European Multi-Stakeholders Consultation on Agricultural Research for Development

FLORENCE (ITALY)

7-8TH MARCH 2011

REPORT

April 2011

Report includes contributions from CSA (Julie Flament), FARA (Jonas Mugabe, François Stepman), IAO (Stefano Del Debbio, Paolo Sarfatti, Gabriella d'Elia), ICRA (Jon Daane), NRI (Tim Chancellor), RUFORUM (Moses Osiru).

Report coordinated by Julie Flament
SUMMARY

SUMMARY ................................................................................................................................................. 2

I.  INTRODUCTION ................................................................................................................................. 3

II.  SYNTHESIS ......................................................................................................................................... 6

DISCUSSIONS AROUND THE THREE MAIN THEMES ............................................................................. 6

DRIVES, EXPECTATIONS AND CONSTRAINTS DE THE RESPECTIVE Stakeholders and opportunities .... 7

III.  REPORT OF THE CONSULTATION ..................................................................................................... 11

RESULTS OF EUROPEAN INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS ........................................................................ 11

CONTRIBUTION FROM INVITED KEY-SPEAKERS: SUMMARY ................................................................ 14

GROUP WORK ............................................................................................................................................ 18

PLENARY DISCUSSION .............................................................................................................................. 38

ANNEXES ..................................................................................................................................................

ANNEX I. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS ...........................................................................................................  ...

ANNEX II. SOME STATISTICS ON PARTICIPANTS ..................................................................................  ...

ANNEX III. PROGRAM ...............................................................................................................................  ...

ANNEX IV. COMPOSITION OF WORKING GROUPS ..................................................................................  ...

ANNEX V. KEY ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS POSTED BY PARTICIPANTS ...........................  ...

ANNEX VI. KEY-SPEAKERS ‘PRESENTATIONS .........................................................................................  ...

ANNEX VII. REPORTS OF EUROPEAN INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS .........................................................  ...
I. INTRODUCTION

PAEPARD II

PAEPARD II is the second phase of the "Platform for African-European Partnership in Agricultural Research for Development" which is a project funded by the European Commission. The general goal is building African / European multi-stakeholder partnerships in the Agricultural Research for Development (ARD) to achieve the Millennium Development Goals.

Collaboration between Africa and Europe in ARD is presently mainly a collaborative research among researchers only, without involvement of actors outside research. This research is essentially guided by the interests of European researchers. The specific objective of the second phase of the PAEPARD project is to strengthen scientific and technical collaboration between Africa and Europe in the field of Agricultural Research for Development with an emphasis on inclusive partnerships with actors who are not scientists, to encourage more equitable partnerships, demand-oriented and mutually beneficial.

Partners that form the consortium PAEPARD are: Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa (FARA), the European Alliance on Agricultural Knowledge for Development (AgriNatura - EEIG), Pan-African Federation of Farmer’s Organization (PAFFO), Collectif Stratégies Alimentaires (CSA), Regional Universities Forum for Capacity Building in Agriculture (RUFORUM), The International Centre for Development Oriented Research in Agriculture in (ICRA), Food Agriculture Natural Resources Policy Network (FANRPAN) Europe-Africa-Caribbean Liaison Committee for Agricultural export promotion (COLEACP). The project duration is 36 months and began operating in December 2009.

Agricultural Research for Development (ARD)

The vision of Agricultural Research for Development developed by partners PAEPARD is¹:

- The ARD-oriented application contributes to practical results that support the innovation process conducted by end users of research;
- ARD Partnerships must be inclusive and involve all actors in order to obtain operational results and their dissemination;
- In innovation processes, end users of research, researchers and other stakeholders share their knowledge to create value.

¹ Source: presentation by Jon Daane during this first European MSC.
Activities of PAEPARD

PAEPARD partners declined the objective of the second phase of the project into several specific objectives:

- mobilize the researchers and not scientific actors involved in both Africa and Europe, to promote collaboration in the field of ARD;
- create partnerships around common challenges (federating themes);
- provide tools for the dissemination of knowledge and access to information;
- strengthen the capacities of different actors to work in inclusive and balanced partnerships;
- advocate among the ARD donors (including African national governments) to support inclusive partnerships.

These concrete goals are to be achieved in an iterative process involving various activities. So far these activities have primarily consisted of organising "internal" consultations by group of actors (research, farmers ‘organizations, private sector, NGO) in Europe and Africa, and the launch of the first call for “application for support to the development of multi-stakeholder partnerships that promote demand-driven agricultural innovation” in December 2010. The mechanisms involved in this call for concept notes are described in the graph below.

---

2 Source: presentation by Jon Daane during this first European MSC.
Context of the European Multi Stakeholders consultation

This first European multi-stakeholder consultation was then organized after the initial series of internal consultations conducted by a group of actors and the launch of the first call. It took place in Florence on 7 and 8 March 2011 at the Istituto per l’Agronomico Oltremare (IAO) 3.

The objectives of the consultation were, firstly, to enable participants to become familiar with the PAEPARD project and its opportunities, assess the progress PAEPARD, and conduct an analysis of players. On the other hand, the objective was to share experiences and ideas between different groups of actors to explore opportunities to establish inclusive and balanced ARD partnerships. This should lead to recommendations for future activities and directions of PAEPARD.

To achieve these objectives, the MSC has been organized as follows. An introductory session about PAEPARD allowed partners to present the project and the results of the internal consultations acting family. Then, discussions were organized around three main themes identified by the organizers of the MSC in order to provide recommendations to PAEPARD on specific objectives cited above. At first, the speakers ‘key’, invited by PAEPARD and representing different families of players, participants were exposed to experiences and collaborations on three themes. In a second step, the themes were discussed in small groups around specific issues raised by the organizers. Finally, the conclusions of the groups on three themes were presented in plenary by the rapporteurs and issues proposed by participants were extensive. The detailed program of two days of the MSC is available in annex III.

Content and objectives of this report

This report seeks to capitalize on the discussions generated by the MSC to guide PAEPARD in its activities and future directions. In the short term, the experience of the European MSC should guide the organization of the first African MSC to be held in May 2011.

It is organized as follows:

- a first part, the synthesis, attempts to summarize the results obtained in the working groups and provides a summary of the drivers, constraints and expectations of each type of actor in relation to agricultural research for development (ARD) and the different pathways and opportunities to meet these expectations and constraints.

- a second part, the ratio of the MSC itself, provides the reader with a summary report of the presentations and discussions on three themes. This section includes a summary of the presentations and speakers, the synthesis of the group work and a summary of the discussions in plenary.

- the appendices allow the reader to refer, among others, to the original presentations of the speakers and the reports of the internal consultations conducted within the European research sectors, the private sector and NGOs.

---

3 IAO is a member of AGRINATURA, participating to PAEPARD
II. SYNTHESIS

The two days of the European multi-stakeholder consultations allowed participants from different groups of actors (research, Farmer Organisations, private sector, NGOs) to exchange views on many issues at stake in PAEPARD.

The discussion focused particularly on the three themes proposed by the organizers of this consultation (see introduction and below). The richness of the discussions around these three themes has been captured and in a summary report which is available in the following chapter. The first part of this synthesis aims to briefly introduce the content of the discussions around these three themes.

The working group discussions and the and plenary discussions helped to address the drivers, constraints and expectations of each type of actor in relation to research, and opportunities (pathways) to meet these expectations and the corresponding needs. On the other hand, a number of specific recommendations were made for the PAEPARD project. The second part of this review seeks to structure these different elements and recommendations to facilitate the subsequent work of PAEPARD that will tackle these constraints and expectations and explore avenues for achieving the objectives of PAEPARD.

DISCUSSIONS AROUND THE THREE MAIN THEMES

The first theme, "Processes and mechanisms for establishing balanced partnerships" reviewed the processes and mechanisms involved in multi-stakeholder partnerships. Participants described their vision of a balanced and inclusive partnership and identified the factors of success and failure in implementing such partnerships. The potential roles of each type of actors were identified, while recalling that these roles may vary according to projects and balanced partnerships. This is a dynamic process that involves all partners but they are not necessarily active at the same time and different functions may appear over time. The importance of developing a common vision, identify the common problems and objectives was emphasized as the essential role of a facilitator to achieve this objective. This facilitation role is specific to the goals of the consortium and can be played by different actors in different situations. Some experiences of partnerships have been listed as an example. Finally, it was recalled that partnerships must remain a means to achieve goals without becoming an end in itself, and some recommendations were made towards PAEPARD in order to promote partnerships.

Discussions on the second theme “promising partnerships around unifying themes” have highlighted the differences in interpretations of what is to be understood as a "unifying" theme and different interests related to each type of players. Mechanisms to define a "unifying theme" were discussed, including using past experiences, and some leads were provided. Finally, a series of unifying themes were suggested. A consensus was reached around global issues, such as access to markets (national, regional and international) by small scale producers in Africa, food security and sustainable management of natural resources. These global themes need to be divided into more concrete sub-themes.

The discussions of the third thematic group focused on the information, capacity building and advocacy needs of the respective stakeholders in general and specific information needs for every stakeholder. Ways to meet these needs have been proposed and specific recommendations were made for communication activities of PAEPARD. Moreover, the creation of a platform of for matchmaking between actors was discussed through some examples. Finally, areas in which capacity building is needed were listed and some aspects around advocacy by PAEPARD.
DRIVES, EXPECTATIONS AND CONSTRAINTS OF THE RESPECTIVE STAKEHOLDERS AND OPPORTUNITIES

The European Multi-stakeholder consultation and the European internal consultations identified different drives, constraints and expectations of each type of player in relation to agricultural research for development (ARD) as well as different ways to meet those expectations and constraints. This section attempts to synthesize them, without claiming to be exhaustive. The information provided below will be deepened and complemented by the results of the African multi-stakeholder consultation and the African internal consultations.

Different stakeholders and drives towards ARD
The discussions focused on three groups of actors: researchers and the end users of ARD, the private sector (PS) and farmer organizations (FOs). Relations in terms of expectations and constraints between these actors have been discussed (however, relations between the private sector and FOs towards ARD were little discussed).

Before discussing these relationships, we must take into account the specific drives of the actors that shape expectations (FO, PS) or constraints of the group of actors towards ARD. These drives are defined in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCHERS</th>
<th>PRIVATE SECTOR (PS)</th>
<th>FARMER ORGANISATIONS (FO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Career based on publications in scientific journals;  
  • Institutional funding depending on call for research projects. | • Increase the economic performance of the enterprise;  
  • Responding to market demand for products in which the enterprise invest. | • Respond to the needs and problems of small holders. |
## Expectations and constraints

Common **expectations** for users of ARD have been identified and specific expectations for the private sector or farmer organisations. In parallel, the **constraints** faced by the research to meet these expectations have been highlighted. These elements are summarized in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shared expectations (PS and FO)</th>
<th>Expectations towards ARD</th>
<th>Constraints of Research to respond to those expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Results which can be used. The results must be translated into usable tools and technologies. This often involves providing for extension services and / or transfer of human resources in parallel with the transfer of technology.</td>
<td>Results which can be published. Researchers from universities and institutions are guided by the need to publish in journals. This is the main or the only way to advance in their careers. Producing publishable results is often not compatible with the production of tools or usable technologies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multidisciplinary responses.</td>
<td>Compartmentalisation of the research. Researchers often specialize in one area and there is little collaboration between specialties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent Collaboration and dialogue with research.</td>
<td>No culture of collaboration, lack of tools and time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific expectations from the private sector</td>
<td>Short term results are needed to respond to the market needs.</td>
<td>Different time scales. Research is often conducted for the midterm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific expectations from the farmer organisations</td>
<td>Take into account local knowledge.</td>
<td>Lack of knowledge (or credit) of the mechanisms of participatory research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prioritisation of research according to the needs of the producers</td>
<td>Prioritisation of research according to call for proposals et available funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to these elements, we must add two major constraints faced in general by researchers to meet the expectations of users of ARD:

- **Funding opportunities.** Because on the one hand, research funding requires considerable time from researchers and, secondly, because the funding requirements are restrictive in terms of selected research topics and working methods. In developing countries, emphasis is rarely placed on applied research. Moreover, in Africa, research institutions are strongly dependent from foreign funding. In some countries, like Mali, a considerable part of the research is funded by multinationals, thus fulfilling the expectations of the last ones rather than those of producers.
- **Lack of incentives** for researchers to work in the field of ARD, which is hardly compatible with the goals of career and research publishing.

**Opportunities**

Against the expectations and the constraints described above, several opportunities have been identified in order to respond better to the users' expectations of ARD. These opportunities have been classified into general and specific pathways for the Private Sector and the Farmer Organisations. The approaches are not directly the responsibility of PAEPARD but they can guide the project and share some useful strategies for advocacy within or outside PAEPARD.

**General pathways**

**Develop incentives** (motors, drivers) specific for ARD researchers, different from scientific publications. We must seek to stimulate and reward the societal benefit rather than just scientific excellence. It was suggested that specific channels should be used to publish research results and stimulate their application. Former practical experience should be valorised through diploma courses.

**Mobilize researchers** around ARD. The benefits for researchers and society of "business unusual" should be highlighted, including dissemination of experiences. The sharing of experiences can demonstrate that applied research is not necessarily inconsistent with the publication of results and can lead to identify more fundamental research topics. An effort should also be conducted to bring the universities and other organizations to consider ARD in their research and teaching. New methods of teaching and learning and changes in curriculum can be considered; young people's interest can be stimulated by field placements and applied research.

**Adequate funding** must be developed. Advocacy must be conducted with appropriate institutions. Some ideas discussed are the use of criteria promoting inclusive partnerships and initiatives taken by users of ARD, or introduction of contractual arrangements defining the specific services to be offered by researchers (including quality control of these services).

**Specific pathways for the private sector**

Develop **training of young scientists** and PhD students in the private sector firms. This would allow the private sector to have access to new knowledge and expertise of senior supervisors and young researchers to have access to a rich learning environment and practical and interesting issues for analysis. Specific ARD training courses can be beneficial to research institutions as the feedback they receive from the participants allows research institutions to upgrade their general teaching.

The involvement of **experts** who face similar problems in **networks** can be useful for improving production.

**Databases of local consultants** "used" by the private sector may help to identify potential mediators between producers and researchers.
Pathways for farmer organisations

Develop mechanisms to translate the needs of producers in research questions. On a more global scale, we must put in place mechanisms for the systematic involvement of FOs in the definition of research projects.

Develop innovations that allow local knowledge of farmers and scientific knowledge to be complementary through participatory research. These innovations must be better detected, capitalized, scientifically validated and disseminated.
III. REPORT OF THE CONSULTATION

This chapter of the report provides a summary of the presentations and discussions of two days of consultations. It thus includes

- A summary of the results of the internal consultations in Europe (full reports available in the appendix);
- a summary of the presentations of speakers (original submissions available in the appendix);
- a summary of the working group
- a summary of the discussions in plenary.

The detailed program of two days of consultation is available in annex III.

RESULTS OF EUROPEAN INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

Outcomes of the European Private Sector consultation, 2010, Catherine Guichard (COLEACP)

In order to discuss with the private sector about opportunities to collaborate with researchers and universities, COLEACP sent a questionnaire to 330 private companies, received 50 replies and organized face-to-face discussions and a meeting with importers in Brussels on October 26, 2010.

The investigation revealed three main aspects:

1) It’s urgent to understand and learn how to interchange and work together, private and research sectors (widespread ignorance about research opportunities; lack of finance; lack of interaction and communication; compartmentalization of disciplines in research);

2) Businesses under rising pressure of “standards”; responsibilities and costs pushed by retailers back to suppliers; demand for short-term solutions; more precariousness for small holders;

3) The Private sector recognizes the need to talk, plan and work with Research for achieving economic development.

On the basis of these results, PEAPARD II will:

- Organize multi-stakeholder consultations
- Review the suggestions received and select the most promising ones in terms of achieving development impacts in Africa
- Try to encourage its stakeholders to develop together relevant methods and tools for ensuring sustainable collaboration after the program’s end.
Outcomes of the European NGO consultation, 2010, Julie Flament (CSA)

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 mobilization of NGOs in PAEPARD aims to provide concrete evidence to PAEPARD for promoting a research approach that meet the needs of family farmers in Africa and is demand-driven. In this context, the specific objective of the first consultation of the European NGOs was twofold: 1) highlight the constraints and opportunities to establish more inclusive and balanced partnerships and 2) develop a common vision on what NGOs should promote inside the PAEPARD project.

Following the presentations of experiences, the participants discussed three main topics:

1. **The conditions for the establishment of balanced partnerships.** The discussions helped to highlight the importance of eligibility and selection criteria for appropriate funding mechanisms are appropriate partnerships. Participants also stressed the importance of the construction phase of the partnership, to promote project ownership by stakeholders and provide for the monitoring of the partnership by means of adequate communication and coordination. Pathways were provided at these three levels.

2. **Promote the inclusion of FO to guide partnerships** in order to be demand-driven. The inclusion of Farmer Organisations in partnerships has been recognized as essential to guide ARD projects to respond to the needs of small scale farmers in Africa. Several drivers and challenges to the inclusion of Farmer Organisations were identified.

3. **The role of NGOs in the reorientation of ARD.** With their long experience in working with Farmer Organisations and / or field knowledge, NGOs can play several roles in the reorientation of ARD in favour of a more focused approach towards the involvement of small scale farmers in Africa. These roles include the strengthening of farmer organizations and facilitation (role of "broker") between Farmer Organisations and researchers or between Farmer Organisations and the private sector. The divide between the research and development and possible reasons for this divide have been identified. A dialogue needs to be restored between researchers and NGOs the dialogue in order to develop innovative partnerships.

Outcomes of the European Research consultation, 2010, Paolo Sarfatti (IAO)

In 2008, PAEPARD I 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 a face to face meeting in Brussels, developing priority topics targeting the FSTP and FP7 EC programmes

In 2009, European research organisations were involved in the GCARD preparatory phase, through an electronic consultation in September 2009 and a physical meeting on 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 I), there was overall consensus on the major drivers and the future challenges facing

---

4 Program, list of participants and speakers’ presentations are available on the CSA website on [http://www.csa-be.org/spip.php?article734](http://www.csa-be.org/spip.php?article734).
agriculture and agricultural research. The assumption for the research sector was that this constituency was already “mobilised” and ready to actively participate in partnerships.

Taking into account the past experience, the consultation for the research stakeholders in PAEPARD II 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 I and GCARD consultations and meetings.

A mailing list of 211 experts from European research, higher education, and capacity development organisations was developed for the consultation. The consultation took place during the period October 2010 - January 2011 with five questions on innovation challenge, case-study on African-European multi-stakeholder partnership, capacity strengthening needs for researchers for the establishment of balanced partnership between non research and research stakeholders, the priority information needs, comments and recommendations on innovative innovation partnerships.

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. Research themes could be clustered around 4 major areas: value chain, water, agricultural policies, macro-economic issues.

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.).
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.*

The FONGS (Senegalese Federation of NGOs) is an independent small farmers’ association federating 31 local associations (at county or regional levels); it is a founder member of the CNCR (The National Council for Rural Dialogue and Cooperation) and is committed to the building and coordination of a strong rural people’s movement at all levels. 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 four challenges: the challenge of food sufficiency, the challenge of sustainable management of natural resources, the challenge of employment for rural youth and the challenge of improving living standards and income. 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, and designing and implementing fairer policies and investing in the real potential of family farming.

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 lessons learned from the FONGS’ experience and case studies are that:

- Research must not be an end in itself, 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.

It is also important to emphasize that, up to now, it has been the FONGS which has undertaken the initiatives, chosen its partners and coordinated the processes.

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

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 a well-established system, ARD hasn’t provided the expected stimulus to attain the objectives and should find a strategy to overcome the factors that prevent agricultural research findings make the expected desired impact.

There are some limiting factors that challenge ARD: 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.
The most emerging challenges in Nigerian agri-food sector are basically low yielding crop varieties and brood stock, population growth and urbanization, labor as constraint to agricultural production and climate change and environmental factors.

Strategies and way forward to overcome these limits or constraints could be to assist countries to have consistent policy that promotes agro-industrial linkages; Agricultural R&D should 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; to create strong partnership with non-agricultural institutions to build the required synergy; to implement strong partnership and involvement of the private sector.

These partnerships should take account of each partner’s competency and comparative advantage, should have both vertical and horizontal linkages at community, country, regional and international levels, should have the capacity to deliver their component of the package.

Nigeria, with its Vision 2020 strategy and its national agencies and institutions that already exist to address the none-core agricultural areas of the food value chain, could offer some partnerships opportunities in ARD field.

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

Concerning institutional partnerships, be it participating in the governance of the institutions, representation in technical bodies or representation in evaluation authorities, it is essential that producers take an active role there, bringing up the major challenges facing agriculture (production, management of natural resources, employment and income) and the issues concerning international trade negotiations. The rural people’s organizations (RPOs) must make strong points concerning these issues, with convincing proof and statistical data to back them up.

As for operational partnerships, there is a gap between research findings and producers’ practice which must be reduced, specifically through brokerage or facilitation. An effective way of reducing this gap is by coming together around an idea for innovation (technical or organizational). The origin of these innovations may be

- scientific origin and incorporation into the farmers’ agricultural, social and economic practice, following trials on different scales and at various control levels;

- originated by farmers, replicated in different environments and situations.

Rural innovations have historically played a dominant role in agriculture. The role of these farmers’ innovations is fundamental, but an engine for change is necessary. One can speed up and safeguard innovation and change through four functions/stages of a policy for innovation: identifying innovations, financing them, assessing them and then promoting/disseminating the innovations. The tools for achieving this are, for example, the introduction of a funding obligation in project funding contracts, identifying ways of capitalizing on the innovation (files, encyclopaedic files, website, etc.), partnership contracts and ICT support. Incentives for the actors to get involved in this process are: recognition (becoming well-known), the enactment of « farmers’ rights » and the recognition of experiential knowledge (VAE in French), translated into an experience-based diploma.

Knowledge of commercial value/nature is recognised by a certificate and knowledge of scientific value/nature is recognised by publication in scientific journals. And so we must develop a new channel for recognising popular/farmers’ knowledge/innovations.

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 meet several stakeholders’ interests and mobilize their commitment to a joint learning process. Through the creation of a multi-disciplinary and multi-institutional participatory methodology applied with the farmers, a team was formed and it came out that the rice sector is a relevant field for social learning and multi-stakeholders innovation development process as several stakeholders were willing to engage in such a multi-stakeholder innovation process.

The major challenges faced by the rice sector include quality issues (variety blending, storing facilities and duration), access to market (partly due to the quality issue), water management (free riding of individual farmers, maintenance of the irrigation system); other issues (resistance of weeds to herbicides; bird attacks; lack of technical support, etc.).

A multi-stakeholders workshop was held from January 18th to 27th, 2010 with about thirty stakeholders (universities, research institutes, platforms of actors, farmers’ organizations financial institutions and extension services).

The main outcomes of this process are an action research plan for the development of the rice in Benin; trust building among stakeholders; the renewing of commitment of stakeholders to pursuing the multi-stakeholder innovation development process in the rice sector; the creation of a task force to pursue the writing of the project and task division.

Francois Stepman PAEPARD. Synthesis of the experience of the first PAEPARD call.

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.

The technical eligibility criteria were divided into three categories: 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) and expected impact (intended beneficiaries and development outcomes, potential for development of research partnership).

82 proposals were received, 51 eligible proposals have been reviewed by the WP5 Selection Committee and about 10 proposals will be selected.

Received proposals were developed around several topics:

- 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 that were proposed included: 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; Public Private Partnerships.
GROUP WORK

Methodology

Participants were subdivided in 3 groups of 10-15 people each in a way to achieve a good mix of stakeholder categories in each group, while taking account of language abilities. Two groups could operate without translation (one in English and one in French), and one group operated in French and English with simultaneous translation. The composition of each group can be found in Annex IV.

Each group discussed each of the 3 proposed topics:

1. Processes and mechanisms for balanced partnerships
2. Promising federating themes
3. Collective and individual stakeholder group needs in terms of information, capacity strengthening and advocacy.

In order to facilitate discussion on each topic, each participant received an A4 with suggestions for the content of the group work on each specific topic and the results expected from the groups. These suggestions are given in the table next page.

The 3 groups discussed the 3 topics according to the following schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Group 1 English/French</th>
<th>Group 2 French</th>
<th>Group 3 English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 1:</strong> 13.30-15.30</td>
<td>Topic 1</td>
<td>Topic 2</td>
<td>Topic 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 1:</strong> 16.00-18.00</td>
<td>Topic 2</td>
<td>Topic 3</td>
<td>Topic 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 2:</strong> 8.30-10.30</td>
<td>Topic 3</td>
<td>Topic 1</td>
<td>Topic 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each group had a facilitator who stayed with the same group for all three topics. The task of the facilitators was to help the group structure its discussion and come to conclusions/results. His objective was to keep the discussions targeted, stimulate participation of all members and promote exchange of diverse ideas and views. These facilitators were: for group 1, Paolo Sarfatti (IAO); for group 2, Jon Daane (ICRA); for group 3, Tim Chancellor (NRI).

The results/products of each group discussion on each topic were reported on flip charts and/or pin boards. These flip charts served as an input to the discussion of the same topic by another group during the next session, so that there was a constructive build-up of shared knowledge and each group was not “reinventing the wheel”. After each session a PAEPARD rapporteur assigned to a specific topic changed groups and presented the results of the earlier discussion(s) on the topic to the group that was going to discuss the topic next. The rapporteurs’ role was to ensure that the results of each group were captured on flip charts in a way that satisfies all members, to report these results to the next group, etc. and to present the collective results of all groups on their topic as an input to the plenary discussion of Day 2. These rapporteurs were: François Stepman for topic 1 (PAEPARD manager), Jonas Mugabe for topic 2 (PAEPARD manager) and Moses Osiru for topic 3 (RuForum).

Each group also appointed their own co-rapporteur, who stayed with the group to serve as the “group memory” (across all 3 topics) and who also complemented the presentations of the PAEPARD rapporteurs on each topic. These co-rapporteurs were: for group 1, Audrey Papucci (Action Contre La Faim); for group 2, Jean-Pierre Imele (Biotropical PFI); for group 3, Estelle Gallot (AgriCord).
In your group, please discuss and answer the following questions. [It is possible that different participants or stakeholder groups have different opinions regarding the answers. The purpose is to bring these out and find ways of dealing with these differences rather than to achieve a consensus at all cost.]

Please capture the results of the discussion on flip charts and/or pin boards so that they can serve as an input to the discussion of the questions by the next group.

**Topic 1 – Processes and mechanisms of balanced partnerships**
- [If this question has not been dealt with in your group yet] What are, in your view, inclusive and balanced Europe-Africa multi-stakeholder ARD partnerships driven by the demands of end-users in the interest of African family farmers?
- What are the key factors of success/failure of such partnerships?
- What are the roles of farmers’ organizations, private sector, NGOs and research organizations in such partnerships, and how are these roles articulated?
- What are the implications of working in such partnerships for researchers and research?
- How to establish Europe-Africa inclusive and balanced partnerships in ARD? What are the processes, mechanisms and good practices to promote? What are the constraints met by the different stakeholders?
- What should PAEPARD do (or do differently) to promote the establishment of such partnerships?

**Topic 2 – Promising federating themes for partnership establishment**
- [If this question has not been dealt with in your group yet] What are, in your view, inclusive and balanced Europe-Africa multi-stakeholder ARD partnerships driven by the demands of end-users in the interest of African family farmers?
- How and by whom should “federating themes” be defined to promote the establishment of such ARD partnerships? [Such partnerships are established around “federating themes”, i.e. themes or “innovation challenges” that the partners cannot resolve alone and that bring them together.]
- What are, in your view, promising “federating themes” around which the participation of different stakeholders from Europe and Africa could be mobilized and that have high priority and potential for improving the conditions of African family farming?
- What should PAEPARD do (or do differently) to identify such federating themes and promote the establishment of Europe-Africa partnerships around such themes?

**Topic 3 – Collective and individual stakeholder groups’ needs in terms of information, capacity strengthening and advocacy**
- [If this question has not been dealt with in your group yet] What are, in your view, inclusive and balanced Europe-Africa multi-stakeholder ARD partnerships driven by the demands of end-users in the interest of African family farmers?
- What information does each stakeholder group need to enable it to establish or join such ARD partnerships and how should this information be provided? What should PAEPARD do (or do differently) to provide this information?
- What capacities need to be strengthened to enable different stakeholders to establish and effectively collaborate in such ARD partnerships? How should capacities for “social learning”, knowledge sharing, co-innovation be strengthened? What should PAEPARD do (or do differently) to support this capacity strengthening?
- How and where do different stakeholder groups advocate for inclusive and balanced Europe-Africa multi-stakeholder ARD partnerships? How could PAEPARD support this advocacy?
Summary report of group work for the 3 topics

1. Processes and mechanisms of balanced partnerships

This sub-section presents the summary report of the first topic on ‘Processes and mechanisms of balanced partnerships’. The report is presented along the four questions posed for the topic as below. The summary of the discussions for each question (aggregated for the three groups) is presented below. The discussions on this topic were initiated by group 1 and followed by group 3 and 2. François Stepman was the overall rapporteur for the topic.

Q1: What are, in your view, inclusive and balanced Europe-Africa multi-stakeholder ARD partnerships driven by the demands of end-users in the interest of African family farmers?

“It is difficult to assess in advance if a partnership will be balanced: it depends on the process”

Partnerships are vital in the current era of development to align different institutions to achieve synergy. But little is known about the development of partnerships and how to make them work and balanced. A number of past partnerships were barely effective and the existing guidance on how to run an effective partnership is limited. The growing rhetoric among the agricultural research and development partners to become more accountable to the beneficiary and other stakeholders has provoked the need for balanced partnerships.

Linkages don’t happen automatically: they need a facilitating or broker organization to create them. A common analysis of the problems and common objectives are essential. Different European and African organizations with different interests and motives have to be brought around the table to contribute and benefit. It needs great (cross-cultural) facilitation and negotiating skills which are not very often core competences of researchers.

“Inclusive partnership” means that all stakeholders that have an interest in the partnership are associated. All partners should be held responsible and accountable for the construction of the process. But the number of organizations involved can reduce the efficiency of the partnership, if the level at which the partnership is expected (i.e. operational or strategic) is not defined. A balance must be found between inclusiveness and operational efficiency and the role of each partner must be well defined.

It is important to clarify if the partnership is mainly research or development oriented. The partnership needs to overcome mutual suspicion and prejudice while partner organizations need much support and mentoring.

The groups also outlined the following principles for partnerships:

- Partnerships should be organized around specific development problems that articulate a clear demand and, for PAEPARD, should relate to African family farmers. The problem/demand could be systems oriented, or based on a commodity or other issue depending on the context;
- Stakeholders should have a shared concept of the desired outcome/objectives;
- Multiple stakeholders should be involved;
- Stakeholder functions are not static and may differ from partnerships to partnership based on the problem. For example, depending on the context and specific problem, a village farmer group could be an NGO or a private sector organization;
- Tools such as value chain analysis can be used to identify stakeholders;
The partnership should be equitable - a partnership is not about balancing numbers - how much, how many etc. are not the important questions but should be based on equity related to roles and functions for balance;

A partnership is not a subcontracting arrangement;

A partnership is not an end in itself but rather a means to an end; and

Partnerships need to be constructed

One participant emphasised that inclusive, balanced multi-stakeholder ARD partnerships should not be an aim in themselves. Such partnerships should only be formed in cases where they are an efficient means of meeting end-users’ demands through research. Their composition should be defined by questions of efficiency, which means that, where research can meet end-users’ demands without participation of all stakeholders, partnerships do not always need to be balanced and inclusive.

Q2: What are the key factors of success/failure of such partnerships?

In order of priority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key factors of success</th>
<th>Key factors of failure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A common vision is more important than a balanced partnership. The federating theme</td>
<td>Lack or inefficient communication or poor understanding of the objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>must be essential for each partner. But partnership is not an end in itself. It is a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tool to reach set objectives. The mutual involvement of Research and End Users in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Think Groups is for sharing a prospective vision and define common objectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is therefore important to have enough time to develop a common knowledge base and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shared point of views.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of mutual respect and dialogue, clear responsibilities and organizational</td>
<td>Lack of good coordination and inter cultural sensitivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationship.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good management and coordination is essential. Clear mutual benefits: the win-win</td>
<td>Top – down approach: top – down reflections and knowledge sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>factor has to be perceived by all the partners. Inspiring facilitation: one of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partners is to be accepted by the partners as leader.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is less about balance among the partners but more about efficiency. The partnering</td>
<td>Resources: partnership is not sustainable beyond the funding period, interruption of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>must be cost-effective. A proper budget is required to meet physically and discuss</td>
<td>funding, limited funding or own contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>issues as well as balanced [financial] investments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieve practical results: clear return at the end of the project.</td>
<td>Lack of focus on practical results beyond the research or lab findings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key factors of success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarify access to results (ownership of results)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimacy (technical and social) of each partner. The background and</td>
<td>The background and experiences of the partners matches the objectives of the consortium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiences of the partners matches the objectives of the consortium.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect of the deadlines</td>
<td>Tight deadlines, no long term time perspective on which to build the partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear and shared risk and market analysis</td>
<td>External socio economic and political risk factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedding personal participation in a consortium</td>
<td>Turn-over inside an institution/organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Digital divide, use of scientific language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key factors of failure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too many partners: too many partners of the same category, partners</td>
<td>Domination of one or two partners, unbalanced power relations, partners with unequal or very limited [assimilation] capacities,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with little interest, domination of one or two partners, unbalanced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power relations, partners with unequal or very limited [assimilation]</td>
<td>capacities,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capacities,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tight deadlines, no long term time perspective on which to build the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External socio economic and political risk factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn-over inside an institution/organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital divide, use of scientific language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q3: What are the roles of farmers' organizations, private sector, NGOs and research organizations in such partnerships, and how are these roles articulated? What are the implications of working in such partnerships for researchers and research?

“Partnership is not about playing a set of standard roles”

“Everybody needs to be perceived as a researcher who tries to solve problems”

Balanced partnerships are a dynamic process: there are different functions which are involved over a period of time

- Not everybody is as active at the same time: non operational partners are kept on stand-by
- Mutual expectations have to be constantly clarified
- Missing key partners may be identified later in the process

The motivation to participate in a partnership depends on:

- The capacity of the respective partner
- The sectorial and geographical legitimacy
- The political, economical, social context
- The involved staff who participate according to the function that has been attributed to them in the consortium

There are different motivations to participate in a partnership and different functions according to the type of actors.
The Research’ perspective

Function: offering different options and lead data collection

Constraints:

- Constraints can be different for European and for African researchers. But lack of incentives for ARD is a common problem.
- Development oriented research does not pay off for academic career: only end-of-career researchers can afford “to go developmental”
- No institutional incentive structure: junior researchers are focused on publications for career or scholarships
- There are contradictory evaluation criteria for European agricultural (tropical) scientists
- Funding trends have influenced the way research institutes operate
- It is important to clarify the benefits for research to engage in multi stakeholder partnerships
- Some young researchers in Africa may engage with non-research actors but more out of opportunism to get a scholarship or work on their thesis without much regard to the restitution of their research findings to the involved farmer communities
- There is a different motivation between local [African] researchers and local consultants: the local consultant often gives better advice, is better informed and has more incentives to do his work

Implications for researchers?

- Get all the actors in the planning process
- Review award and incentives system
- Clarify when partnership is mainly research or when is it considered development
- Relating to development actors can facilitate the “discovery” of new research questions ex: the “Onion de mort” (Benin): inefficiency of some bio pesticides has triggered a lot of interest from researchers for this plant
- Senior university staff can be motivated to engage in development through student field work
- The involvement of young researchers in field work related to innovative partnerships can be highly motivating and inspirational
- Relating with development actors can be very beneficial for university training and education purposes
- Applied research is instructive for training purposes
- Funding modalities should be contractual: (i) define specific services to be offered, (ii) specify how the quality of those services will be guaranteed, (iii) clarify the role of the service providers in the agreement
- The involvement of researchers in ARD has to be reflected in career path opportunities. Presently many [young] researchers are discouraged to participate in innovative ARD partnerships.
Implications for the other actors?

• Collaborating non-research actors should be aware of the career path and incentives of scientific researchers which can limit the involvement of (European) researchers in a developmental type of research.

• Non-research actors would expect not only short term consultancies from researchers but sustained research support

The farmer’s organizations’ perspective

Function: Represent the interests of the end users, lead prioritization, bring in local knowledge, bring in innovation, help researchers to sustain and disseminate research findings, advocate for adapted funding, can take the initiative for research (Example Sénégal : FNRAA -Fonds National de Recherches Agricoles et Agro-alimentaires), increase the opportunities of farmers from South and North to be connected (example: AGRICORD).

Constraints:

• Farmers are often overlooked in the articulation of constraints in the food chain

Implications:

• Farmer organizations are to lead prioritization

• Find ways to integrate scientific and farmers local knowledge

• Develop mechanisms to translate farmers’ needs into research question

• Develop mechanisms to systematize the implication of farmers organizations into definition of research projects

The Private sector’s perspective

Function: input, output and market access

Constraints:

• research is only useful if it is applied to improve food production and distribution

• private companies have no time to scan for funding opportunities

Implications:

• Interested in integrating young researchers in enterprises

• The involvement in networks of experts who face similar problems is useful if applied to improve production

• Example: Pineapple producers of ACP can better inform EC policy makers to modify phyto sanitary criteria when it is supported by scientific evidence and research findings

• Data bases of local research consultants that are used by the private sector (example COLEACP) and can act as intermediaries between producers and researchers

The NGO’s perspective

Function: neutrality and watchdog, capacity building of farmers ‘organizations, extension, research, platform or link between farmers and researchers

The Policy maker’s perspective
Function: infrastructure, trade policies

Constraints:

• Many development priorities
• Corruption for channeling funding
• Lack of evidence on return of agricultural investments

Implications:

• Need to receive from accurate forecasts and statistics from research

Additional functions from other actors

• Training institutes: capacity building
• Consumers: question the sustainability of production and the failing food distributions systems (food waste)
• Retailers: monitor consumer demand & changing tastes

Q4: How to establish Europe-Africa inclusive and balanced partnerships in ARD? What are the processes, mechanisms and good practices to promote [Opportunity]? What are the constraints met by the different stakeholders?

Some practical experience was shared on a number of partnerships which were thought to be successful and balanced:

Title: IPM/Rice

Research-led partnership:
Centro de Estudos Tropicais para o Desenvolvimento (CENTROP) Portugal, Centro de Estudos Tropicais para o Desenvolvimento
Partners: US, Greece, Germany, Italy, Spain, Israel

Theme: post harvest storage. Innovative solutions to storage problems that are effective, inexpensive and environmental friendly.

Opportunity: because of a positive collaboration with private sector there was a sharp decrease of rice weevils through improved rice storage techniques.


Constraints: Impact of innovation is always country specific. Empathy and hard work of all partners is essential in a multi stakeholder partnership. The private sector appreciates the scientific backstopping.
**Title: Food security and health**

**Research-led partnership:** University of Leeds, David Howlett

**Partners:** IITA, ICIPE

**Theme:** How can the results of basic science and inter-disciplinary research lead to increased impact on food security and human health and how can partnerships between research and development organisations deliver innovation and impact?

**Opportunity:** The Africa College, a research partnership (<2008) between IITA, ICIPE and University of Leeds is holding an international conference to share lessons on translating research results into impact for food security, nutrition and human health. 22nd to 24th June 2011

**Constraints:** Overcome cultural gap between the different scientific disciplines: health, agriculture, climate change specialists. Academicians have to change their behavior from research excellence to society benefit. It takes time to build partnerships and everybody has to gain something from the partnership. It is important to be honest about the mutual benefits, transparent and equal. The partnership should focus on results.

---

**Title: Mango West Africa**

**Private-led partnership:** Compagnie Fruitière, Rémi Tessier

**Countries:** Burkina Faso, Mali, Ivory Coast

**Theme:** La lutte régionale contre les mouches des fruits et légumes en .

**Opportunity:** The project mobilized farmers, middleman, value chain leaders, importers and researchers. But it is not only important to have farmers on board. It is essential to involve value chain leaders.

**Constraints:** Introducing Vietnamese agricultural technique to combat fruit flies by the introduction of ants. Was considered by the farmers as too time consuming: the domestication of the ant colonies to eradicate fruit flies was not always effective. It was difficult to find funding to extend the project.

---

**Title: Family farming/Smallholders/Exploitation familiale**

**NGO led partnership:** Terra Nuova (Italy), Paola De Meo. Terra Nuova is an international non-governmental organization and a membership-based association. Founded in 1969 and headquartered in Italy, Terra Nuova is operational in various African and Latin American Countries.

**Partners:** Terra Nuova’s interventions are mainly focused on local socio-economic development in rural and urban areas and on institutional strengthening and capacity building of local institutions.

**Theme:** Small holders farming

**Opportunity:** Family farming has a great resilience and autonomy

**Constraints:** Unbalance between NGOs working in Africa not knowing Italian situation of farmers and vice versa.
Good practices that were also mentioned:

- Blog on internet, with partnership references, information sharing
- To work on short and long term at the same time
- To include beneficiaries in the project elaboration

**Q5: What should PAEPARD do (or do differently) to promote the establishment of such partnerships?**

PAEPARD needs to be demand driven: concerns of the end users should be central

- Don’t pre-define the function of broker: this function is specific according to the objectives of the consortia
- **Balance between inclusiveness (all those who have an interest) and efficiency (each partner needs to have a clear responsibility).** Numbers decrease efficiency if all partners are involved at operational level.

PAEPARD should improve the attraction of development research:

- better target/highlight the benefits for researchers (see above: implications for research)
- Should unlock how research is presently planned

PAEPARD is to identify, capitalize, validate, and disseminate innovative partnership experiences

- Have or develop a clear set of principles on innovative partnerships
- Promote in-country partnerships which are more sustainable than cross country partnerships

PAEPARD should advocate for improvement of specific calls:

- FP8 is too ambitious
- Target low hanging fruits.
- Example how to improve the calls under the ACP-EU Cooperation Program: HRST/ST/AURG/CALL1/2011 (Ref EuropeAid/130-741/D/ACT/ACP)

PAEPARD should tap for useful lessons on other initiatives:

**Continue where DURAS ended**

- DURAS: Promotion of Sustainable Development in Agricultural Research Systems in the South

At the heart of DURAS has been its innovative competitive grants system, which followed an original selection and evaluation process that placed a premium on multi-stakeholder partnerships. [http://paepard.blogspot.com/2010/10/innovative-funding-for-innovative.html](http://paepard.blogspot.com/2010/10/innovative-funding-for-innovative.html)

- The principles developed through DURAS ensured that research priorities were identified in a participatory fashion and that less vocal stakeholders, most notably civil society groups, were mobilized to participate meaningfully in agricultural research for development (AR4D) processes. [http://paepard.blogspot.com/2011/02/building-true-partnership-between.html](http://paepard.blogspot.com/2011/02/building-true-partnership-between.html)

- In tribute to the diversity and richness of partnerships involved in the 12 projects funded under its Competitive Grants component, the DURAS Project Coordination Unit has worked
with Agropolis International to prepare a special issue of Dossier d’Agropolis, which is now available here in English (French version here)

ELLA: Evidence and lessons from Latin America

• ELLA is a programme that opens up access to evidence-based development knowledge from Latin America – for development researchers, practitioners and policy makers across Latin America, Africa, Asia and the international development community.

• ELLA is funded by the UK Department for International Development (DFID), and is being developed and implemented by a consortium of partners, led by Practical Action Consulting, with offices across Latin America, Africa and Asia.


The Institutional Learning and Change (ILAC) Initiative

• Information about how researchers can monitor and evaluate projects and assess research impacts.

• ILAC hopes the site will help researchers to strengthen their capacity for collaborative research - especially in agriculture, to help develop innovative research that involves poor people and helps research to become more effectively managed.

• The resources and library sections of the site contain rich collections useful for all those interested in the evaluation and impact of collaborative projects. The library contains over 1200 references on: participatory research, monitoring and evaluation, impact assessment, organizational learning http://www.cgiar-ilac.org/

Sénégal : FNRAA (Fonds National de Recherches Agricoles et Agro-alimentaires)

• FNRAA aims to finance agricultural research and food production in collaboration with the NARS (National Agricultural Research System), development partners and users of research results.

• The purpose is to create the necessary conditions for a diversified and sustainable funding of Senegalese agricultural research and agri-food.

• http://www.fnraa.sn/

Ligue des universités de recherche européennes (LERU)

• One of the objectives of LERU is to propose concrete solutions or research paths that can be suggested to the European Commission or the European Parliament.

• LERU also facilitates cooperation between the 22 member universities.

• In light of the ongoing debate on the simplification of the EU Research Framework Programme (FP), LERU released a note with recommendations for simplifying the financial management of EU research projects: http://www.leru.org/index.php/public/news/press-release-research-funding/
2. Federating themes for partnership establishment

This sub-section presents the summary report of the second topic on ‘Federating themes for partnership establishment’. The report is not presented along the four questions posed for the topic because groups didn’t follow these questions during their work. This report focuses then on main subjects that were discussed by the 3 groups. The discussions were initiated by group 1 and followed by group 3 and 2. Jonas Mugabe was the overall rapporteur for the topic.

What is a federating theme?

Research and non-research stakeholders can have divergent interests with respect to federating themes. For non-research stakeholders, a federating theme is a theme emerging from a need and that is related to an identified area of development aiming at filling a knowledge gap and generating economic benefits. For research stakeholders, the target is research findings publishable in peer reviewed journals as this determines the career of the scientist.

In the first group, a consensus was found between farmers’ organizations, researchers and private sector around a general theme which could be the entry point for ARD: the “conquest of markets by African family farmers”. This conquest of markets should concern especially local, national and regional level, but also international markets. More precise federating themes should be in line with this general theme. A matrix was suggested to group themes based on product value chains and operations in the chain from input supply and production, via processing and storage to retail marketing and consumption.

How to define a federating theme?

The question was asked how and by whom the federating themes should be defined. It was suggested that the mechanism to define a theme could be more important than the theme itself. The importance of finding a mechanism that allows researchers to answer specific needs of end-users and that includes a way of translating these needs into research questions was highlighted. Some participants asked PAEPARD to define these mechanisms.

Some avenues worth exploring, given by the participants, were:

- Make sure that all actors express their ideas.
- It is important that the right people are working on the problem.
- Themes should be based not only on problems but also on existing opportunities with pre-defined themes around which stakeholders can build the innovation partnerships.
- It is difficult to sit in a meeting like this and define the federating themes because it can be biased by a dominant group/actor towards its interests without taking into account the interests of African small farmers.
- We should not re-invent the wheel but build on the previous work done by other institutions/processes like CORAF/WECARD, ECOWAS, and PAEPARD I, ASARECA, AFRICA-BRAZIL, GCARD that set priorities for ARD. A way could consist of updating these themes by a consultancy work.
- The PAEPARD calls should put more emphasis on principles (inclusiveness, multistakeholderiness, etc.) than on themes/priorities. Some priorities can be defined but if there is a very good project
(as regards the different PAEPARD principles) it could be selected even if it is not related to defined themes.

A type of approach (a process) to identify themes has been proposed in group 3: firstly going through the different priorities identified by African stakeholders, looking thus on which EU could be partner and looking particularly on underinvested themes (areas where there are demands for years and years but where research has never really invested). This implies looking at levels of investment.

**Factors of success for the definition of federating themes: some examples**

Concerning the national innovation platform of Benin (PNISA-Benin) presented during the first plenary session, participants discussed on factors of success for the definition of federating themes that led to its formation. They agreed that the most important factors of success that helped to catalyze the process are:

- **Existing local dynamics**: the innovation partnership of Benin (PNISA-Benin) was formed around local dynamics with real needs of producers of rice and pork. Nuffic, ICRA and local partners come to reinforce the local efforts.

- **National priorities**: the two commodities (rice and pork) around which the innovation partnerships have been formed are considered as national priorities set by the government of Benin.

- **Sustainability**: the innovation partnerships have been formed around activities socially anchored in the habit of the farmers that can still continue (although with difficulty) even without any external support as they constitute the economy of the place.

- **Mutual interest**: the innovation partnership has been formed around themes that met the mutual interest of African and European partners.

Another example was given from Mali where a bio-pesticide was developed and is today widely utilized by cotton producers. How this happened? One national research scientist (entomologist) realized that the wild grapes and surrounding vegetation were not attacked by insects contrarily to cultivated cotton. He started his research and discovered that the wild grapes secrete (exude) some substances that dismiss, move insects away from the plants. With the preliminary results he associated farmers in the experimentation. Since that time there is a functioning partnership which is today institutionalized as Mouvement Biologique du Mali, between researchers and cotton producers that helps to sort out the problems that farmers face. Small-scale producers played a big role in this success story of partnership between researchers and farmers. Other actors to be involved are traders, cooperatives but also other development partners who can somehow influence the sector, because they are linked to it. These are the infrastructure and health sectors. Partners like FAO, IFAD, AfDB, World Bank can also be associated to the definition of federating themes in order to explore the complementarities. In short all protagonists of the action must be involved.
Some suggested themes

Themes suggested and discussed by participants during discussion were:

- **Food Security**: This is much too broad but can be approached by sub-themes related to productivity, production, market access etc.
- **Eco-System Governance**: Natural resources management for sustainable use.
- **Farmer Empowerment**: building the capacity of farmers to better produce and manage natural resources.
- **Seeds and livestock breed improvement**: adapted seeds (to climate change, etc.) and enhanced livestock (including fish) breed selection and improvement
- **Regulation of agricultural markets and price volatility**
- **Innovation and Change**: application of novelties (idea, technologies, process) to generate economic and social benefits and reduce poverty.
- **Information and communication**: development of tools to disseminate the information in ARD among partners.
- **Link agriculture-nutrition, quality of food, healthy and nutritious food**
- **Productivity**: increasing the productivity of the factors of production.
- **Crop protection and animal health management**: to reduce crop losses during the growth and prevent livestock wastage and increase animal protein availability.
- **Post-harvest, processing and conservation**: to reduce post-harvest losses, diversify products. Should also include the safety of consumers and competitiveness in regional and international markets.
- **Water resource management**: use of water in agriculture mostly rain water harvesting and irrigation technologies.
- **Promotion of sustainable seeds**: big seed companies like Monsanto, Syngenta and others dealing with GMOs are taking an important role in the commercialization of seeds on the continent, a situation that makes smallholder producers more dependent on them. Country Research Institutions can build strong partnership with AATF to benefit from the patent of advanced laboratories and domesticate the GM technology. PAEPARD can contribute in building such partnership.

Some value chains can be developed around the above themes such as **fruits and vegetables**, **livestock** and **cereals** like maize. Problems faced in these value chains can be translated in research question. Research can be approached to help solve the problem. It was highlighted that fruits and vegetables in particular could fit, as value chain helping to define federating themes, to PAEPARD project as this value chain is related to family farmers needs in terms of food security and income and also to private sector needs in terms of exportation.

- **Bio-pesticide** can be of strong interest for African and European partners. In Africa, interest can come from consumers (food safety issues linked to misuse of pesticides on the continent) while in Europe, research findings can lead to a patent which can be turned to monetary benefit. This issue of bio-pesticides was discussed in the last group where two opinions appeared. The “anti-
bio-pesticides” argued that the theme is not of much interest for Africa today where the issue seems to be to increase the production in order to reduce hunger rather than to take care of consumer safety. They said the total pesticides consumed on the continent are less than the total used in a country like France. The “pro-bio-pesticides” recognized that the theme may not be a priority today but that, as we are talking of value chains targeting export, we should think about bio-pesticides to increase the competitiveness of African products.
3. Collective and individual stakeholders groups’ needs in terms of information, capacity strengthening and advocacy

This sub-section presents a summary of the group work on the third topic on ‘collective and individual stakeholders groups needs in terms of information, capacity strengthening and advocacy’. It is presented along the four questions posed for the topic as below. In essence, what was required was for participants to propose for three important areas of information and communication, capacity building and advocacy, what to do, how to do it and what PAEPARD should do. A summary of discussions for each question (aggregated for the three groups) is presented below by questions provided. The topical discussions on this topic in particular were initiated by Group 3, followed by group 2 and 1. Moses Osiru was the overall rapporteur for the topic.

Q1: What are, in your view, inclusive and balanced Europe-Africa multi-stakeholders ARD partnerships driven by the demands of end-users in the interest of African family farmers?

See the summary report of the first topic (“Processes and mechanism of balanced partnerships”).

Q2: What information does each stakeholder group need to enable it to establish or join such ARD partnerships and how should this information be provided? What should PAEPARD do to provide this information?

Initially from the earlier groups, participants organized the information needs by group of stakeholders (Table 1). On further discussion, and particularly based on information from a number of shared experiences amongst the groups, the information was rearranged based on information ‘clusters’ or ‘families’ that participants agreed would be required for communicating the PAEPARD Project outcomes (See Table 2). It was also noted that the PAEPARD project has only two more years and that this should be taken into consideration in design of any initiatives.

Table 1: Information needs to establish an ARD partnership for different stakeholder groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Information needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| All stakeholders | 1. Understanding the context i.e. living conditions, where from, expectations  
2. Funding opportunities  
3. Why do others stakeholders want to be part of the partnership |
| Farmers | 1. What are the benefits and risks; why is research necessary  
2. What is expected from others stakeholders?  
3. How do they arrive at the benefits |
| Researchers | 1. What is researchable  
2. Funding opportunities |
| How | 1. Platforms for matchmaking  
2. Exchange of information  
3. Common planning (who does what, where)  
4. Market information  
5. Existing platforms/ databases |
Table 2: Recommendations for PAEPARD: types of information clusters (family) and relevant information needs for each cluster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information ‘Family’</th>
<th>Information needs</th>
<th>How</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why PAEPARD</td>
<td>Communication on PAEPARD and justification</td>
<td>Website, information letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match-making</td>
<td>Require database with institutions and profiles that includes functions, competencies, experiences, disciplines, activities</td>
<td>Description of actors, minimal information, maximum efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>Funding opportunities, partners, projects</td>
<td>Passive- view information Active- receive information in our mailbox, key word search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Case studies, evidence/information to promote PAEPARD;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The question of a platform for matchmaking was discussed through examples.

- The failure of the ‘infosys’ project database was highlighted. The database was too data- and time intensive and did not build on existing databases and initiatives at the time.
- It is not wise to build complex systems
- Matchmaking should be conducted in a targeted manner, with a system of pre-matching
- The main constraint for a platform is the need of input from stakeholders targeted.
- Important to be willing to adapt the technology based on needs- project should be optimized;

A successful example in terms of communication was given: the GIOBASS project which worked in a village in Senegal to promote research, action and training. They produced technical manuals in local languages, provided audio support in local radios to allow for capturing of a wide audience. The project also benefitted from existing programs such as trade fairs and other organized activities outside the project.

Others recommendations were made:

- The how and why are more important than the what
- Other support (beyond electronic) is needed – for specific stakeholders. Example: Local languages, radio
- Focus on exchange of information between different groups
- Keep technologies simple and adapt to needs
- Build on existing technologies (and optimize)
Q3: What capacities need to be strengthened to enable different stakeholders to establish and effectively collaborate in such ARD partnerships? How should capacities for ‘social learning’, knowledge sharing, co-innovation be strengthened? What should PAEPARD do to support this capacity strengthening?

Participants listed a number of areas as suggestions for areas that capacity building is required by PAEPARD as follows. Participants also recognized the importance of identifying the levels at which capacity building should be undertaken. No effort was made to identify specific levels in the meeting, but this was flagged as being an important issue for PAEPARD.

Multi-stakeholder collaboration in innovation partnerships, social learning, mind-set changes

- Innovation systems approaches
- Capacity for effective representation of different groups, e.g., who represents NGOs?
- Sustainable group formation
- Group dynamics, team building
- Facilitation skills- how to facilitate multi-stakeholder groups
- Soft skills (making videos, conference organization, etc.)
- Information collection and sharing
- Knowledge sharing/ dissemination
- Packaging of information to different audiences and policy/ donors
- Multi-disciplinary thinking
- Curriculum reforms and mainstreaming

Research management and research skills

- Agricultural research management
- How to translate development issues into a research problem
- Proposal writing
- M&E, research methods
- Difference between data and information
- How to develop Memoranda of Understanding
- Financial management
- Reporting

Other capacities and issues mentioned

- At what level should capacity be built?
- Farmers’ organizations for markets
- Technical capacities
Experience was shared on a capacity building effort in South Africa, undertaken in collaboration with Wageningen university and research center (Netherlands). The objective of the initiative was to build capacity for agricultural advisory services in South Africa with a focus on the small holder emerging farmers. The project was initiated at the end of the apartheid era when research, training and extension were all under the ministry of agriculture. The project focused on three major areas:

- Master’s of Science and Ph.D studies and university collaboration
- Technical education for retooling staff
- Farmer education and training at research centers

The project approach was to train a core group of trainers (ToT) who would learn by doing through short practical courses for field staff to empower them, enhance decision making and improve management of extension activities. Triads were formed involving two South Africans and one Dutch. In addition a course was developed consisting of five modules which was continually adjusted as the course was rolled out. Through parallel classes over 400 South Africans were trained. Some important lessons from the experience are presented below:

1. Important to design and implement the initiative together from the beginning;
2. There are two approaches that can be used- bottom up versus top up;
3. Need to target and engage the right people at the right time;
4. The project design took 1.5 years
5. It was important to increase institutional capacity

The groups also noted that it was important to recognize that PAEPARD is already in its second year and cannot do everything. Thus PAEPARD should focus on brokerage and building partnerships and recognize that there are many other capacity building efforts. Thus PAEPARD should focus on:

- Methodologies and tools, communication on documentation of experiences
- Experience sharing
- Coaching systems for facilitators
- Case studies
- The project should co-design and co-implement capacity building efforts and work at different levels (i.e. managers, technicians etc.).

Q4: How and where do different stakeholder groups advocate for inclusive and balanced Europe-Africa multi-stakeholder ARD partnership? How could PAEPARD support this advocacy?

For advocacy, participants noted that it was important to be clear from the outputs of the PAEPARD project, what to advocate. As a first step, PAEPARD should develop a communication strategy that identifies the relevant audiences that PAEPARD would like to reach. Some of the types of messages that PAEPARD needs to advocate for the need to channel more money to support research and policy to support reforms on how research is done- in a bid to move towards research for development. One group proposed that it might be useful to have a new conceptualization of
proposal development that would allow partners to identify shared concerns / problems as the first phase, prior to implementation of the project.

The groups also noted that advocacy is already done by a number of players and platforms including the PAEPARD partners and beyond. Some examples of platforms for advocacy (including platforms as “instrument” of advocacy and platforms as target for advocacy) that were identified included (this list is not meant to be exhaustive) the European Commission; FARA; GFAR, COLEACP, EIARD, RUFORUM, E Aff, CTA, PAFFO, ROPPA, etc. It was suggested by some that advocacy should be undertaken more towards the end of the project so that it builds on the project lessons and findings. As a starting point, there should be an effort to document outcomes of the PAEPARD 1 project and to undertake baselines. The project should provide evidence on benefits of ‘business unusual’ and resulting development impacts. Other advocacy goals should be to:

- Promote action research
- Build African ARD institutions
- Use both passive and active advocacy but focus on passive for PAEPARD
- Timely information
Methodology

After the presentations of the groups’ conclusions and recommendations on the three topics, participants were asked to each post one key issue or recommendation to be discussed in the final plenary discussion. These clustered around the following subjects (the detailed comments and recommendations made on post-it stickers are available in annex):

- **Partnership and partnership formation.** Issues raised concerned the “why” and “when” of forming multi-stakeholder ARD partnerships, as well as the “how to” of making them demand-driven, of strengthening their capacities for social learning, and of providing brokerage services.5

- **Demand articulation:** How to articulate, express, capture demand through interaction between researchers and users, and how to translate demand into research questions.

- **Ways of enhancing PAEPARD’s added value or complementarity** relative to existing initiatives; and which opportunities to target.

- **Recommendations for the African multi-stakeholder consultation** to be held in May and based on lessons drawn from this European multi-stakeholder consultation.

A few participants also suggested specific federating themes.

These four clustered subjects were presented to the participants as an introduction to the final plenary discussion and as a possible agenda for this.

Summary of the plenary discussion

*Partnership and partnership formation*

Much of the discussion on partnerships centred on the differences in culture and working practices between actors involved in ARD and on their implications for the formation and effectiveness of multi-stakeholder ARD partnerships. These differences are due to different drivers or institutional incentive structures that govern the actors’ behaviour. In particular, the discussion focused on the implications of differences between business actors on the one hand and research and university staff on the other. For the former, the overriding consideration is market demand for products in which they invest. If anything, they require quick solutions from applied research to respond to new market opportunities. By contrast, research and university staff is driven by the need to publish in peer-reviewed journals as the only or main means of advancing their careers. Moreover, for their survival, European and African research institutes need to invest considerable time in fund raising for research. Also, the national agricultural research institutes (NARIs) in most of Africa are severely underfunded and often strongly depend on volatile and decreasing foreign donor funding. Career incentives and dependence on time-bound external funds are not conducive for research institutes and their staff to engage in multi-stakeholder partnerships, which demand different outputs than scientific publications. Some participants therefore felt that researchers engaging in ARD partnerships were a marginal phenomenon, based on individual social motivations rather than on institutional drivers, such as performance assessments and career perspectives.

Notwithstanding this, participants gave several examples of successful ARD collaboration between MSc or PhD-research and business. Business representatives indicated strong interest in providing internships for young scientists and PhD students in their company. In this way they hoped to gain access to new knowledge and to the expertise of senior thesis supervisors. University staff felt that this was perhaps one

---

5 Regarding the “why” and “when”, one participant emphasised that inclusive, balanced multi-stakeholder ARD partnerships should not be an aim in themselves; partnerships should only be formed in cases where they are an efficient means of meeting end-users’ demands through research, and their composition should be defined by questions of efficiency (which means that they do not always need to be balanced and inclusive).
of the more promising ways to ultimately mainstream their engagement in innovation with other stakeholders, based on institutional incentives driving education rather than research. Such internships provide very interesting subjects for analysis by young scientists and offer a rich learning environment to nurture new talent. They benefit both end-users and the higher education institutes, which receive highly relevant feedback needed to modernise their training of students.

In this respect, participants conceded that, if universities and other educational organisations are to effectively address ARD in their research and teaching, changes in the curricula and improved methods of teaching and learning are needed. Some specific capacity gaps were identified, such as the skills needed to write strong proposals. It was suggested that in most educational organisations there are at least a few committed staff with interests in ARD. But it was stressed that it is important to bring a critical mass of educators on board, not just those who show initial interest, if education is to have a substantial long-term impact on agricultural development. It was felt that a strategy for mainstreaming the engagement of educational organisations in demand-driven ARD was needed.

It was also noted that the Sub-Saharan African Challenge programme and the UniBRAIN project, both FARA-led, offered contexts in which research collaboration with end-users in multi-stakeholder partnerships was becoming less of a marginal phenomenon and began to be more mainstreamed. The UniBRAIN (Universities, Business and Research in Agricultural Innovation) project seeks to link education, research and business in sustainable agriculture. Another project in which the private sector is involved is the Africa Enterprise Challenge Fund which supports businesses working in agriculture, financial services, renewable energy and technologies for adapting to climate change. These initiatives should provide lessons for partnership with businesses in the agricultural arena.

The discussion also touched upon the crucial role of brokers in bringing the different actors in ARD partnerships together. Participants noted that several PAEPARD-partners and other organisations worked with networks of African consultants who were available to provide specific support to local actors involved in innovation. It was conceded that the required institutional and competency-profile of brokers varied with the kind of partnership and innovation challenge. More knowledge and experience was felt to be needed to determine these for specific situations.

**Demand articulation**

This item was not much discussed, apart from a strong appeal from farmer organisation representatives that farmers’ needs and demands should direct the formation and operation of multi-stakeholder ARD partnerships.

**Ways of enhancing PAEPARD’s added value or complementarity**

Participants commented on the need for PAEPARD to maintain a clear focus and to look for synergies with other initiatives. Potential initiatives mentioned included the GALVmed programme, a public-private partnership that focuses on preventing livestock diseases such as East Coast Fever by making vaccines, diagnostics and medicines more accessible to developing-country farmers. It was also suggested that PAEPARD should establish links with the Global Donor Platform for Rural Development.

**Recommendations for the African multi-stakeholder consultation**

Some participants expressed the view that there is a need to move beyond consultation and abstract discussions to concrete action. With this in mind, the programme for the multi-stakeholder consultation in Africa should be structured rather differently. One way of doing this could be to organise this consultation around a few potential partnerships, either selected from the successful applicants to the PAEPARD call or mobilised around one or more new federating themes, and to invite the main stakeholders involved. Discussions on partnership formation and needs in terms of information, capacity strengthening and advocacy could then be more concrete and focused on practical action.
Some issues were not or insufficiently addressed during the European consultation. These include the role of the African Diaspora (both the science and the business community) and gender. The latter is a serious omission in view of the preponderance of women farmers and the severity of the challenges they face.

**Some elements of conclusion**

Paolo Sarfatti gave to the audience some elements of conclusion.

As a preliminary consideration it is important to note that this response, for reasons of time, has not been discussed with the other project partners, even if some considerations have been informally shared during these two days. So this should be considered as a personal contribution.

The discussion during the Workshop has been very rich and intense in spirit of collaboration. There is a lot of experience in the room, the debate benefited from the presentation of interesting case studies. There was a good diversity of points of view, with participants from many different stakeholder categories from Europe and from Africa. Participants gender balance is not as good as it should have been, and gender issues were not discussed as necessary. Representatives of European farmers organizations were not present, as well as from national agricultural research systems from Africa. This is something which should be taken into consideration in the future.

Given the richness of the debate and contributions, PAEPARD partners will have to analyze carefully the Workshop outputs and outcomes in order to capitalize on them. A detailed report of the Workshop will be elaborated. Participants will be contacted and involved to make their own inputs and contributions to the report.

During the Workshop three main topics were discussed:

- a. processes for partnerships
- b. federating themes
- c. needs on information, capacity building, and advocacy

The discussion and conclusions on these three topics showed that there is a good degree of convergence with the internal consultations of the previous months, which were conducted autonomously by single stakeholder groups. This is an important indicator of the readiness, willingness, and expectation of the representatives of the different stakeholder categories mobilized by PAEPARD to engage in partnerships.

One recommendation emerging from the Workshop is that PAEPARD needs to be focused and see carefully how it can add value to other initiatives with similar objectives.

During these two days it has been said that partnerships need to be based on a sound analysis of the context, stakeholders, problems, risks, opportunities, as well as different needs. PAEPARD needs to elaborate more on the concept of opportunities, both in terms of opportunities offered by funding, and by new/emerging technologies. A final recommendation for PAEPARD is to be focused on action.