



# *Synthesis study – ARD partnerships*

Preliminary results for discussion



# *Synthesis Study*

## **Objective of the synthesis study:**

*Generating lessons for current and future partnership in the framework of PAEPARD in terms of:*

- effectiveness*
- efficiency*
- sustainability*

## **Objective of the case studies:**

*To identify elements of success/failure of partnerships that could be learnt for PAEPARD platform as well as used in advocacy for greater partnerships between the two continents.*



## *A very diverse set of cases*

	<b>Case</b>	<b>Title</b>
<b>1</b>	ASARECA	Case study on the Partnership between Civil Society Organizations and ASARECA
<b>2</b>	ICRA/NARDTT	A case study of the Agricultural Research for Development in South Africa
<b>3</b>	REPARAC	Un étude de cas pour la PROPAC
<b>4</b>	FNRAA	Le Fonds National de Recherches Agricoles et Agroalimentaires du Sénégal
<b>5</b>	RAD	Le Réseau Agriculture Durable et la recherche agricole
<b>6</b>	COLEACP	Etude de cas du COLEACP
<b>7</b>	EAFF/CAPAD	Case study on gift of Japanese Rice project



# *Analytical Framework proposed by PAEPARD*

<b>Initiative</b>	<b>Roles and responsibilities</b>			<b>Cases</b>
	Definition	Implem.	M&E	
<b>Research</b>	R+U	R	R	FNRAA, REPARAC
	R	R+U		ASARECA, NARDTT
<b>Users</b>	U	R+U		RAD, COLEACP

Partnerships are grouped based on :

- Who took the initiative to form the partnership
- How were roles divided in project design, implementation and evaluation.

These are assessed on equality, effectiveness and sustainability.



# *Lacking Information Cases*

- The impact of the projects itself.
- The cost-benefit ratio of the partnerships
- Role division during implementation



# *Starting off the partnership*

## *Preliminary results*

### Capacity problems:

- Lack of capacity in coordinating and managing partnership
- Lack of understanding what it meant to work in partnership, from both CSOs and formal researchers



## *Researchers / users- Preliminary results*

### **Researchers:**

- Researchers stick to disciplinary focus
- Few researchers trained in participatory research
- Scientists often lack support by their institutes
- Rewarding systems work against partnership building

### **Users:**

- Find it difficult to formulate research projects
- Little recognition of the need to partner with research actors and private sector
- Not remunerated for time investment
- Do not coordinate among them so as to play a more powerful advocacy role



## *Outcomes - Preliminary results*

- Research has become more accessible
- Researchers trained in participatory/action research
- Participants with increased capacities to work together
- Participants trained in coordination, management, book keeping and time management
- Working together opens opportunities: future contacts, easiness to draw on other stakeholders' knowledge.





## *Sustainability- Preliminary results*

- a. Of results of partnerships: promising, because they reflect users' needs to a greater extent than "conventional" research
- b. Of the partnership itself: all partnerships dependent on external funders for continuation
- c. Of the relationships established: here perhaps most gains to be made



## *Key factors for success – Preliminary results*

- Champions and brokers
- Legitimacy of partners (especially CSOs)
- Recognition by senior managers – buy in or organizations
- Shared responsibilities
- Shared gains (resources, results)
- Transparency and communication (decision making, planning, learning)



## *Financing- Preliminary results*

- - Key to allow time/resources needed for building a partnership in the first place
  - The terms and conditions of donors/calls often oblige actors to work together
  - But can we “force” partnership?
  - **Competitive funds:** there are certainly interesting examples there;
  - Though these examples also show that partnering remains difficult to put in practice
  - Substantial time and resources need to be set aside for building the capacity of actors to work together



# *Back to our analytical framework – a number of provocative statements*

<b>Initiative</b>	<b>Roles and responsibilities</b>			<b>Cases</b>
	Definition	Implementation	M&E	
<b>Research</b>	R+U	R	R	FNRAA, REPARAC
	R	R+U		ASARECA, NARDTT
<b>Users</b>	U	R+U		RAD, COLEACP



# Model 1

Initiative	Roles and responsibilities			Cases
	Definition	Impl.	M&E	
<b>Research</b>	R+U	R	R	FNRAA, REPARAC

- Usefulness of results depends on active participation of users at initial stages
- In selecting proposals in case of competitive funds
- And in proper communication of results later (if shared at all...)
- Chances are that researchers get on a different track in the process...
- Partnership not really in place at implementation – therefore less sustainable as such



## Model 2

Initiative	Roles and responsibilities			Cases
	Definition	Impl.	M&E	
<b>Research</b>	R	R+U	?	ASARECA, NARDTT

- Usefulness of results depends on active participation of users at implementation
- Which can be hampered by the initial process of research planning – lack of trust, mutual respect and accountability.
- Reluctance in sharing results by academic community
- Partnership not really in place at implementation – therefore less sustainable as such



## Model 3

Initiative	Roles and responsibilities			Cases
	Definition	Impl.	M&E	
<b>Research</b>	U	R+U	?	RAD, COLEACP

- Users' in charge of defining the issue
- But a mid-term between users' immediate interests (especially if "politicized") and scientific rigor has to be sought.
- Brokers between partners extremely relevant and needed.



## *A few last points for discussion*

- How do you exactly want to use the lessons learned elsewhere?
- Are the models useful?
- Or are we after basic principles behind partnership and how they can apply to ARD?