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# ANNEX I. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<td>3</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>UK NRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
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<td>Stuart</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>The Netherlands ICRA</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>D'Elia</td>
<td>Gabriella</td>
<td>Italy IAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>De Santis</td>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Italy IAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Diop</td>
<td>Babacar</td>
<td>Senegal FONGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ewole</td>
<td>Gustave</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Félicité-Zulma</td>
<td>Denis</td>
<td>France COLEACP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Flament</td>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Belgium CSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fonts</td>
<td>Augusti</td>
<td>Spain IRTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Gallot</td>
<td>Estelle</td>
<td>Belgium European Agri-Agencies network AgriCord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Glin</td>
<td>Laurent</td>
<td>Benin OBEPA/ Environmental Policy Group WUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Goita</td>
<td>Mamadou</td>
<td>Senegal ROPPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Guichard</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>France COLEACP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Helmer</td>
<td>Thierry</td>
<td>France CIRAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Holderness</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Italy GFAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Howlett</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>UK University of Leeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
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<td>Rabe Isa</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Merli</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Italy IAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Muchiri</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Kenya Eastern Africa Farmers Federation (EAAF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Mugabe</td>
<td>Jonas</td>
<td>Rwanda FARA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ortolani</td>
<td>Livia</td>
<td>Italy AIAB (Association Italienne Agriculture Biologique)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Osiru</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Uganda RUFORUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Papucci</td>
<td>Audrey</td>
<td>France Action Contre la Faim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
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<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Provost</td>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
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<td>France</td>
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<td>Sarfatti</td>
<td>Paolo</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
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<td>36</td>
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<td>Joel</td>
<td>France</td>
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<tr>
<td>37</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Tessier</td>
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<td>Italy</td>
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<tr>
<td>40</td>
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<td>Hans-Willem</td>
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<td>42</td>
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<td>Carl</td>
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ANNEX II. SOME STATISTICS ON PARTICIPANTS

42 persons participated in the European multi-stakeholder consultation, including the PAEPARD partners. Invitations were launched by WP1 PAEPARD partners (work package 1) for their “own” stakeholder family: IAO/ICRA launched about 10 invitations for research, COLEACP launched about 10 invitations for private sector and CSA launched about 7 invitations for European NGO and 3 for African farmers’ organizations.

The distribution of participants in terms of gender and stakeholder family is illustrated by the graphs below.

Participants’ distribution in terms of gender

Participants’ distribution in terms of stakeholders family
ANNEX III. PROGRAM

DAY 1 – March 7th 2011

Morning session

08.30-08.40 Welcome to participants (Giovanni Totino, IAO)
08.40-09.00 Workshop introduction, objectives, expected results, agenda (Jon Daane, ICRA)
09.00-09.20 Outcomes of European internal stakeholder consultations (Julie Flament, Paolo Sarfatti, Catherine Guichard)
09.20-09.40 Synthesis of African internal stakeholder consultations
09.40-10.30 Discussion on the internal stakeholder consultations
10.30-11.00 Coffee break
11.00-11.10 Presentation of the 3 topics to be discussed in each group, objectives, expected results and methodology of the group work (François Stepman, PAEPARD)
   1. Processes and mechanisms for balanced partnerships
   2. Promising federating themes for partnership
   3. Collective and individual stakeholder groups needs in terms of information, capacity strengthening, and advocacy.
11.10-12.30 Introductions on the 3 topics:
   • Babacar Diop, FONGS. Processes and mechanisms for balanced partnerships at the national level: experience of partnership between research and African farmers’ organizations in Senegal (topic 1 and 3)
   • Rabe Mani, FAO Nigeria. Strategic agricultural research and development for national food security value chain (topic 2)
   • Henri Rouillé d’Orfeuil, Coordination Sud. Processes and mechanisms for balanced partnerships at the international level (topics 1 and 3)
   • Laurent Glin, Obepap/Wur. Partnering for demand-driven agricultural innovation: forming and strengthening capacity of a multi-stakeholder partnership in the rice sector in Benin (topic 3)
   • Catherine Guichard, COLEACP Synthesis of the experience of the first PAEPARD call: partnerships, themes, quality and needs (topic 1,2, and 3).
12.30-13.30 Lunch break

Afternoon session

13.30-18.00 Working groups (3 parallel groups). Groups will discuss each of the three topics and will elaborate conclusions and recommendations for the PAEPARD project. Facilitators: Jon Daane (ICRA), Paolo Sarfatti (IAO), Timothy Chancellor (Agrinatura)
### DAY 2 – March 8th 2011

#### Morning session

8.30-10.30 Working groups continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.30-10.30</td>
<td>Topic 3: Collective and individual groups’ needs</td>
<td>Topic 1: Processes and mechanisms of balanced partnerships</td>
<td>Topic 2: Promising federating teams for partnership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.30-11.00 Coffee break

11.00-11.45 Presentation of each group’s conclusions and recommendations for each topic by reporters: Moses Osiru (Ruforum, topic 3), Francois Stepman (topic 1), Jonas Mugabe (topic 2)

11.45-12h30 General discussion on the groups’ conclusions and recommendations (moderators: Jon Daane and Timothy Chancellor)

12.30-13.30 Lunch break

#### Afternoon session

13.30-14.30 General discussion on the groups’ conclusions and recommendations (moderators: Jon Daane and Timothy Chancellor)

14.30-15.00 PAEPARD comments and responses on the groups’ conclusions and recommendations (Paolo Sarfatti, IAO, and Stephen Muchiri, EAFF)

15.00-15.15 Wrap-up and workshop conclusion (FARA: Adewale Adekunle)
ANNEX IV. COMPOSITION OF WORKING GROUPS

Group 1: French and English - Facilitator: Paolo Sarfatti
1. Carvalho
2. De Meo
3. Fonts
4. Goita
5. Guichard
6. Helmer
7. Howlett
8. Mani
9. Papucci
10. Van Der Waal

Group 2: French - Facilitator: Jon Daane
1. Del Debbio
2. Diop
3. Ewole
4. Flament
5. Felicité-Zuma
6. Glin
7. Imele
8. Pillot
9. Provost
10. Sor
11. Tessier
12. Van Damme
13. Rouille D’Orfeuil

Group 3: English - Facilitator: Tim Chancellor
1. Adekunle
2. Coupe
3. D’Elia
4. Gallot
5. Holderness
6. Ortolani
7. Wulfrank
ANNEX V. KEY ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS POSTED BY PARTICIPANTS

Demand articulation / Articulation de la demande

Recommendations

- Research must focus on smallholders
- Demand must come from the actors who are to be stakeholders in the process.
- It is important to ensure that the needs of smallholders are taken into account by researchers.
- Mechanisms must be developed so that non-research actors can express their needs in terms of research and other mechanisms developed which allow researchers to satisfy them.
- PAEPARD must be « demand-driven ». The main objective (battle) must be identified, as well as how to tackle obstacles to its achievement
- Researchers should dedicate more time to understanding the farmers’ situation (context, private sectors, daily tasks…) and define jointly with the farmers which areas/themes to work on.
- The objective is to supply effective answers to needs expressed; the partnership is merely a means, not an end in itself (and must not become the new religion)

Questions asked

- How should demands and needs of the RPOs be identified and incorporated into the PAEPARD approach?
- How can PAEPARD gain access to private sector demands, which require rapid reactions to market changes?
- How can private sector involvement in the identification and support of research questions be strengthened?

Partnership, partnership formation and ways of enhancing PAEPARD’s added value or complementarity / Partenariat, formation de partenariat et moyens pour améliorer la valeur ajoutée et complémentarité de PAEPARD

Partnerships / Partenariats

Recommendations

- Foster the creation of partnerships centred around an issue, getting the actors to network with one another; direct research and funding
- Build up partnerships which enhance the efficacy of Agricultural Research for Development (RAD) and partnerships with the private sector.
- Create a paper about ten pages long reflecting on the term « brokerage » or facilitation
- Build on the existing initiatives which have already been launched.
- Use similar initiatives from other continents as reference points.

Questions asked
• In what ways can PAEPARD concentrate its efforts and add value to the level of support it gives to the implementation of new partnerships?
• How can it become a true hub, bringing together the various actors and possibly initiate some joint projects?
• Who chooses the level of competence of the researchers for any given partnership (student, seasoned professor)?

**Advocacy / Plaidoyer**

**Recommendations**

• The institutions which need to be got on board in order to increase funding for RAD in Africa should be identified

• International cooperation between research/non research actors needs to be promoted and to progress. It must be made more effective and more systematic in the development area.

**Strengthening of capacities / Renforcement des capacités**

**Recommendations**

• PAEPARD should enhance the capacity of potential partners to carry out analyses of challenges and constraints before developing project proposals. This is essential for objectives and actions to be shared.

• PAEPARD’s capacity-building activities should contribute to bringing about social change in research

**Federating themes / Thématiques clés**

**Recommendations**

• Discussions on federating themes must be continued

• Consideration must be given to neglected issues which could benefit smallholding farmers

**Suggestions for federating themes / Suggestions de thématiques-clé**

• The vulnerability of key products to climate change, from the farm to the plate: water resources, energy, new and devastating plant diseases, competition.

• Making social change through the way in which research is conducted.

• The introduction of biopesticides must be a priority action because we are concerned with export markets and national public health (healthy and sustainable environment)

• The new tools for research on family farming and on different production models
ANNEX VI. KEY-SPEAKERS’ PRESENTATIONS

The presentations which follow are derived from the contributions by the guest speakers, as described in the programme:

- **Babacar Diop, FONGS, Senegal.** Processes and mechanisms for balanced partnerships at the national level: experience of partnership between research and rural farmers’ organisations in Senegal.

- **Rabe Mani, FAO, Nigeria.** Strategic agricultural research and development for national food security value chain.

- **Henri Rouillé d’Orfeuil, Coordination CIRAD-South, France.** Processes and mechanisms for balanced partnerships at the national level.

- **Laurent Glin, Obepap/Wur.** Demand-driven partnerships for innovation: training and capacity-strengthening in a multi-stakeholder partnership in the rice sector in Benin.

- **François Stepman PAEPARD.** Summary of the results of PAEPARD’s first appeal: partnerships, themes and needs.
Babacar Diop, FONGS. Processes and mechanisms for balanced partnerships at the national level: experience of partnership between research and rural farmers’ organisations in Senegal.

Presentation on the FONGS (membership and networks)

The FONGS is an independent small farmers’ association federating 31 local associations (at county or regional levels); it is a founder member of the CNCR and is committed to the building and coordination of a strong rural people’s movement at all levels.

The vision and strategy of the FONGS

FONGS members are mainly smallholding farmers who share the vision of rural and agricultural development led by family farming.

The FONGS supports the associations in implementing the economic and social transformations they aspire to at the rural family level and uses the rural people’s movement as a channel for advocacy activities to influence policy-making.

Agriculture in Senegal is faced with 4 challenges

1. The food sufficiency challenge: Senegal is strongly dependent on imports (31% of its consumption) and spends almost 225 billion CFA francs per year on importing rice.
2. The challenge of sustainable management of natural resources: space and resources available are not infinite.
3. The challenge of employment for rural youth: Currently 269 000 young people (of whom 153 000 living in the country) come onto the labour market every year.
4. The challenge of improving living standards and income: 65% of poor households are in rural areas.

The place of research

Faced with these challenges, it is advisable to concentrate all available energy and tools on fostering:

- widespread introduction of innovations which can enhance the capacity of family farms to increase their primary production in a sustainable manner.
- designing and implementing fairer policies and investing in the real potential of family farms.

Among the tools to be activated are research and extension. It is important that as of now we should include the «advisory and dissemination» aspect in our considerations, so as to move «from the lab to the field».

An example: the National Agricultural and Food Technology Research Fund (FNRAA).

The mission of the FNRAA is to finance to order those agricultural and food technology research projects considered a priority by the State, development partners and the users of research findings (RPOs, etc).

The FNRAA’s vision is to create the conditions for a diversified and sustainable funding of agricultural and food technology in Senegal.

Case study
Under the FNRAA umbrella, the RPOs, the local grain processing associations and the bakers’ associations started a test project for making multigrain bread, using grains grown locally for its production.

This product, presented by the RPOs, was accepted by a deliberation committee comprising the various stakeholders involved in the research.

Practical experience of collaboration between the FONGS and research: EXFAM

The « EXFAM » project, active in Senegal between 2007 and 2009, funded by the National Fund for Agricultural and Rural Research, saw the collaboration of the FONGS, the Senegalese Institute for Agricultural Research (ISRA), the Directorate of Analysis, Planning and Statistics (DAPS) of the Ministry of Agriculture and the Textile Fibre Development Company (SODEFITEX), in order to gain a better understanding of the conditions of rural people in Senegal: the issue for the FONGS was the introduction of the « nutritional needs coverage rate » as an indicator of rural poverty.

Practical experience of collaboration between the FONGS and research: « Quality Production »

The farmers’ organizations carry out joint research activities with the National Agency for Rural and Agricultural Advice (ANCAR), and the Senegalese Institute for Agricultural Research (ISRA), to introduce seed varieties suited to the new climate conditions: the case of black-eyed peas in the peanut-growing area and onions in the river valley.

Practical experience of collaboration between the FONGS and research: « Productivity problems »

The FONGS conducted an evaluation process on the productivity of family farming, together with Initiative prospective agricole et rurale (IPAR). This process gave the farmers’ organizations the opportunity to update their political aims and their practice.

Lessons learned

Research must not be an end, but a tool serving the other direct actors in the economy and in society.

Demand must originate from these actors, and the latter must have full understanding of the process in which they are to be stakeholders

In the practical experiences mentioned here, it was the FONGS which undertook the activities, chose its partners and coordinated the processes.

Proposals of themes on which to direct research

The process of evaluating the productivity of family farming (FF) conducted by the farmers belonging to the FONGS and the CNCR, pointed to three themes to work on to improve the capacity of FF to satisfy the population’s nutritional requirements:

1. Improving the overall productivity of FF
2. Improve the capacity to manage land areas and natural resources
3. Foster the development of rural economies and businesses

How far can PAEPARD contribute to the implementation of these themes?
Rabe Mani, FAO Nigeria. Strategic agricultural research and development for national food security value chain.

Focus of Presentation

1. Expound on factors that prevent agricultural research findings make the expected desired impact from a Nigeria Perspective.
2. Set course for discussion to answer the following questions
   a. What will be the strategy to overcome the factors and accelerate impact?
   b. What kind of partnership can be developed to address the factors.
   c. What are the strategic priority research areas such partnership should address?

Nigeria Brief

- Land Area: 923,768km²; 84 million ha of agric. land
- Rainfall 300mm in North to 2500 mm in coastal south
- Ecological Vegetation: Semi-arid, Sub-humid, Humid and Mangrove
- Population: Est. 154 million (65% rural based; 70% engaged in agriculture)
- Federation: 36 States and 1 federal capital Territory
- Government: Presidential 3 Tier Govt System Local, State and Federal
- Agriculture on Concurrent List of the Constitution (Agric Research almost Exclusive to Federal Institutions)
- Agricultural Research: 15 National Agric Research Institutes + 36 Federal Universities (16 with established Faculties of Agric.)
- Federal Ministry of Science and Technology: 19 Institutions (RMRDC, NABDA, NBTI)
- IARCs (IITA, ILRI, IFPRI)

National Agric. Research System

- 18 National Agricultural Research Institutes
- 3 Universities of Agriculture
- 15 Colleges of Agriculture
- 47 Faculties of Agriculture
- 8 Faculties of Veterinary Medicine

Limiting Factors and Constraints

- Low uptake of research findings and technology
- Weak extension system
- Research not translated into technology for entrepreneurial interest
- Weak marketing system and limited market capacity to absorb surplus
- Weak agriculture – industry linkage
- Weak infrastructure that supports agricultural growth
**Emerging Challenges**

1. Low yielding crop varieties and broodstock
2. Population growth and urbanization
3. Labor as constraint to agricultural production
4. Climate Change and Environmental factors

**Observation**

- Agricultural Research and Development is expected to be a vehicle that moves or accelerates agricultural development and ensure national food security.
- In Nigeria, in spite of well established system, agric R&D has not provided the expected stimulus to attain the objectives.
- The challenges of agric R&D include major constraints and blockages that are technically not agricultural.
- These factors have contributed to limit the impact of agric R&D to the growth of the agricultural sector and attainment of food security.

**Food Value Chain Conceptual Framework**

- Critical Research and Development Challenge Areas
- Policy Factors
- Production Factors
- Storage and processing
- Marketing and Market Access
- Transport
- Value Addition and Quality Control

**Strategy to overcome the factors and accelerate impact**

- Assist countries to have consistent policy that promotes agro-industrial linkages.
- Agricultural R&D be geared towards addressing the food supply value chain.
- The R&D needs to be focused and respond to demand of the various stages along the value chain.
- Strong partnership with non-agricultural institutions to build the required synergy.
- Strong partnership and involvement of the private sector.

**Nature of Partnership for Value Chain Agriculture R&D**

- Partnership that takes account of each partner’s competency and comparative advantage.
- Partnership should have both vertical and horizontal linkages at community, country, regional and international levels.
- The partners should jointly agree on the priority and focus of interventions.
- Partners should have the capacity to deliver their component of the package.

**Strategic areas to build partnership**
• Selection of priority commodities
• Improvement of planting materials and brood stock
• Natural Resources Management and Environmental Sustenance
• Research findings and Technology adoption studies
• Information Sharing
• M & E of adopted technologies and impact assessment studies
• Capacity building in agricultural research management
• Translating research into technology (development) NBTI-FMST
• Capacity building in agricultural entrepreneurship
• Strategic areas to build partnership. continued
• Policy analysis and advocacy for agriculture – industry linkage
• Support the setting up of rural agro-industries for semi-processing, value addition and employment generation
• Formation of cooperatives and their empowerment through entrepreneurship training and skills acquisition.
• Engage rural entrepreneurs and commodities merchants in market structure development and information sharing.

Partnership Opportunity in Nigeria
• Government has a medium term agric policy and plan within the Vision 2020 strategy
• Vision 2020, emphasizes access to technology for increased small holder productivity, expanded irrigation and access to markets.
• Nigeria has articulated its National Agriculture Investment Plan (NIAP) and has an ECOWAP Compact
• Policy paradigm shift to emphasize private sector leadership and promotion of commercial agriculture.

Partnership Opportunity in Nigeria
• Nigeria has Agricultural Research Strategy nested within CORAF, and FARA Strategic Plans
• Has a coordinating body in place (ARCN) to provide required leadership.
• ARCN to be managed on Programmes (Value Chain) structure
• Research Strategic Plan to be implemented on Results Based Management System
• Expect ‘Buy ins’ from partners
• There are other national agencies already existing to address the none-core agricultural areas of the food value chain.
• There are regional and international agencies to work with
Henri Rouillé d’Orfeuil, Southern Coordination. Processes and mechanisms for balanced partnerships at the national level.

**Institutional Partnerships**
- Participation in governance of the institutions (Board of directors)
- Representation in technical bodies
- Representation in evaluation authorities

**Operational partnerships**
- Gap between research findings and producers’ practices:
  - Publishable research findings
  - Effective practices
- A need for facilitation
- Working together around the idea for innovation (technical or organizational)

**Origins of innovations**
- Scientific origin and incorporation into the farmers’ agricultural, social and economic practice following trials on different scales and at various control levels
- Rural origin, replicated in different environments and situations

**Reflections on innovations by farmers**
- Looking to the future ... but how to speed up and safeguard innovation and change?
- The four functions/stages of a policy for innovation:
  - Identifying innovations
  - Funding
  - Assessing
  - Promoting/disseminating

**Reflections on innovations by farmers (continued)**
- Tools:
  - Introduction of a funding obligation in project financing contracts
  - Ways of capitalizing on them: Files, encyclopaedic files, website
  - Partnership contracts
  - ICT support
- Driving forces:
  - Recognition (becoming well-known)
  - Enactment of « farmers’ rights »,
  - Recognition of experience-based knowledge (VAE in French) translated into a diploma-bearing path ...
How to speed up the process of capitalizing on knowledge?

- Knowledge of commercial value/nature ... and a certificate
- Knowledge of scientific value/nature ... and publication in scientific journals
- Popular/farmers innovation ... and what?

**Introduction: Why the rice sector?**

- The need for a ‘field’ for social learning and co-innovation in the agricultural sector in Benin originated at the beginning of the process of setting up of the PNISA (*Plateforme Nationale pour l’Innovation dans le Secteur Agricole au Benin*);
- The idea was to identify a federating theme that could converge several stakeholders’ interests and mobilize their commitment to a joint learning process;
- The envisaged entry point to such a process could be either a problematic or a commodity chain;
- Thus, a systematic guideline was conceived for the purpose of selecting this problematic/commodity chain.

**Criteria set for the selection of the problematic/commodity chain**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Notoriety</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Equity</th>
<th>Sustainabil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political and social relevance</td>
<td>Technical relevance</td>
<td>Efficiency in use of research resources</td>
<td>Distribution of effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Envisaged procedure for applying the criteria**

- Documentation on national and regional agricultural policies;
- From which a list of relevant research needs (problematic or commodity chain-oriented) is established;
- A number of evaluators is appointed;
Each of the above identified research needs is assessed according to the designed criteria (on a five-point scoring);

The individual assessments are aggregated and ranked;

The highest scored research theme is selected for the joint learning and co-innovation process.

**Documentation on several commodity chains**

Discussions and concertations within the steering committee of PNISA led to the choice of a number of commodity chains as potential ‘fields’ for a multi-stakeholder agricultural innovation process: Milk, Cotton, Pineapple, Rice, Chicken, Pork, Vegetables, Roots and tubers.

**Another process, another agreement!**

- Parallel to the process engaged by PNISA, the Project NPT 146, a Dutch-funded project aiming at strengthening research relevance in FSA and EPAC (at Abomey-Calavi University in Benin) initiated a multi-stakeholder workshop, which came up with an agreement on six potential commodity chains likely to serve as entry point for joint learning processes. These include: Vegetables, Rice, Pork, Pineapple, Cotton, Fish

**Cross-checking agreements on the rice and pork sectors**

- One important objective of the NPT Project is to improve the relevance of research by strengthening the connection between university’s agricultural departments and the rural world to respond more effectively to field demand in innovation;

- In this perspective, the project intended to identify a practical field to build up this connection;

- A multi-stakeholder meeting was organized (December, 31st 2009) by the coordination of the Project in partnership with the PNISA board for this purpose;

- The participants agreed to build on existing dynamics and the need of a multi-disciplinary perspective;

- It was then decided to cross-check the initiatives of PNISA and NPT Project with the national priorities from the Government, which defined 13 priority agricultural commodities;

- The cross-checking of these three existing agreements (PNISA, NPT workshop and national priorities) gave rise to more than two commodities;

- An additional argument, i.e. existence of working experience, has been considered and led to the choice of the rice and pork sectors.

**A participatory explorative field inquiry**

- A multi-disciplinary and multi-institutional team was formed (sociologist, plant scientist, animal scientist, economist), which went to the field (6-8 January 2010) to:

  o Submit the choice of rice and pork sectors as learning field for a multi-stakeholder innovation development to the opinion of professionals groups and farmers;

  o Assess the potential of stakes and research opportunities within these commodity chains.
• Through a participatory methodology (throughout the process of preparation and implementation of the field visit):
  o farmers’ organizations being given a sense of responsibility;
  o Unstructured interviews and focus group
    ▪ Addressing challenges faced in the rice sector;
    ▪ From a historic perspective

A participatory explorative field inquiry

It came out from that field visit that:

• The rice sector is relevant as a field for social learning and multi-stakeholders innovation development process;
• Several stakeholders were willing to engage in such a multi-stakeholder innovation process;
• The major challenges faced by the rice sector include:
  o quality issue: variety blending, storing facilities and duration;
  o Access to market: partly due to the quality issue;
  o Water management: free riding of individual farmers (maintenance of the irrigation system);
  o Other issues: resistance of weeds to herbicides; bird attacks; lack of technical support, etc.

Engaging partnership to address the challenges of the rice sector

A multi-stakeholders workshop was held from January 18th to 27th, 2010.

• About thirty stakeholders were gathered from:
  o Universities: FSA/UAC, EPAC;
  o Research institutes: INRAB;
  o Platforms of actors: PNISA;
  o Farmers’ organizations: UNIRIZ, ANEP;
  o Financial institutions: MDB;
  o Extension services: CeRPA-ZC

• Objective
  o To seal the commitment of stakeholders to build up a social learning community to address the challenges in the rice sector in Benin;
  o To make a participatory in-depth diagnosis and action research planning, which will serve as “seed” for a multi-stakeholders project in the rice sector in Benin.

Way of doing…..

• Building on stakeholders’ knowledge and experiences;
• An iterative process in progressive cycles, recycling reflections and products of each phase as input for the following through plenary sessions and working groups alternatively;
• The model starts from need assessment in innovations to multi-stakeholders action plan development;
• Facilitation by experts (2 international; 1 local).

**Major outputs**

• Action research plan for the development of the rice in Benin;
• Trust building among stakeholders (due to fair discussion; importance given to all kinds of knowledge);
• Renewing of commitment of stakeholders to pursuing the multi-stakeholders innovation development process in the rice sector;
• Setting up a task force to pursue the writing of the project and task division.

**Finalization of the multi-stakeholders project for the rice sector**

• Restitution of report to concerned institutions by participants to negotiate institutional commitment;
• Mini-workshop of project draft writing and governance structure designing (20-21, March 2010) by force task members, NPT coordination, a representative of PNISA;
• Recourse to technical expertise (from universities and research centers) for particular technical details or improvements;
• Mini-workshop of re-reading of the project document;
• Finalization by the force task members.

**The Rice Project: “Rice Action-Research for Development”**

• **Overall objective:** To promote a multi-stakeholders partnership for the development of the rice sector in the Centre of Benin
• **Project leaders:** PNISA, FSA, EPAC, UNIRIZC
• **Budget:** 1.309.206 Euros

**Way ahead!**

• Identification of potential partners for fundraising;
• Setting up of fundraising committees (4) composed of 3-5 stakeholders;
• Informal contacts;
• Submission of project document to some potential donors.

**Conclusion**

• The process that led to the choice of the rice sector demonstrated:
• The diversity of sources of stakes and stakeholders (PNISA, NPT 146, Government priorities);
• Awareness of this reality consequently helped deploy concertation and collaboration as a means to achieve necessary agreements;
• The rice sector appeared to be an interesting “field” of social learning and co-innovation due to:
  o its potential in research opportunities on the one hand and
- the willingness of stakeholders to engage in such a multi-stakeholders process to address the multiple and complex challenges that can hardly be solved by individual actors.

- Fair, transparent and balanced discussion (valuing all kinds of knowledge), next to working experiences help build trust among stakeholders;

- A good facilitation with a sufficient flexibility and the existence of a financial mechanism (the NPT Project) to support the process seem also critical in results so far achieved.
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PAEPARD launched on 8th of December 2010 a call for applications for support to the development of multi-stakeholder partnerships that promote demand-driven agricultural innovation and research; deadline was 28/01/2011:

- 82 proposals received
- 52 proposals were accepted on administrative grounds
- 52 proposals were pre-selected for a technical appraisal
- 51 proposals have been reviewed in pairs by the WP5 Selection Committee

**Technical eligibility criteria**

Profile of Applicant and partners

- Required expertise and experience from leader
- Competence from proposed partners
- Quality of proposed division of roles

Partnership suitability

- Definition of clear innovation challenges
- Evidence of demand by end users
- Contribution to existing initiatives
- Sustainability of partnership

Expected impact

- Intended beneficiaries + development outcomes
- Potentials for development of research partnership
- Expected outcomes to benefit large number of people beyond the partnership

Funding prospects

- European funding opportunities 30
- Canadian funding opportunities 3
- American funding opportunities 6
- Regional / National/African funding opportunities 3
- Not mentioned: 40

**Funding prospects**  (European Commission)

- Union européenne TG-2011-GJG-1901860995 - 15 February 2011 - 1
- HRST/ST/AURG/CALL1/2011 (Ref EuropeAid/130-741/D/ACT/ACP) ACP-EU Cooperation Programme 30th April 2011 - 17
- ACP Edulink funded by the European Union Expected to be issued during the 1st quarter of 2011 - 6
- FP7-KBBE-2012-5-CP-CSA - 2
• FP8 - 1
• Food Security Thematic Programme de la CE (2009-2013) - 1
• Les appels à projet annuels du Programme Société Civile et Culture (PSCC) de l’Union Européenne - 1

**Themes**

**Food Security**
- Nutritional balance
- Increase in rural income
- Family farming, ecological farming, direct marketing
- Crop - livestock integration
- Urban agriculture

**Production**
- Ecological intensification, diversification
- Increase in vegetable or fruit crops production
- Post harvest technologies and handling
- Aquaculture/fish farming
- Pork production

**Sustainable land and resources management**
- Soil fertility
- Seed/plant material multiplication, in vitro multiplication, aeroponics
- water management
- Disease control
- Bio pesticides
- Technology transfer
- Mitigating effects of climate change

**Innovative approaches**
- Tools for measuring impacts among the end users.
- Platforms and tools for interactions between researchers and farmers, involving the other stakeholders in the value chains.
- E-agriculture: GIS, KIM, interactive multi-media learning and decision making tools
- Enhancing farmer ownership of innovation process
- Linking smallholders to markets
- Facilitate direct market access for African producers for export crops
- Participatory variety selection
- PPP
ANNEX VII. REPORTS OF EUROPEAN INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

1. Report of the consultation 2010 of the European Private Sector
2. Report of the consultation 2010 of the European NGO Sector
Introduction and background

The consultation of European Private sector operators was carried out in the framework of PAEPARD Work package 1 (Mobilising European Stakeholders).

Following identification work of the European importers of fruits and vegetables already engaged in Africa who were the most likely to be interested by the PAEPARD approach, COLEACP mobilized them through 3 complementary steps: (1) surveying their needs and expectations by circulating a questionnaire; (2) holding some face-to-face discussions when possible during events and meetings; (3) conducting a consultation meeting which was held in Brussels on October 26, 2010.

This approach encompassing both physical and virtual discussions was deemed necessary since the September-October period is usually very busy with several world trade events taking place and limiting availability for attending other events. It proved to be appropriate since social movements in Europe in October 2010 affected the logistics of perishable products throughout Europe and reduced even further the availability of some importers to devote time for the consultation and attendance of meetings.

The consultation

In Year 1 of PAEPARD II, COLEACP was in charge of organizing the consultation of the European Private Sector with a view to compiling past experience and future prospects for collaboration with the research sector and universities in the field of Agricultural Research for Development in Sub-Saharan Africa.

Due to the delays in finalizing the Consortium agreement (July 2010), the internal consultation of the private sector only started in September. It was therefore decided to target the COLEACP network of members in the fresh fruit and vegetable sector and postpone in Year 2 an extension of the consultation to some other European industries.

COLEACP databases of European importers of fruits and vegetables were firstly searched in order to identify those private companies already engaged in Africa who were the most likely to be interested
by the PAEPARD concept and willing to collaborate. A second search was conducted in order to categorize importers according to their domain of specialization (conventional, organic, fair trade) and consequently get feedback on specific needs per industry.

Following the circulation of a questionnaire to 330 private companies by mid-October 2010, 50 replies were received by end of November (20% from European importers, 54% from African exporters and 26% from African local experts and service providers).

When the Consultative meeting took place on October 26, a review of the first replies to the questionnaire was made and initiated a lively discussion between participants.

**The questionnaire:**

The questionnaire was designed in order to assess the interest of European private companies to collaborate with researchers and universities along the three following sub-objectives:

- Optimising the economic performance of companies along the value chains,
- Meeting “societal” demands,
- Learning from past experiences to build more interaction between the private sector and the ARD institutions for contributing to reduction of hunger, alleviation of poverty and sustainable management of natural resources.

Some initial questions allowed for a better understanding of the company involvement in the value chain from production in Africa to export, import and distribution in Europe, and whether the company was involved in conventional trade, organic trade and/or fair trade. Due to the pressure exerted on suppliers by European retailers, importers were also asked to indicate which private certifications were requested from their African suppliers.

Beyond European importers, the questionnaire was adapted for circulation within the COLEACP network of African private sector members, ie. African exporters and local experts.

The questions about the “optimization of the economic performance of companies” included the following ones:

- Are there any innovative techniques/methods that you would like to see available in Africa and at what stage?
- What innovative partnerships and new forms of relationships/organisation should be established between companies in the industry? with research institutions and universities? at what stages?
- What technical problems should be resolved with the support of research?

Concerning the “societal” demands as expressed by the consumers or for corporate responsibility, the questions focused on the following issues:

- Do you think that Africa lacks independent scientific/technical references (where African researchers and university experts could make a useful contribution) in the following fields:
  - Organic agriculture,
  - Environmental protection,
  - Rational management of water,
  - Renewable energies,
  - Social conditions of employment of local workforce:
  - Other issues.

Finally private companies were invited to explain on an anonymous basis the reasons for success or failure of their past collaboration with researchers and university people in order to draw lessons from the examples and better prepare for future partnerships.
Details were sought on the following aspects:

- what kind of research partner? in Europe? in Africa?
- purpose of the collaboration?
- expected results?
- nature of mutual commitments?
- results obtained?

Please indicate what kind of new working relationships should be established between African companies and the world of research?

Responses to the questionnaire

Regarding the "optimization of the economic performance of companies", a majority of answers still pointed out unresolved technical problems with plant health, mainly those due to diseases such as anthracnosis and pests such as fruit flies. Worries were expressed by business operators that researchers are neglecting their needs and leaving them with no efficient solution. Much interest was expressed for research work that would result in more rational fertilization, safer crop protection through development of bio-pesticides and more crop value addition through re-use/processing of by-products or waste.

With no surprise, respondents mentioned raising European customers’ expectations regarding organic production, environmental protection, minimized water and energy uses, as well as social conditions of employment of local workforce in Africa. The need for African suppliers to receive support for obtaining GAP and environmental certifications was expressed, as well as for demonstrating corporate responsibility regarding workers’ health and welfare (special attention to be paid to family health, children’s education and employment of women).

Among past experience of collaboration with agricultural research, some partnerships were quoted as being successful in part or in total, for example partnerships on:

- Madagascar lychees with the University of Pretoria in South Africa,
- Production/post-harvest/storage of pineapples, bananas and mangoes of West African growers with CIRAD in France,
- Soil analysis for adjusting fertilization of Guinean producers with the national Research institute,
- Floral induction by ethylene treatment for small scale fields in Cameroon.

It is worth noting that all respondents supported the idea of placing young researchers in producers’ organizations or exporters’ organizations.

The Consultative meeting

The Consultative meeting took place on 26 October 2010 in Brussels with the participation of 2 European importers, 1 Exporter from Senegal, 2 experts from the COLEACP/PIP programme and 5 PAEPARD representatives of WP1, WP4, WP5 as well as the EU co-manager. The Coleacp Delegate General chaired the session with the support of a Professor from the Gembloux University of Belgium who presented experiences of collaboration between the Private sector and Research and moderated the ensuing debate. Additional presentations were made respectively by CSA/WP1 co-leader on the results of the 1st consultation of European NGOs and by ICRA/WP4 leader on Innovative partnerships for Innovation in Africa.

The main outcomes of this first internal consultation of the EU Private sector, in the fresh fruit and vegetable subsector, were the following:

- overall ignorance or “reserved” interest of a substantial number of private operators towards research; among frequently asked questions: what are “they” doing? how can “they” help me?
- both importers in Europe and exporters in Africa are under rising pressure of regulations and private standards, with responsibilities and costs being pushed by retailers back to suppliers; such businesses tend to look for short-term, technical and immediately applicable solutions; this trend is seen as generating more precarity for small producers and small enterprises in Africa;

- operators in the fresh produce trade usually buy ‘patented’ technology and services from providers; only some medium to big size operators enter into contract with research institutions and pay for results, sometimes on an exclusivity basis and with no willingness to share with other operators; limitations can be seen in the collaboration between private sector and research attributed mainly to a lack of finance on both sides;

- lack of interaction and communication is frequently mentioned; as a consequence, different understanding of challenges to be met lead to divergent views on best ways to address them; therefore there is a strong need for appropriate platforms for regular and structured dialogue between operators and researchers on clearly targeted issues; the core issue is less on prior identification of a common challenge before talking together and more on talking first on what the challenges are before identifying grounds for collaboration;

- compartmentalization of disciplines in research; some issues appear ‘neglected’ by research institutions, especially in relation with ‘minor crops’ as opposed to large crops such as bananas; team work to be encouraged/structured between researchers working in different scientific disciplines required to solve most agricultural issues;

- a strong interest for working with research was particularly expressed in:
  
  - technology transfers coupled with transfers of know-how in companies (in many areas/topic),
  - prevention (risk analysis) and solutions to technical problems re. pests, diseases, contaminants,
  - specific interest in some issues such as:
    - Alternative Plant Protection Products (biopesticides)
    - Environmental/Social Indicators in Africa
    - Value addition to by-products/processing (without getting involved in industrial processing, a sector dominated by trans-national companies);

**Conclusion**

It was concluded that the Private Sector and the Research/Universities sector need to learn how to work together on targeted issues.

A recommendation was issued for PAEPARD II to continue its facilitation role on the expression of needs for partnerships (heterogeneous vs. federating ones) and also encourage its stakeholders to develop together relevant methods and tools for ensuring sustainable ‘Research/non-Research’ collaboration after the programme’s end.
INTRODUCTION

As part of the PAEPARD project, the Collectif Stratégies Alimentaires (CSA) held a consultation of European NGOs in Brussels this past 22 September. Some thirty people – the majority representing NGOs, but also some representatives of African farmers’ organisations, research, and the private sector – took part in the meeting. The consultation was led by Mamadou Cissokho, honorary president of Farmers and Agricultural Producers’ Organisations of West Africa (ROPPA), and Marek Poznanski of CSA.

The agenda, list of participants, and speakers’ presentations are available on CSA’s website at the following address: http://www.csa-be.org/spip.php?article736.

Aims of the PAEPARD project and European NGO consultation

The consultation of 22 September 2010 took place under the PAEPARD (Platform for African–European Partnership in Agricultural Research for Development) project, which is financed by the European Commission and aimed at bolstering scientific and technical co-operation in agricultural research for development (ARD) between Africa and Europe. The second phase of this project (2010–2013) strives in particular to turn this co-operation towards more inclusive partnerships that include players who are not research scientists in order to encourage more equitable, mutually beneficial demand-driven partnerships (more information is available on CSA’s site: http://www.csa-be.org/spip.php?article701 and the PAEPARD blog: http://paepard.blogspot.com).

To this end, the organisation of consultations of civil society and the private sector in both Africa and Europe must give the PAEPARD project a working foundation that is rooted in reality in order to produce a set of “directives for innovative, balanced, demand-driven partnerships” and to orient the PAEPARD project itself in choosing the partnerships to support.

The consultations of European NGOs are aimed at giving PAEPARD material elements drawn from the NGOs’ experiences that will foster the adoption of a research approach that focuses on the demand that arises from African family farmers. One consultation a year will be organised, with the follow-up between consultations to be done by CSA.
The specific aim of this first European NGO consultation was twofold, to wit, (1) to reveal the restrictions on and opportunities for establishing more inclusive, balanced partnerships; and 2) to develop a common vision on the elements to be promoted by NGOs within PAEPARD.

**Summary of the first consultation of NGOs**

The aim of this document is to summarise the restrictions on and levers for establishing more inclusive, balanced, demand-driven partnerships based on African family farmers’ requirements as identified by the participants in the consultation.

This summary, which is based on the presentations of the participants’ experiences and subsequent discussion, is organised around three of the subjects covered during the consultation, namely,

1. conditions for setting up balanced partnerships;
2. fostering the inclusion of farmers’ organisations to make the partnerships demand-driven;
3. NGOs’ roles in reorienting ARD.

**OUTCOMES OF THE FIRST NGO CONSULTATION**

**Conditions for setting up balanced partnerships**

*Appropriate financing mechanisms: eligibility and selection criteria*

Through the eligibility and selection criteria that are used, project financing mechanisms are essential for establishing conditions that are or are not conducive to partnerships. The eligibility criteria must be chosen according to clearly identified, prioritised objectives. Weighting each criterion according to its importance ensures concordance between the scores obtained by the evaluated projects and the ranking of objectives.

The following criteria were identified as fostering balanced partnerships:

- **Team composition criteria**: Requiring a minimum number of different stakeholders or the presence of a particular type of participant (NGO, FO, private sector) can foster the creation of multidisciplinary teams.

- **Leadership criteria**: Defining the type of leader or specific conditions that the leader of a project must fulfil can make it possible for players who are historically disadvantaged in partnerships to take the initiative (non-traditional research stakeholders as NGO, FO). This criterion can be used to avoid instrumentalising such participants, that is, to avoid their token inclusion in a team in order to meet team diversity criteria, and consequently foster their real participation in developing the project.

- **Geographic criteria**: Setting priority or mandatory areas (for example, the simultaneous presence of African and European players) can boost geographic diversity within the projects.
**Recognising the importance of the partnership building phase**

The partnership’s intrinsic diversity of social actors and interests is a major challenge that must not be overlooked. Diverging interests mean that a **common vision** and common principles on which the partnership will be based must be established right from the start for the project to run smoothly. Reaching a consensus amongst partners is a tricky business that takes time. However, donors/financiers often fail to allow for this partnership-building phase. Yet it is indispensable to **recognise the partnership itself as an initial target to achieve** and, consequently, to **provide for this partnership building phase** in setting both the project’s agenda (sufficiently lengthy time period) and its budget. The presence of a ‘broker’ can facilitate this step’s proceedings.

**Fostering stakeholder ownership of the project**

All of the players must have ownership over the project. This is vital if one wishes to set up true balanced partnerships. **Shared ownership** of the project’s agenda and activities and **accountability** for its outcomes are what distinguishes partnerships from simple collaborative undertakings in which we often see the project being owned by one organisation that alone is responsible for the project.

The various players’ ownership of the project will depend on how the tasks, responsibilities, and corresponding resources are shared out amongst them. The idea is to set each organisation’s role jointly (and if need be formally). This step entails a certain degree of **decentralisation** (or reducing the main organisation’s central role) compared with collaborative projects. This is not always easy since, traditionally, research organisations have been responsible for project leadership. This decentralisation goes hand in hand with a **redefinition of the role of research** in the projects that are conducted. What is more, **shared project ownership is also linked to the establishment of transparent governance**: The structure and decision-making processes amongst the partners must be clearly defined.

**Allowing for partnership follow-up: communication and co-ordination**

**Effective communication** is vital to ensure a project’s transparency and openness and to implement and co-ordinate its activities. Time for this communication and co-ordination (and the personnel and administrative costs that they entail) must be foreseen in planning the project.

The role of a facilitator or ‘broker’ is often crucial for smooth co-ordination of activities. There is effectively a need to realise that partnership mechanisms and the involvement of all the partners must be maintained over the course of the project. That means that tools and resources must be mobilised for this purpose.

What is more, a **communication area** must be created to allow information exchange and the sharing of knowledge. Direct exchanges between the partners themselves rather than via a secretariat should be given priority.

Modern **information and communication technologies** facilitate electronic communication, but **face-to-face meetings at regular intervals** remain necessary (they need not necessarily be frequent, since that would require major financial means that thus would not be used for the project itself). One must allow for the fact that modern ICT (such as the Internet) are less easily accessible to some players than to others. Planning meetings and information exchanges is generally the facilitator’s role. The challenge is often to strike a balance between too little and too much information.

**Language** is a common constraint on communication, since a partnership often involves several languages. As a rule, English is the reference language. This makes the inclusion of players who do not master English (especially the end-users of ARD projects, *i.e.*, peasant or family farmers) difficult. This constraint must be recognised and taken into account in order to come up with solutions. The facilitator or broker can help to overcome this obstacle by making the working documents available.
to ‘disadvantaged’ players systematically and by informing them of the subjects on meeting agendas ahead of time in order to enable them to participate better and take the floor during these meetings.

**Shifting to more demand-driven partnerships: fostering the inclusion of farmers’ organisations**

Including farmers’ organisations is recognised as essential to have ARD projects that are driven by the demand expressed by African family farmers. The participants in the consultation identified several levers for and obstacles to integrating farmers’ organisations:

- The presence of organised, professional farmers’ organisations clearly aids their integration in research projects. It is vital that farmers’ organisations should already have their own positions when a research project gets under way.

- The farmers’ organisations’ participation in research projects is contingent on teaching these organisations about planning, prioritising, activities, making project proposals, building projects, and accepting the principles of audits and outside appraisals. A direct capacity-building fund for farmers’ organisations is thus necessary.

- Involving farmers’ organisations in project governance mechanisms fosters joint responsibility. Including family farmers in the scientific committee of a project can moreover make it possible to redirect the research questions in favour of family farmers.

- If farmers’ organisations are to be included in a project, the parties’ common interests must be documented. These common interests can be identified by examining concrete cases of priority agricultural products, for instance. One interesting way to learn about a predefined theme is ‘action learning’, which is based on case studies (of past or ongoing cases). The idea is to bring together all of the players involved directly by the subject in question to share methodologies and good practices and to identify each player’s needs. In this way, areas calling for research can then come to light.

- Collaborating with pre-existing structures (networks, initiatives, etc.) makes it possible to avoid overlap and competition that may harm the effectiveness of projects in the field. When creating a partnership with peasant/family farmers is the goal, one must set up a consultation process in the area concerned in order to pinpoint existing structures. Special attention must be paid, however, to the fact that existing structures may exclude certain players. It is thus necessary to check the representativeness of existing organisations and their independence from specific political interests.

- The diversity of the peasant population is important. The idea that there is a single farmers’ movement is an illusion and care must be taken to allow for the diversity of small farmers’ interests. In particular, one must ensure that decision-making is balanced between umbrella organisations and local organisations.

- Extension work to spread a project’s results to the population must be considered. It is necessary to go beyond the preconception that there is a transfer of knowledge from ‘those who know’ to ‘those who are ignorant’. What is more, consultation and dialogue with farmers’ organisations before any results are disseminated make it possible to assess the relevancy of extension work in each situation.
- **Risk management** is an important aspect to consider in a partnership. All innovations carry risks, as the results are uncertain. Very often, such risks are neither considered nor gauged, even though family farmers take them on.

**ONGs’ roles in reorienting ARD**

Thanks to their lengthy experience working with farmers’ organisations and/or their knowledge of the field, NGOs can play several roles in redirecting ARD so that it is driven more by African family farmer demand. These roles include:

1. **Reinforcing family farmers’ organisations’** abilities to lobby and grapple with calls for tender by helping the farmers’ organisations to submit applications and master the various procedures.

2. **Acting as facilitators** (or ‘brokers’) between farmers’ organisations and researchers, or even between farmers’ organisations and the private sector. NGOs can effectively be good go-betweens or interpreters between farmers’ organisations and researchers, ‘translating’ the researchers’ language for the farmers’ organisations and, inversely, ‘translating’ the farmers’ organisations’ problems into research questions. What is more, through their lengthy experience working with farmers’ organisations and their own networking experience, NGOs can help to establish partnership mechanisms between farmers’ organisations and research organisations/the private sector to enable them to work together more easily.

However, collaboration between NGOs and research is not easy to achieve. We see a divide between research and development work. This is due in part to the absence of ‘mixed’ financing that would, for example, allow a research project to be carried out in parallel with a development project. Indeed, current funding schemes make it possible at best to include a research component in a development project or, inversely, to integrate a participatory component in a research project. In both cases, this leads to one player’s “instrumentalising” the other player. What is more, this divide is also historical and ideological, as the crystallisation of conflicts around certain sensitive subjects (GMOs and production patterns, for example) helped to break off the dialogue between researchers and NGOs. Work to restore this dialogue is thus necessary if we want to set up partnerships that include researchers and NGOs.
Introduction and background
The consultation of European research stakeholder was carried out in the framework of PAEPARD Work package 1 (Mobilising European Stakeholders). The NGO and private sector stakeholder groups carried out during the first year of project implementation e-consultations and face to face meetings in order to mobilise their constituencies around the PAEPARD project.

The assumption for the research sector was that this constituency was already “mobilised” and ready than other stakeholder groups (e.g. NGOs, private sector, etc.) to actively participate in partnerships.

In 2008 PAEPARD 1 organised an e-consultation and a workshop, involving approximately 50 participants. The e-consultation identified 10 broad “ARD priority areas” and 83 subtopics. These were further discussed and analysed during the face to face meeting in Brussels, developing priority topics targeting the FSTP and FP7 EC programmes. The “ARD broad areas” included: climate change adaptation and mitigation for small farmers in Sub-Saharan Africa, globalisation and trade impact on developing countries, bio-energy, animal diseases and pandemics, agricultural innovation systems, environmental degradation and natural resources management, development policies, high value crops, demography, traditional knowledge.

In 2009 European research organisations were involved in the GCARD preparatory phase, through an electronic consultation in September 2009 and a physical meeting 1st of October 2009, involving 193 participants from 50 countries. The GCARD Regional review for Europe concluded that, based on the recommendations of previous recent European and international ARD reviews (including ERA-ARD and PAEPARD 1), there was overall consensus on the major drivers and the future challenges facing agriculture and agricultural research; and there appears to be increased convergence between agricultural research agendas in developing countries and in European countries.

The consultation
Taking into account the previous exercises, the consultation for the research stakeholders in PAEPARD 2 was planned to be carried out as an e-consultation without a face-to-face meeting, considering that it would have been possible to build on the outcomes of PAEPARD 1 and GCARD consultations and meetings.
A mailing list of 211 experts from European research, higher education, and capacity development organisations was built for the consultation. The mailing list was built using the following sources:

- European ARD stakeholders contacted for the electronic consultation for GCARD I (this was developed by EFARD in collaboration with the GFAR Secretariat);
- the subset of research organisation of the PAEPARD I stakeholders list;
- the list of Agrinatura members.

The e-consultation was carried out in two steps during the period October 2010 – January 2011 (see in Annex the presentation of the consultation).

The consultation response rate was 9% (15 messages received out of 161 effectively delivered).

Participants who actively participated in the e-consultation were subsequently contacted and invited to participate in the 1st European PAEPARD Multi-Stakeholder workshop to be held in Florence at IAO on the 7-8 March 2011.

**Responses to questions**

In the following section are reported the 6 questions submitted for the consultation and a summary of responses received.

**Question 1.**

*What are the concrete innovation challenges (e.g. in value chains, Natural Resources Management, etc.) around which you would like to work with other African and European Agricultural Research for Development stakeholders?*

**Value chains**

- Agricultural value chains in Ethiopia (Durum wheat and wild coffee)
- Improvement of value chains of typical productions (Coffee Arabica in Uganda, Tanzania, and Angola)
- Water management systems
- Cereals market (especially determining factors that influence supply/demand on cereals market).
- Capacity building for in-service training for rural extension in the RSA
- Global Review of rural Extension for EC-Delegations with case studies conducted in i.a. Ghana;
- From farm to fork: integrated approach to food safety with the application of sustainable agriculture at a different range of agricultural and economic scenarios, from small and familiar farms to industrial agriculture in CPLP countries.
- Organize a system for tracking and monitoring according with national plan for rural development.
- Define and operationalize the implementation of issues relating to a rural development policy.
- Strategic Regionalism and Sustainable Chain Development
- Food Sovereignty Strategies and Policies
- Food Sovereignty as an Alternative to WTO’s Agricultural Liberalization
- Water management (ecophysiological selection of plant material, minimum irrigation technique, recycled water, sensors applied for vegetation management, carbon / water balance).
Question 2.
Do you have an interesting case-study of African-European multi-stakeholder partnership which you would like to propose, which provides lessons on mechanisms for the establishment of effective partnerships?

Responses to this question have been subdivided into two groups: a) on-going projects, b) comparative studies in other continents, and c) proposals for new topics based on European experience

a) On-going projects

- Agricultural and Rural Development in Angola - The objective of the intervention is to help provide the rural population a central place in public policy in Angola, including through training of technicians, the dissemination and testing of methods of intervention and follow-up evaluation, and further reflection on topics relevant to rural development.

- Le projet Domestication et Développement du Baobab et du Tamarinier (DADOBAT) a pour objectif de développer des systèmes de production durables applicables au baobab et au tamarinier dans trois pays Ouest-Africains (Benin, Mali, Senegal). Ces systèmes de production durables se fondent sur la caractérisation, la conservation et l'utilisation des ressources génétiques locales. Ce projet devrait avoir des effets positifs en termes de sécurité alimentaire et de générateurs de revenus dans les pays qui y sont impliqués. Les problématiques relatives au développement des cultures/créneaux sont traitées grâce à une méthode holistique de recherche et à des activités de recherche pluridisciplinaires.

b) Comparative studies in other continents

- Strategic Regionalism, Grandnational Enterprises and Sustainable Chain Development in the Bolivarian Alliance: A Multidisciplinary Multimedia Project

- Food Sovereignty in the Latin America and the Caribbean: Case Studies from the Bolivarian Alliance

c) Proposal for new topics, based on European experience.

- Some areas of Africa, similarly that happened some years ago in Southern of Europe are developing new cities and new tourist areas. These need a lot of water and part of this water will be used in the maintenance of vegetation for ornamental value and ecological services. We propose increase the water use efficiency of these new green areas by means of eco-physiological selection of plant material, minimum irrigation technique, recycled water, sensors applied for vegetation management.

Question 3.
What are the capacity strengthening needs for researchers for the establishment of balanced partnership between non research and research stakeholders?

All partners, researchers and non-researchers, must be considered experts with complementary knowledge and skills. The first step should be initiated by a non-research partner that will show the problem at the community researchers and non-researchers.

From this collaboration must result on developing a strategy that defines the level of collaboration of each partner in all stages of the project. The proposal must be innovative for all partners, should result on the improvement of research and development, competitive enough to be accepted by Institutions that offer funds. The researchers should support for capacity strengthening, including training of non-researcher partners to use the tools of the project in the future.
Question 4.

What are the priority information needs, in terms of content, media, and timing, for building new partnerships? You are invited to respond to a questionnaire developed by PAEPARD on information issues?

On this question, respondents were asked to use directly the Survey Monkey questionnaire managed by Work Package 3 (http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/39GFNLH)

Question 5.

What are your comments and recommendations on innovative innovation partnership, taking into account your own experience?

It was felt that the PAEPARD document on “Refining the concept of partnership brokerage” which was circulated with the consultation, focuses very well the PAEPARD objectives.

It was pointed out that when CSOs, private sector, research institutes and universities have a particular interest in building a strong partnership, there are very good results either in Europe or in Africa.

General conclusions

The main conclusions from this first consultation of the European research stakeholders are the following.

Response rate

The response rate was low in absolute terms and compared to expectations. Probably there is a certain e-consultation “fatigue” which could be explained with the frequency of similar exercises carried out during recent years (PAEPARD 1 and GCARD). Some Agrinatura members commented that the communication on PAEPARD was not clear and its relevance for research organisations was not sufficiently highlighted. In particular the fact the consultation was finalised to establish a concrete mechanism and process for brokering partnerships.

Research topics

The topics proposed by research stakeholders during the PAEPARD 2 e-consultation are fully consistent with the previous consultations. The main difference is that topics were more specific and targeted to well identified themes. Research themes could be clustered around 4 major areas of interest for the participating European research community:

a. value chains (e.g. on wheat, coffee, and including food safety issues);

b. water management and irrigation;

c. agricultural and rural development policies (including rural extension);

d. macro-economic issues (e.g. trade, food sovereignty, etc.).

Value of the consultation

The aim of this consultation was not to mobilise research actors, since it was considered that these were already active an mobilised. Rather it was to make them aware of the PAEPARD II and its new approach to partnerships and partnership brokerage. This objective has been achieved only partly. The main lesson learned is that a much more effective effort must be done to communicate the PAEPARD II brokerage concept and make European research organisations more aware of the concrete opportunities offered by PAEPARD II (calls, brokerage events, capacity strengthening, etc.). It would be important to illustrate the added value of PAEPARD II, which is adopting a radically
different approach on multi-stakeholder partnerships, less opportunity based and more based on needs and demand, as well as on the concept of more balanced partnerships.
PAEPARD – CONSULTATION OF EUROPEAN RESEARCH STAKEHOLDERS

PAEPARD (Platform for African – European Partnership in Agricultural Research for Development) is a three year project, beginning this year, financed by the European commission. The objective of PAEPARD is to strengthen scientific and technical collaboration between Africa and Europe in Agricultural Research for Development (ARD) with emphasis on more inclusive partnerships with non-research actors, in order to encourage more equitable, more demand-driven and mutually beneficial partnerships.

Objective of the consultation for European Research organisations

In this frame, a specific part of the project (work package 1) aims at mobilising European ARD organisations partnerships with Africa and in PAEPARD. The subjacent objective of the European Research organisations participation is, based on their experience, providing keys to reorient research towards more demand-driven approach for African family farmers. The aim of the consultation is highlighting constraints and opportunities for the establishment of more inclusive and balanced partnerships, and elaborating a common view of what research organisations should promote into PAEPARD.

Methodology

The consultation will be conducted through e-mail, facilitated by the Istituto Agronomico per l’Oltremare (IAO), one of the Agrinatura-EEIG members participating in PAEPARD.

Participants

All European research organisations interested in food security and agricultural research are invited to participate in the consultation.

Objectives

The objectives of the consultation are to:

- Develop a common understanding of the PAEPARD project and a definition of the related expectations by research stakeholders, with a particular accent on how to partner with non research actors.
- Review partnerships experiences with non research ARD stakeholders.
- Identify
  i. interesting case studies of multi-stakeholder ARD partnerships or
  ii. partnerships establishment mechanisms to be further investigated
• Review and amend the partnership guidelines, drafted by WP5, and make recommendation that take into account the experience of each stakeholder category
• Identify the main capacity strengthening needs for the establishment of balanced partnerships between non research and research stakeholders. A review of the capacity strengthening expertise among the stakeholder category will be put at the disposal of the WP4 on Capacity Building.
• Identify concrete innovation challenges (in value chains, NRM, etc.) around which the stakeholder category would like to work with others.
• Propose a strategy for the mobilization of African and European stakeholders for collaborative ARD.
• Provide WP3 on Information and Communication Management with information regarding each stakeholder category’s information needs (in terms of content, media, timing); and review the communication strategy.

Questions

The consultation will be carried out in two steps.

Week 1
Participants will be asked to answer the following questions:

1. What are the concrete innovation challenges (in value chains, NRM, etc.) around which you should like to work with others African and European ARD stakeholders?

2. Do you have an interesting case-study of African-European multi-stakeholder partnership which you would like to propose, which provides lessons on mechanisms for the establishment of effective partnerships?

Week 2
Participants will be asked to answer the following questions:

1. Do you see any particular capacity strengthening needs for researchers for the establishment of balanced partnership between non research and research stakeholders?

2. What are the information needs (in terms of content, media, timing) for building new partnerships? Participants will be invited to respond to a specific questionnaire developed by PAEPARD Work Package 3 (Information and Communication).

3. What are your comments and recommendations on partnership guidelines elaborated by PAEPARD, taking into account your own experience? The partnerships guidelines developed by PAEPARD Work Package 5 (Partnerships) will be circulated to participants.