priority for the PO, allowing it in the long run to be a genuine research partner and to gain a recognised status in the governance of a partnership. The risks of manipulation of a PO enjoying special relations with the research sector should be assessed and if possible bypassed by an integrative approach involving other POs in the PO-research dialogue, thus preserving their independence and representativeness.

- In general, the research sector, in its contribution to the improvement of knowledge, must include an economic and financial impact analysis when it works towards the development and resolution of a research issue. This approach is a unifying factor for research users and stakeholders. Encouraging the use of inter-disciplinary research teams to work on a particular research topic will increase the chances

of finding solutions in a shorter time frame while optimising costs.

The research sector must find ways of rewarding researchers in applied research who achieve a compelling societal impact. At the same time, the consultations insisted on the need to integrate local knowledge in the search for easily adoptable solutions to the challenges of small family farming. The involvement of young researchers in ARD requires a revision of university curricula that would emphasise fieldwork and successful experiences in applied research.

In addition to project managers, it seems reasonable that research institutions should also involve their own managers, to ensure coherence and feasibility of decisions at the project level.

- As representatives of civil society, non-governmental organisations¹³ have a role to play in supporting certain stakeholders in the partnership, such as producers' organisations. They alert the political authorities about the directions to be taken in the area of research.

Their knowledge of the situation on the ground, of the needs of producers, their role as a link between several partners and their fund-raising capacities all make NGOs an important intermediary capable of having an influence on the choice of research projects in the framework of a partnership.

- Private sector operators¹⁴ are key stakeholders in economic development, intervening all along the value chain (from production to distribution, at local, regional and international level). Their interest in technology lies in providing the best answers to market demand, thus strengthening their hand in the face of competition.

Conditions must be created to attract these key stakeholders in a multi-stakeholder partnership, taking into account the speed at which their economic environment is changing (access to credit, affordable technologies, etc.). Investment in research should allow a business a transfer of know-how, but should also provide the implementation of solutions to major societal challenges: the protection of the environment, alternatives for plant protection (such as bio-pesticides for example), the delivery of added value to by-products from agriculture or processing. Globally, however, the private sector is not yet much attracted by what public research in Africa has to offer.



⁶ European NGO consultation on 22 September 2010, in Brussels.

⁷ European NGO consultations on 27 September 2011, in Brussels.

⁸ East African multi-stakeholder consultations on 15 October 2010, in Nairobi.

⁹ European NGO consultations + Central African multi-stakeholder consultation on 25-26 November 2010, in Yaoundé.

¹⁰ European NGO consultations + regional African multi-stakeholders.

¹¹ European NGO consultations + Central African multi-stakeholder consultation + West African multi-stakeholder consultation.

¹² Consultations with European NGOs on 22 September 2010 and 27 September 2011, in Brussels.

¹³ European NGO consultation on 22 September 2010 and 27 September 2011 in Brussels.

¹⁴ Consultation with the European private sector on 26 October, in Brussels.

> Ways to be developed for making the partnership more sustainable

• During the consultations, funding was identified as a key element of cohesion of multi-stakeholder partnerships. It impacts their sustainability, enabling the conclusion of joint projects to the benefit of all the stakeholders in the partnership.

Private stakeholders from within the same sector could pool financial resources for the benefit of research in the framework of common platforms. The search for funding, the sources of that funding and the methodology of implementation require special attention from all the stakeholders of the partnership. Funding has to be considered when forming a partnership, and has different uses.

Consensus has to be reached by all partners on how funding should be used. Indeed, the partnership-building stage and the development of research proposals require from the beginning for each partner to make a financial contribution from their own resources (meetings to be held, fact finding and exchange missions, participation in international fairs, writing research proposals, etc.).

Capital can be generated by setting up intra-consortium economic partnerships from the start (such as GIE BIOPROTECT in Burkina Faso) around the chosen theme or common interests backed by complementary expertise.

The creation of such economic partnerships can be encouraged by support through regional business incubators established under the African Agribusiness Incubators Network (AAIN). Donor funding obtained after the submission of research proposals allows the inclusion in project budgets of phases for the evaluation of research progress and implementation of research results, thus contributing to the internal dynamics of the partnership.

• ‘Non-scientific’ stakeholders or ‘users of research’ expect multi-disciplinary responses on questions of research and the pragmatic use of its results, through dissemination in plain language, or the transfer of knowledge and technologies.

They would like the research sector to be permanently listening to their needs by creating a constant dialogue.

The presence of young doctoral researchers within enterprises facilitates this dialogue. This framework of exchange through common platforms encourages a better understanding of the needs of each party and of the constraints they face. It creates favourable conditions for the development of topics and for joint methodologies to reach sustainable high-impact solutions.



• The role of agricultural innovation facilitators (AIF) is to favour cohesion within a partnership and in particular to prevent any possible conflicts of interest. PAEPARD has therefore chosen neutral individuals capable of objectively moderating partnerships.

An AIF can be chosen from among the consortium partners although this is not a necessity. They can be on the staff of a PO, having been trained to this effect, or be drawn from a database of consultants.

The workshop on the role of facilitators organised by PAEPARD in Entebbe in September 2013 laid down some criteria that AIFs should meet in order to best contribute to the creation and strengthening of partnerships.

These include a good understanding of the sectors and their key players and the ability to identify sources of funding and to explain their mechanisms. An AIF should also be capable of setting up and managing a partnership process by facilitating the emergence of unifying research topics and bringing together stakeholders to draw up questions, find solutions and apply them.

Finally, they must be a good communicator, have the ability to prevent and resolve conflicts, to conduct advocacy actions and activity plans with partners; they must also know how to document a process and to report regularly on progress in the actions implemented by the partners and show neutrality; they must also know how to write proposals.

This long list shows how scarce such profiles are, especially if the AIF is poorly, or not at all remunerated. This explains why so many consortia do without the services of an AIF, with the consortium leader or coordinator acting in their place.

 **The African producers wish to make value of the farmer's knowledge in a well-balanced relationship between partners**

¹⁵ Consultation with the private sector in Brussels on 26 October 2010.

• It is important to create a participative multi-stakeholder mechanism allowing to translate the problems met by end users of research into ‘research topics’, which involve all the stakeholders who may potentially be involved in the partnership. This mechanism could take on different forms, such as an electronic platform, or a multi-stakeholder working group, meeting regularly around a common theme. The momentum within a partnership is created by the internal sharing of expertise between members but also by the contribution of external technical support (for example, the PAEPARD network or the partners of the programme).

This mechanism must have a sense of duration over time, favouring the preliminary sharing of ideas and information, a necessary phase in the creation of partnerships, to build a common strategic approach to issues.

• Over time, the partnership can be a source of new skills for its members. The sharing of experience or the multi-disciplinary approach to research, the governance of the partnership, the preparation and submission of research proposals, the financial management of research budgets for the partnership, are all opportunities to develop new skills.

It is also fertile ground for developing economic or scientific cooperation, through collaborative work that could generate revenues that will contribute to giving autonomy for the partnership in its everyday activities.

• The application of results of research projects coming out of a participative process will be more sustainable over time, as the results respond to the specific needs expressed by the beneficiaries themselves.

Moreover, their dissemination will follow a commonly agreed action plan, thus meeting the expectations of the partners.

The implementation of the development of results can be carried out in conjunction with the POs and research, using the usual tools of dissemination or, if appropriate, through international sector support programmes.

Difficulties and obstacles facing partnerships

During the consultations, both at stakeholder group level and at regional level in Europe and Africa, difficulties and obstacles to the establishment of partnership were noted (e.g. divergence of priorities and interests of partners). A certain number of brakes that might altogether prevent the creation of partnerships were identified.

> Lack of understanding of stakeholders' professions

The consultations showed that stakeholders in the private sector and the research sector have not established regular close links between each other¹⁵.

The reasons cited are either a mutual lack of understanding of each other's professions or a reluctance to establish such links. Producers often have a vision of researchers as people who appropriate farmers' knowledge for their own research, without ever returning to give them back the results.

During the consultations, they expressed the desire for farmers' knowledge to be properly recognised and valued and for the results of research to be accessible to farmers.

Likewise, African producers wanted to build a real partnership with African food companies and with the world of research in order that they should not only provide the field for experimentation but should actually benefit from research. In the West African mango sector, orchards produce many waste products (grade-outs during sorting, diseased or damaged fruit) which are not used in any way. Without dialogue between the producers, the people involved in post-harvest processing (whether for animal feed, compost energy, or cosmetics) and researchers (often shut inside their specific discipline), these waste products remain untreated, encouraging the growth of fruit flies, a real plague across Africa.

> Time constraints

Time is also a limiting factor, with private operators working in the short-term, needing virtually immediate economic results, while researchers always operate across a much longer timeframe in addressing a research topic which does not always include an analysis of the impact of results.

Researchers have to confirm their results through experiments repeated in similar or different conditions before they can publish. This takes a lot of time, time which private operators do not have, working on the principle that ‘time is money’.

At the beginning of September 2010, the onion sector in Niger, which represents the biggest agricultural activity in the region, faced fungal attacks in its greenhouses due to heavy rains. Unable to mobilise the necessary financial resources in time, the research institutes (INERA and ICRISAT) were not able to assess the damage, identify the destructive fungus and propose rapid and effective solutions.

In Guinea, soil analysis to prevent risks connected

to crop pests such as nematodes could not be carried to completion due to the frequent power cuts and the lack of money at the national research institute to buy fuel for generators. In Cameroon, researchers at the IRAD have access to private plantations to carry out their research, but in the absence of a properly signed framework agreement, producers often have to wait a long time before getting access to the results.

> **Compartmentalisation and the obligation of publication**

Within research institutions, the culture of compartmentalisation between researchers from different units and specialisations does not encourage the pooling of expertise to find solutions to research questions.

The need for researchers to achieve publishable results, which is not always compatible with the expectation for usable results, can put a significant brake on the implementation of an inclusive partnership on issues of interest to users.

Some researchers – especially young researchers starting out on their careers – do not see development research as an area in which to dive into. For them, development research is seen as the reserve of researchers who have climbed all the rungs of their research career and are waiting for their retirement.

> **Scarcity of funding**

The funding of research projects can be an obstacle to the cohesion of a partnership, from the moment that the type of funding (competitive or commissioned, national, regional or international, open or not to co-funding, to risk capital, to the private sector), its source and its use are not clearly defined by the members of a partnership.

The notion of financial investment is seen differently by the different partners. The private operator wants the results that emerge from a research process that has required a significant private investment to have an important, sometimes exclusive, economic impact given the extent of the resources committed.

Researchers certainly want the investment to match the scale of the scientific challenge, but also want it to carry individual and collective recognition due to the number and quality of scientific publications. The criteria set out by donors when issuing calls for funding (countries covered, desired themes, short response times) do not always match the research projects developed by the members of

a partnership. Donors are not interested in or do not know about the issues raised by partnerships (lack of visibility, awareness) and focus more on research institutions that are closer to their own vision.

Thus, during the whole period of the multi-stakeholder consultations from 2010–2012, the partnerships facilitated by PAEPARD could only respond to two calls: the European Commission's FP7 (Seventh Framework Programme), and the call launched by the Commission of the African Union.

Neither of these calls, however, corresponded to the direction followed by PAEPARD, as they were aimed at rather pure research and did not involve the users of research.

> **The primacy of individual over collective interest**

Private operators are looking for an exclusive competitive edge, allowing them to have a permanent advantage over their competitors. In this context, the relationship between research and private sector, when funded by private investment for research, is built across an exclusive connection serving non-convergent individual interests.

The research sector targets international recognition of the value of its work and its institutions through a ranking system allowing greater access to funding, which ultimately guides its research themes and their typology (more fundamental than applied). The development and application of results through usable technologies are no longer a priority.

The culture of participative research has not yet been integrated into the process for developing research projects.

> **Availability of skills within partner organisations**

The coordination and management of a partnership must be ensured in the short-, medium- and long-term by people with the necessary skills within the partner organisations.

> **Language barriers**

The linguistic aspect appears as a possible obstacle to the cohesion and sustainability of the partnership and must be overcome to avoid compartmentalisation and discouragement among partners.

Indeed, in multi-stakeholder partnerships, the language problem operates at two levels: language and jargon. In terms of language, the problem is the divide between English and French, which creates a communication barrier. The language problem also arises among people who may speak the same



language, but use a different jargon according to their socio-professional group. It is therefore important to use simple language, likely to be understood by all partners, which is not as easy as people think, especially for researchers.

The contribution of PAEPARD: a response to the partnership innovation deficit

> **Operators learning about partnership**

The design of PAEPARD met some criteria set by the donor and has been made easier by a desire for harmonisation among programmes funded by the EU. As it evolved, the platform should integrate new 'non-scientific' stakeholders (regional producers' organisations, European and African private sector, non-governmental organisations), which have not necessarily had common experiences previously. Not only did the stakeholders involved not know each other before the partnership, but some carried prejudices about the others: the result either of bad personal experiences or of unfounded reputations.

Non-researchers were associated with the research sector in an effort to build a new innovative partnership process (ULP), which should erase the memory of the unsuccessful attempts at sustainable partnerships previously led by African and European research sectors (PAEPARD I, see table 1).

The organisation into activity components was totally alien to most non-researchers. It would have been necessary for the partners to take the time to

comprehend this new world, its logic, the means put at their disposal and to understand how they linked together. The desire of DG-DEVCO to move forward in three-year timeframes, starting every time almost from scratch, met a new agenda, which had its relevance in that particular context (see table 1). But to ask of new partners a rapid adaptation to this new culture of project organisation, without any teaching tools, without a real definition of the roles of each partner, without a modus operandi in the allocation of budgets and their management, and without an understanding of the expected impacts, in the face of overall and specific objectives, was part of a mission that may have been exhilarating, but was risky in terms of results to be achieved.

In this context, the partners of PAEPARD II went through a slow and laborious inception period, for they needed not only to understand how a partnership should be built but also to take ownership of the programme tools provided in the different activity components. The absence at the start of an overall strategy and of proper communication explaining the linkages and the complementarity between the activities developed within each component, led to the partners gradually discovering for themselves what was expected by the programme. This situation gave the impression that things were not advancing along a clear and detailed roadmap, as part of a structured and coherent whole.

> **Consultation at the heart of teaching**

During the consultations, the functioning of the programme and its ultimate objectives were explained to PAEPARD's partners without any teaching tools. Partners were led to understand the architecture and the connections of the components experimentally and pragmatically, in the manner of a laboratory. The setting out of pathways to reach the proposed objectives was obvious neither to the programme partners nor the members of their networks.

In the course of the European and African consultations, the partners of the programme and their members were gradually able to appreciate the impact and the usefulness of the activities developed by themselves within each component.

This was the point at which the crying need became apparent for a structured and permanent communication from the programme towards its external audiences, but also within the programme, through different tools: intranet and web pages for each multi-stakeholder platform, information bulletins, training workshops and common publications.

The consultations have highlighted the expectations and the constraints about the forms of partnership to be established



> Consultation: an innovative element

The process of multi-stakeholder consultations at sectoral level and at the level of the different groups of stakeholders enabled the identification of expectations and constraints on the forms of partnerships to be created in agricultural research and development.

Within PAEPARD, these consultations have been instrumental in developing a common vision, necessary for the construction of any partnership. The experimentation required in innovation partnerships led PAEPARD to launch a process of calls open to ad-hoc partnerships, then to a user-led process (ULP).

The first process did not completely meet the recommendations that had been set out (imbalance in partnerships, more research-led initiatives, topics that do not meet the needs of users, almost total absence of funding, etc.) and was unable to satisfy PAEPARD's partners.

This is how a new process, the ULP, was proposed, more in line with the expectations of participants in the consultations, putting the users of research results at the heart of the process.

Recommendations

The recommendations of the various consultations laid the foundations for the sustainable construction of a process of multi-stakeholder partnerships. The following key ideas emerged:

- It is important to develop and institutionalise a framework of permanent dialogue between 'researchers' and 'non-researchers' in order to identify unifying themes that can be translated into research proposals supporting the creation of partnerships.
- Duration is an element that promotes the construction and ownership of a shared vision of partnership around a unifying theme.
- The partners involved must meet criteria that contribute to the sustainability of the partnership throughout the project (respect for the roles and responsibilities assigned, capacity to manage a partnership, sharing of expertise throughout the project, and of results at the end of the project, search for economic co-partnerships, being open to other areas of expertise, etc.).
- The strengthening of stakeholders' capacities to work together in partnerships and to develop competitive proposals is an ongoing and central activity in multi-stakeholder partnerships. This activity requires a constant re-evaluation of the

needs of stakeholders and constant adjusting of content for them.

- The search for funding that allows both the independence of the partnership and the research and development of solutions to the unifying theme.
- Communication is a way to energise the partnership (smooth dialogue between partners overcoming any language barriers), but also to promote it to the outside by using appropriate information and communication tools (website and intranet, blogs, social media, etc.).
- The coordination and the facilitation of the partnership are two distinct but complementary roles. The coordinator, chosen internally, will coordinate the activities of the partnership and the external support that is necessary; the facilitator, chosen externally, mediates, solves conflicts and seeks out new partners and funding.

Concluding remarks

Input from PAEPARD's consultations on the construction of partnerships

The exchanges that were organised in the course of the different sectoral or multi-stakeholder workshops allowed the participants to express their vision on the phases and the elements that they felt were indispensable for the construction of a balanced and sustainable partnership.

All the partners of PAEPARD are agreed on the following observation: while the cultures and the interests of each sector are often different, points of view need to converge and expertise be put at the disposal of all the partners if a partnership is to be successful.

Participants in the consultations all wanted a pragmatic and harmonised approach to the partnership process; beyond this, it must meet essential objectives related to agricultural development in Africa for the benefit of all populations.

Innovation in partnership can express itself in many ways:

- The place of stakeholders in the partnership and the importance of their roles and responsibilities were a central concern among stakeholders during the consultations. Agricultural research for development must be built around the needs expressed by the producers, who are the major users of research results,



through their organisations and other stakeholders (businesses, NGOs, etc.). The inclusion of 'non-researchers' in the partnership should take place at the early stages of setting up the project, as it involves distribution of resources and responsibilities that are traditionally managed by the research sector.

- The capacity of each stakeholder to respond to the expectations of the partnership is decisive. To ensure this, it is essential to facilitate capacity building according to needs so that each partner can meet the responsibilities assigned to them within the partnership.
- An environment that is favourable to the partnership between researchers and other stakeholders implies that donors and public authorities should build flexible funding mechanisms for ARD, in order to meet expectations and needs. Funding calls should facilitate the access of all stakeholders capable of managing funds. These should be available to fund research proposals that have emerged from a participative process enabling the identification of issues and topics for research that involve multiple stakeholders.
- Communication between members of a partnership and towards their environment helps to strengthen it by boosting the participatory process and giving greater visibility vis-à-vis other potential partners and donors interested in the identified themes. The stakeholders of a partnership must therefore have access to ICT tools (websites, social networks, etc.) and know how to use them.
- The development of economic partnerships between consortium partners (whether in the framework of the common theme or outside it) aiming to give stakeholders financial autonomy during the active phase of development of research topics and fundraising can contribute to the greater sustainability of the partnership.
- Agricultural innovation facilitators (AIF) may be brought to play a central role in the identification of common agricultural issues, due to their knowledge of the sectors and the players involved. Either as a consultant or attached to a producers' organisation, the AIF knows how best to support the creation of partnerships, how to lead them, to avoid or resolve conflicts, as they have been chosen and accepted by the stakeholders themselves. The AIF's involvement complements that of the partnership coordinator, who manages activities in line with an agreed

agenda. Moreover, the facilitator handles relations with donors during the provision of funding for research. The AIF takes part in the translation of agricultural problems into research proposals and in identifying possible funding sources¹⁶.

Consultations: what perspectives for the future?

The recommendations made during the consultations have led to two types of partnership process:

- Calls open to existing or ad-hoc partnerships; these have led to the selection of 19 consortia in two waves¹⁷.
- Development of a new process for the creation of partnerships led by the users of research (ULP)¹⁸.

PAEPARD has had to face the imbalance of partnerships that offered few possibilities to 'non-researchers' to lead research topics so they would meet their needs (the majority of consortia from the open calls). It has reacted by offering a more inclusive partnership process, giving a more balanced place to non-researchers in the partnerships (ULP). In both cases, PAEPARD mobilised the various components of the programme to strengthen the capacities of the consortia, to help them reorganise and even structure themselves around their projects through inception workshops¹⁹.

The programme also strengthened the capacities of the AIFs chosen by the consortia and ULP, in order to strengthen their role in the process, both for independent consultants and for the members of POs (see the 2011 and 2013 Entebbe workshop reports), and learned the lessons from its experience. At present, out of the 24 consortia supported by PAEPARD (19 open calls and 5 ULPs), only four use the services of an AIF. One of the reasons for their absence from most consortia is the impossibility of finding a sustainable solution to funding the position. It is worth noting that in the framework of the ULP, AIFs were recruited in five out of six phases, for as long as PAEPARD was providing financial support. The consortia mainly function with a coordinator (either a member of the consortium or a ULP coordinator).

PAEPARD has implemented a communication strategy to give greater visibility to the achievements of the programme, in particular the creation of partnerships. It involved organising four parallel workshops at international events during scientific weeks organised for example by the FARA, GCARD

The partnership shall make easier the resolution of problems for the benefit of each partner

¹⁶ See "From assumptions to reality", F. Stepman (2016) p. 12-15.

¹⁷ See "From assumptions to reality", F. Stepman (2016) p. 9.

¹⁸ See "From assumptions to reality", F. Stepman (2016) p. 10-11.

¹⁹ See "From assumptions to reality", F. Stepman (2016) p. 13-14.



or RUFORUM, during which actions for the creation of or support to consortia were presented. A dozen consortia have been able to take part in such events so far. PAEPARD also responded to the need expressed by the consortia to have internal communication tools created by the programme (nine consortia and three PAEPARD partners coordinating ULPs now benefit from them). These encourage an internal dynamic, but they also provide a means of monitoring and greater openness for the activities of the consortia, not only for PAEPARD's partners but also all the members of other consortia.

Despite the fact that PAEPARD organised eight proposal-writing workshops as part of its support programme for consortia, only 23 consortia (out of 79 proposals) obtained funding. They were able to apply to funding calls that were often identified by the programme itself. It is hard to identify the reasons for failure since donors do not give any explanation as to why certain proposals were rejected.

Here too, PAEPARD met the expectations of partnership members by providing them the means to start their research through an innovative financing tool: competitive research funds (CRFs). The granting of CRFs follows a selection process based on criteria evaluated by a committee of independent experts. Four consortia were eligible and were thus able to respond

to other international funding calls, complementing PAEPARD. Other consortia were also able to benefit from a second type of funding, incentive funds (IF) allowing eligible consortia to organise activities aimed at evolving their concept notes into research proposals during a writing workshop.

Through all the activities that it has developed, PAEPARD has created momentum among ARD stakeholders, both in Africa and in Europe, contributing to a greater understanding of the objectives of all involved and encouraging them to create an inclusive partnership process.

The communication tools, funding opportunities and support to the development of proposals in response to funding calls, developed by PAEPARD, would seem to respond to the needs expressed by stakeholders during the consultation process. They facilitate the implementation and the management of activities of multi-stakeholder partnerships. Nevertheless, as effective as they may be, these tools are applied within multi-stakeholder partnerships that are involved in a complex and changing environment, guided by people and institutions that might deflect them from their initial trajectory. The role of the managers of PAEPARD, while being flexible, is to make every effort to stay the course.

PAEPARD has created a dynamic among the stakeholders of ARD in encouraging them to create an inclusive partnership process



Researcher and producer discuss the health status of groundnuts in Malawi. (Photo: T. Chancellor, NRI)

List of abbreviations and acronyms

AAATF : African Agricultural Technology Foundation

ACBF : African Capacity Building Foundation

AFD : French Development Agency

AfDB : African Development Bank

AIF : Agricultural Innovation Facilitator

ANPRO-CA : National Agency for Rural Development and Agricultural Council

ARD : Agricultural Research for Development

ASARECA : Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa

BDEAC : Central Africa States Development Bank

CAADP : Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme

CEMAC : Monetary and Economic Community of Central Africa

CNOP-Guinea : National Council for Rural Organisations of Guinea

CNRA : National Center for Agricultural Research of Ivory Coast

COLEACP : Europe-ACP (Africa-Caribbean-Pacific) Liaison Committee for the promotion of ACP horticultural exports

CORAF : West and Central Africa Council for Agricultural Research and Development

CRF : Competitive Research Fund

EAC : East African Community

EAFF : East Africa Farmers Federation

ECCAS : Economic Community of Central African States

ECOWAS : Economic Community of West African States

ERA-ARD : European Research Area - Agricultural Research for Development

EU : European Union

FARA : Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa

FP7 : European Commission's Seventh Framework Programme

FSTP : Food Security Thematic Programme

GCARD : Global Conference on Agricultural Research for Development

GTZ : German Technical Cooperation Agency

IFAD : International Fund for Agricultural Development

INERA : Institute for the Environment and Agricultural Research of Niger

IPR/IFRA : Rural Polytechnic Institute for Training and Applied Research

IRAG : Institute of Agricultural Research of Guinea

KARI/KALRO : Kenya Agricultural Research Institute/Kenya Agricultural and Livestock Research Organisation

NEPAD : New Partnership for Africa's Development

NGO : Non-Governmental Organisation

PAEPARD : Platform for African European Partnership on Agricultural Research for Development

PAFO : Pan-African Farmers' Organisation

PANAAC : Pan-African Agribusiness and Agroindustry Consortium

PANGOC : Pan-African NGOs Consortium on Agricultural Research

PO : Producers' Organisation

PROPAC : Regional Platform of Farmers' Organisations of Central Africa

ROPFA : Network of Farmers' and Agricultural Producers' Organisations in West Africa

SADC : Southern African Development Community

SNV : Dutch not-for-profit international development organisation

UEMOA : West African Economic and Monetary Union

UNDP : United Nations Development Programme

USAID : United States Agency for International Development



PAEPARD



The Platform for Africa-Europe Partnership in Agricultural Research for Development (**PAEPARD**) is a 8-year project sponsored by the European Commission (80%) and partners' own contribution (20%).

It is coordinated by the Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa (**FARA**) since December 2009, and extended until end of 2017.

It aims at building joint African-European multi-stakeholder partnerships in agricultural research for development (**ARD**) contributing to achieving the Millennium Development Goals. On the European side, the partners are **AGRINATURA** (The European Alliance on Agriculture Knowledge for Development, coordinating the European partners), **COLEACP** (representing the private sector), **CSA** (representing the NGOs), **ICRA**, specialized in capacity building in ARD, and the Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation (**CTA**). On the African side and in addition to FARA, the partners are the Pan-African Farmers Organization (**PAFO**), the Regional Universities Forum for Capacity Building in Agriculture (**RUFORUM**) based in Kampala, and the Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Analysis Network (**FANRPAN**) based in Pretoria. PAFO involves its members that are the Eastern Africa Farmers Federation (**EAFF**) based in Nairobi, the Réseaux des Organisations Paysannes et des Producteurs d'Afrique de l'Ouest (**ROPPA**) based in Ouagadougou, and the Plate-forme Régionale des Organisations Paysannes d'Afrique Centrale (**PROPAC**) based in Yaoundé. The Southern African Confederation of Agricultural Unions (**SACAU**) is an associate partner of **PAEPARD**.



Disclaimer: «This project has been funded with the support of the European Commission's Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development (DG-DevCo). This publication reflects the views only of the authors, and the European Union cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein».

paepard@dgroups.org
www.paepard.org

