



Building multi-stakeholder partnerships for
agricultural research & innovation:
Lessons from PAEPARD supported consortia
in Sub-Sahara-Africa (SSA)

*Laurent Glin, Monica Kapiriri,
Richard Hawkins, Tim Chancellor*

PAEPARD calls - Background (1)

- 1st and 2nd calls (Dec 2010, June 2011, 6 weeks for submission)
- Criteria:
 - 1+ EU partner; 1+ Africa non-research; and 1+ Africa research partners (mostly met)
 - User identified research need (partly met)
 - Clear funding target (seldom met)
- On offer: € 6,000/partnership for support (but -> 10,000 + in reality)
- Concept notes screened selected by PAEPARD partners

PAEPARD calls - Background (2)

- 1st call:
 - 82 submitted
 - 9 selected
- 2nd call:
 - 69 submitted (15 resubmissions)
 - 10 selected
- Total:
 - 19 partnerships: 117 organizations,
 - 70-30 Af/EU, 50-50 users/research partners
 - 16-3 Af/EU; 7-9 research/non research lead orgs

PAEPARD calls – retrospect, lessons

- Call documents bit ambiguous:
 - established partnerships (with defined funding) vs potential partnerships (with no defined funding)
 - research vs non-research leadership (wording of call, also terminology of ARD).
- 6 weeks to little to build balanced team
- Balanced team more important than scientific quality (at this stage);
- Credible funding strategy more important than defined call

Capacity Strengthening - Objectives

- Development of functional partnerships
- Clarity on the roles of partnership (agricultural innovation facilitators” (AIFs)
- Development of concept notes and then fundable proposals

Capacity Strengthening - Process

- 1st Call: 3 joint PI workshops, international facilitation, 5 days
- 2nd Call: training of (29) AIFs, followed by individual PI workshops (8 of 10, so far), of 2-5 days, and national AIF support
- Combined calls: 2 regional writeshops to develop proposals for AU research call (12 p'ships). (Additional Edulink writeshop planned).

Capacity Strengthening - Outputs

- 19 partnerships supported
- 3 proposals submitted to CORAF (2011);
- 9 proposals submitted to AU (2012)
- 2 (?) other proposals submitted from S Africa partnership (different strategy)

Inception Workshops – Lessons (1)

- Poor culture of sharing (fears: commitment, IPR/copyright, plagiarism, etc.)
- Geographic, scientific, cultural diversity
- Need partnership skills, but difficult to balance with immediate task (concept note)
- Difficult to mobilize European partners (distance, resource input, likely output)
- Few partners = few ideas; more = difficult to manage
- Partnership changes/evolution (why...?)

Inception Workshops – Lessons (2)

- Trust Takes Time. Single event/PIW not adequate (for p'ship dev.), continued support needed
- 6-7 weeks not enough for partnership development and proposal development
- Need combination F2F meetings + distance communication (email, skype, phone)
- Difficult role of facilitator (viz a vis project leader; skills in negotiation, conflict man., logframe/proposal dev. fundraising., etc)

Proposal Development Writeshops - Lessons

- (Re)alignment to donor requirements changed (initial) power relations (AU focus on research consortia),
 - frustration/de-motivation initial lead organizations
 - re-orientation to “pure” research, not “ARD”.
- Not realistic to expect each partnership to target specific call
- Focus on project development, submission, funding at expense of p’ship building

Partnership Development - Questions

- Leadership vs facilitation
 - Can consortium leadership and project leadership be separated? (e.g. if partnership is dependent on 1 project?)
 - Can partnership leadership and facilitation be separated? (if single project mode)
 - Relative time inputs needed (e.g. from AIF)
 - Payments for AIFs (sustainability of PAEPARD model)

PAEPARD partnerships - Conclusions

- Experience so far that few funding mechanisms for PAEP(ARD) type partnerships
 - Not all (research, non research) stakeholders can participate in (most, current) funding calls (advocacy need; partnership strategies)
 - (European) mechanisms for European input to African based partnerships need to be developed
- Consortia/ partnerships need to be built around more than 1 single project (e.g. SA, but time for developing multiple funding sources)

PAEPARD partnerships - Conclusions (2)

- TOR “leader” and “facilitator” need more thinking, negotiation
- AIFs need more capacity strengthening, and play a role in proposal development (writeshops)
- Proposals need to include p’ship building/learning by implementors & consortium members (- donor realization/acceptance?)

Partnership models depend on Funding...

1. Single project/funding (most PAEPARD p'ships)
 - Opportunistic
 - More “led” than facilitated (?)
 - “Stakeholders” not always = “partners”
 - Quick development (?)
2. Multiple project/funding (e.g. SA p'ship)
 - Each partner brings own resources (projects)
 - Facilitator role clearer, partners more equal in power (?)
 - Slower to develop (?)
3. User commissioned research funding (no PAEPARD examples)
 - Strong/wealthy user groups (e.g. Europe)
 - Voucher system
4. Others?