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Executive Summary

In 2011, the Platform for African European Partnership on Agricultural Research for Development (PAEPARD) launched the Users-led Process (ULP) to better articulate users’ needs in a multi-stakeholder research and innovation (R&I) partnership. The ULP comprises six critical steps: (1) Identification of a federating theme; (2) Desk review; (3) Introduction workshop; (4) Multi-stakeholder research question inception workshop; (5) Concept note development; (6) Full proposal development.

In this study, we reviewed the evolution of the ULP as implemented by five organisations (EAFF1, PROPAC2, ROPPA3, COLEACP4, FANRPAN5), identified the ULP stage at which European partners become engaged, and evaluated their contribution. The assessment involved the analysis of both secondary and primary data obtained through literature reviews, interviews and online questionnaires, as well as social network analysis. The following is a summary of the lessons learned:

- The ULP has contributed to developing the social capital of non-research actors, which is essential for sustaining their engagement in research beyond a project life cycle. The multi-stakeholder dialogues initiated or stimulated by PAEPARD in sub-Saharan Africa have empowered sub-regional farmer organizations as partners in the R&I process to demand more from research.

- The ULP can take two to five years to complete. Building trust between researchers and non-researchers and strengthening the engagement of European and African stakeholders takes time and financial resources. Private sector actors are also reluctant to engage if there is no exclusivity to the results. In total, 19 partnerships were developed and 14 research proposals were submitted for funding, resulting in five funded projects.

- There is a mismatch between users’ research priorities and funding streams. European Union (EU) researchers with no institutional care funding are constrained to engage in all stages of the ULP. They tend to engage at the project development stage (six) and this often requires consortia to form new partnerships within a short period. Flexibility within the ULP is necessary, especially when jointly aligning developed research priorities with the requirements of donors.

- Knowledge co-creation between researchers and non-researchers remains constrained by their different perspectives and interests. The language barrier is also a constraint. Time, adequate facilitation and human, as well as financial, resource allocations are essential to build effective multi-stakeholder African-EU R&I partnerships.

- The ULP is valid for building and sustaining R&I partnerships that can contribute to greater development impacts, but the timeframe to attract investment from donors and policy-makers needs to be reduced, and EU researchers and the private sector must enhance their engagement and commitment.
**Background**

Since the 1960’s, thinking and approaches to agricultural innovation have changed from the linear approach of knowledge and technology transfer, to embracing a broader view of the agricultural research and innovation (ARI) process [1-4]. The emphasis has shifted towards the development of system approaches, bringing together networks of actors and enabling collaborative learning for collective innovation [3-6]. In the linear approach, end-users were seen as passive receivers of knowledge generated through research, and were often not included in the research and knowledge generation process. The concept of demand-led research was introduced to counter the ‘top-down’ linear approach and improve responsiveness to the needs of primary users [7]. It was assumed that by engaging users and responding to their needs and problems, they would be more motivated to adopt the new and/or improved products and services created through the research. Although it is critical to increase user engagement, and empower them to participate in R&D processes, this is not so simple. Achieving this paradigm shift takes time and requires capacity building of scientists and non-scientists as well as adequate financial investment [1; 4].

Contradictory perceptions and understanding of demand-led research and its knowledge systems have constrained its development [7]. While some researchers perceive demand-led research as a trade-off between improving research outcomes and limiting the ability to generate new knowledge [7], in contrast, others identify it as a key R&D process in which the assimilation of local knowledge is fundamental. Opinions diverge among researchers regarding who should be accountable for assessing the demand, and its articulation and determination within the research agenda [7]. Surprisingly, demand is not always associated to one end-user and a category of end-users is then recognized, including farmers, civil society communities, researchers, policy-makers and the private sector [7]. Demand-led research, on its own, is not sufficient to solve complex issues [6]. The R&D multi-stakeholder approach has now advanced to become the key to overcoming interdisciplinary issues, in which knowledge is created and innovation takes place as a result of the interaction between stakeholders [1; 8].

As defined by the World Bank, an innovation system is a network of organizations, enterprises, and individuals focused on bringing new products, new processes, and new forms of organization into economic use, together with the institutions and policies that affect their behaviour and performance.” [9]. Instruments such as the multi-stakeholder partnership (MSPH) approach have emerged [1; 6; 10; 11], in which different actors and organizations with different backgrounds collaborate to identify a common problem or aspiration, while maintaining their own stakes or interests. Key stakeholders should be involved from the start because leaving them out may ultimately affect the partnership [8]. In practice, the development of a clear pathway to support research organizations in implementing such an interactive collaborative approach is still lacking. In this respect, the Platform for African European Partnership on Agricultural Research for Development (PAEPARD) is rather unique to have developed a ‘bottom-up’ process for engaging European and African research and non-research stakeholders to address development challenges. In fact, PAEPARD has integrated the demand-led research concept to articulate users’ needs in a multi-stakeholder R&D partnership, namely, the Users-Led Process (ULP). Such a ‘bottom-up’ process demands that several prerequisites are met. Both researchers and end-users need new skills for them to interact and collaborate [7; 12; 13]. Adequate time for building such partnerships is also crucial as researchers need to engage with end-users over a long period to be able to understand, notably, intrinsic factors such as end-users’ knowledge, perceptions and attitudes that influence research uptake [12]. In addition, social accountability is as important as academic accountability [6]. It also requires commitment to capacity development, trust and a willingness to learn on the part of all actors. More specifically, when dealing with African and European partnerships and knowledge gaps between researchers and other actors, cultural differences must be considered.

**Introduction**

The European Forum on Agricultural Research for Development (EFARD) has evolved to become an umbrella organization for European agricultural research for development (ARD) networks. EFARD is a platform that provides opportunities for strategic dialogue among European ARD stakeholders. Its mission is to promote more effective, demand-driven and impact-focused research through building partnerships, particularly with developing countries. EFARD aims to enhance the contribution of the European ARD community to achieve food security, poverty alleviation and sustainable development in developing countries. Moreover, EFARD aims to encourage policy and advocacy for increasing funding to support the engagement of European research actors in ARD projects. EFARD members are involved in European Union (EU)-funded projects.

In 2007, EFARD and the Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa (FARA) initiated the PAEPARD project. Initially, EFARD was represented by AGRAFUTURAMA, who delegated CRAD as the lead EU partner. PAEPARD is funded by the European Commission (EC) through the Sixth Framework Programme Integrating and strengthening the European research area, specific measures in support of international cooperation. The motivation of this initiative was to create MSPH in contrast to the conventional research partnership model, with a pertinent set of skills and knowledge to identify and effectively address the main constraints and thus, the potential to generate relevant product and process innovations that can better respond to food security, poverty alleviation and environmental sustainability.

Results from the first phase (PAEPARD I: 2007-08) indicated that existing partnerships were driven by the EU partners, while the contribution of African partners was limited. This led to the second phase (PAEPARD II: 2009-13), which aimed for more balanced partnerships including non-research actors, such as farmer organizations (FO), non-governmental organizations (NGO) and the private sector. This approach aimed to better identify users’ needs, which in turn, would be used to drive the research agenda.

In 2011, two calls for proposals to support the development of multi-stakeholder partnerships and promote the demand-driven ARD and innovation approach were made by PAEPARD. As a result, 19 consortia were formed in total (nine from the first call and 10 from the second). To assist the last 10 consortia, 24 agricultural innovation facilitators (AFI) at the national level were trained to bring partners together to reach consensus on priorities and joint action.

Despite the efforts of PAEPARD in orienting ARD towards more demand-driven partnerships, the consortia formed from the two calls were considered by non-researchers rather ‘top-down’ partnerships. For example, the Pan African Farmers Organization (PAFO) encountered some difficulties – notably in orienting their partnerships to respond to their needs.
The ULP comprises six critical steps (Figure 1): (1) Identification of a federating theme; (2) Desk review; (3) Introduction workshop; (4) Multi-Stakeholder Research Question (MSHRQ) inception workshop; (5) Concept note development; (6) Full proposal development. Each step is further described in Annex 1 [16].

The three objectives of the ULP are to: promote research based on users’ needs and challenges; improve existing MSHP; and reinforce existing dynamics at national and regional level [15].

Essentially, the aim was to designate regional farmers’ platforms that will select federating research themes, in consultation with their stakeholders, and lead the different ULP-led consortia on the chosen topic. In total, five ULP-led consortia were formed: three were led by sub-regional African FO (EAFF, PROPAC and ROPPA), another was led by COLEACP – a non-profit inter-professional association (private sector), and the final one was led by FANRPAN – a regional network of organizations linked with the agricultural policy process [15].

In 2013, PAEPARD launched the Competitive Research Fund (CRF) and Incentive Fund (IF) to support the five ULP-led consortia and those initiated under calls one and two. The objective of the CRF-IF was to strengthen the capacity of the most promising consortia created within PAEPARD to improve and implement impact-oriented, demand-driven ARD projects [14]. The CRF aimed at providing seed funding to the four most promising consortia and ULP-led consortia, and the IF aimed at supporting concept notes developed by non-ULP and ULP-led consortia according to their needs. This was achieved through inception workshops, write-shops, exchange visits between partners and complementary studies to improve their partnerships.

Since the ULP approach was launched, knowledge on the overall accomplishments and lessons learned of the five ULP-led consortia and the 19 consortia have started to be shared [15].

The assessment of the ULP aims to draw lessons from the approach to engage discussion and reflection among EFARD members, and between EFARD members and those of other platforms of the Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR), including FARA. This study focuses on assessing the involvement of European partners in the ULP multi-partnership approach. The specific objectives are to assess:

I. How the five ULP-led consortia have progressed and grown since their establishment in 2011?

II. What is/was the position of the European partners in the ULP multi-stakeholder partnership?
   a. What are the motivations and constraints to the engagement and collaboration of European stakeholders in the ULP?
   b. What are the power dynamics and levels of trust between African and European stakeholders in the ULP?
   c. What has been the role of European partners in terms of knowledge creation and knowledge sharing? Have European partners learnt from their African partners and vice versa, and how has this learning changed perspectives/approaches to the research?

III. How does the PAEPARD community view the European and African partners in regards to the user-led RRI partnership?

### TABLE 1: End users and beneficiaries targeted by each ULP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ULP</th>
<th>END USERS &amp; BENEFICIARIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COLEACP</td>
<td>Mango producers &amp; livestock farmers, traders and processors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FANRPAN</td>
<td>Smallholders farmers and policy makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAFF</td>
<td>Smallholders farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPAC</td>
<td>Smallholders farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROPPA</td>
<td>Smallholders farmers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The questions addressed the following subjects: engagement, collaboration, knowledge co-creation and learning (Annex 2.2). In addition, a comparative questionnaire was sent to other European and African stakeholders engaged in five consortia from the two calls launched by PAEPARD in 2010/2011 (Annex 2.3).

Last, the members of the PAEPARD discussion group (Dgroup) were invited to participate in a web-based questionnaire to assess lessons learned on user-led RRI partnerships, and scale-up the user-led research. The PAEPARD Dgroup brings together about 7,000 research and non-research actors from Europe and Africa to share and exchange ARD knowledge. A total of 27 questions were asked using a mix of closed, semi-closed and open questions (Annex 2.4).

The responses to this questionnaire were analyzed using a content analysis method. A cleaning procedure was undertaken on the responses of the open questions: responses with insufficient descriptive detail (e.g. yes/no) and responses lacking coherence (e.g. unrelated to the original question) were removed. After cleaning the dataset, the responses of each question were coded and categorized using the MAXQDA 10 software (VERBI GmbH, Germany). Finally, the relative number of respondents was calculated for each identified category.
Results

The evolution, achievements and shortcomings of the five organisations leading the ULP from 2011 to 2016

Evolution of ULP-led consortia and European/African interaction

A timeline of the ULP steps of each of the five organizations that led and followed the approach was built from the literature review and interviews conducted with ULP coordinators (Figure 2). In 2011, the ULP developed and defined the federating themes. The regional FO (EAFF, PROPAC, ROPPA) and FANRPAN developed their federating themes based on the result of the African regional consultations carried out in 2009-2010. The ROPPA-ULP led stopped its activities after the MSHRQ workshop in 2014. The COLACP-ULP developed three concept notes (during the concept note development stage), and is still seeking new funding opportunities to continue the process. The ULP led by EAFF, PROPAC and FANRPAN have each developed several project proposals – mostly in 2014 and 2015. The FANRPAN-ULP was the first one to develop a project proposal that was funded by the PAEPARD CRF. FANRPAN and EAFF were partners in the funded projects, however, these projects were not led by them and/or do not focus on the federating theme. Nevertheless, the coordinators of the EAFF- and FANRPAN-ULP emphasized the role and importance of being involved in these projects, notably in building trust and opportunities with new European stakeholders.

For example, the EAFF-ULP coordinator highlighted that “Since the project has started, European stakeholders’ interest has grown to work together with EMF on the issues of aflatoxin contamination. Furthermore, the coordinator of the FANRPAN-ULP indicated that, “The challenge for FANRPAN in these projects is to keep the users’ perspective even if FANRPAN is not the leader.”

Overall, the timeline shows that the users took from 2 to 5 years to reach the last step of the ULP which is the full proposal development stage.

The review of the existing reports on the ULP shows a lower participation of EU stakeholders than African stakeholders (Figure 3). The EU stakeholders involved in the ULP consortia were essentially from Western and Northern Europe (Figure 4).
The results of the social network analyses provide further information on the engagement and interaction between European and African stakeholders during the process. Four network maps were created representing the PROPAULP (Figure 5), COLEACP-ULP (Figure 6), EAFF-ULP (Figure 7), and the FAANPAN-ULP (Figure 8, page 12).

**PROPAULP**

During the MSHRQ inception workshop, a core group (Annex 3) was formed to take forward the process (Figure 5 - yellow lines). Only two organizations of this core group (CIRAD and the Concertation Nationale des Organisations Paysannes du Cameroun [CNOP-Cameroun]) - the National Consultation of FO in Cameroon - have played an important role in bringing the ULP forward. In total, six stakeholders (AGRISUD - an international NGO, CIRAD, CNOP-Cameroun [CNOP-Cameroun] - the National Consultation of FO in Cameroon, IRAD - the National Institute of Agricultural Research Centre [WUR]) were later engaged in the development of three concept notes. From the four EU stakeholders participated and two of them (ADG, a Belgian NGO, and Wageningen University and Research Centre [WUR]) were later engaged in the development of the three proposals.

At step five, we observe a high connectivity and overlap between stakeholders. This indicates that the same stakeholders have been collaborating to write different concept notes. Furthermore, the overlaps (yellow and green lines) of the connections between stakeholders show the important role played by the members of the core group in bringing the ULP forward.

**COLEACP-ULP**

The network map of the COLEACP-ULP shows a different pattern (Figure 6). COLEACP is not placed at the centre but at the right hand corner of the map. In fact, COLEACP has played a coordinating role in developing concept notes rather than being a direct partner in each of the consortia formed. The central position and the size of the node representing the organization FIRCA indicates that it has played an important role in the ULP. At step four, three European stakeholders participated and two of them (ADG, a Belgian NGO, and Wageningen University and Research Centre [WUR]) were later engaged in the development of three concept notes.

**EAFF-ULP**

Most of the stakeholders that participated in the MSHRQ inception workshop (purple lines) are quite isolated on the map (right left corner, Figure 7). This suggests that the MSHRQ inception workshop (step four) was not a key step for partnership building and that a large number of partners were in fact identified during a later stage. The network map shows that only two European stakeholders engaged in the MSHRQ inception workshops, and that only one (CIRAD) was later engaged in the development of concept notes and proposals. Furthermore, the network map shows that only a few members of the core group participated in the development of concept notes and/or proposals.

Six full proposals (blue lines) were prepared and two projects were funded (black lines, Figure 7). We observe that most of the stakeholders involved in these proposals and/or funded projects are situated at the periphery of the map, which shows that they were not involved in the other ULP steps. Nevertheless, the size and the position of the node representing Makerere University shows that they have been a key actor in the ULP.

At step six, three full proposals were developed. On the map, the stakeholders involved in the proposals are all positioned on the left and are highly connected. This indicates that the ULP led by PROPAULP has built strong partnerships with this particular set of actors. Furthermore, the size of the node for EU organization, CIRAD and two African organizations - CNOP-Cameroun and IRAD - and the short distances between them suggest their key role, especially in the development of the three proposals.
The network map for the FANRPAN-ULP shows similarities with the network map of the EAFF-ULP (Figure 8). Only three stakeholders who engaged in the MSHRQ inception workshops were involved in a consortium that worked on full proposal development in the later stage. One European stakeholder (the Natural Resources Institute [NRI]) participated in step four and was further involved in two of the funded projects. Three projects were funded in total (black and blue lines).

As for the EAFF-ULP, we observe that most of the stakeholders are situated at the periphery of the map, but one of the projects is situated at the centre of the process (blue line). In fact, this project – led by FANRPAN – was funded by PAEPARD CRF funding mechanism and is the only one to focus on the ULP federating theme. The size of the nodes and the distance between them suggest that the National Smallholder Farmers’ Association of Malawi (NASFAM) is a key actor in the FANRPAN-ULP.

The similarities and contrasts between the four ULP network maps provide additional indications on the role played by the ULP in connecting African stakeholders with European stakeholders. The ULP led by EAFF and FANRPAN have developed projects which have received funding, and their network maps (Figures 7 and 8) appear more spread out than those that have not. Stakeholders positioned at the periphery of the maps were engaging more towards the latter stages, and is more common for the EU stakeholders (blue nodes).

**ULP global achievements and shortcomings**

The ULP global achievements and shortcomings were assessed by examining the responses of the five ULP coordinators and stakeholders on the partnership learning process and capacity for reflection (see Q.25-31 presented in Annex 2.1 and Q.21-27 in Annex 2.2). Figure 9 shows the achievements and shortcomings at each step of the ULP.
Engagement and collaboration of European and African stakeholders in the ULP and MSHP

Motivation and key constraints to European stakeholders’ engagement and collaboration

Motivation and key constraints were assessed by examining responses to Q.13-14 of the questionnaire and the responses collected during the interviews with PAEPARD ULP coordinators (Annex 2.1). The responses of the ULP stakeholders to Q.9 and Q.10 (Annex 2.2) were used to complete and further clarify the responses of the ULP coordinators.

Motivations and constraints of the European stakeholders (Tables 1 and 2)

The coordinators observed that European stakeholders were engaged in the ULP because of their interest in sharing and exchanging knowledge, and because of their expertise on the federating theme (Table 2). They indicated that European stakeholders, and notably researchers, were interested to join the ULP because it was an opportunity for them to work in collaboration with the research users.

In fact, this was further described by the response of one European researcher who indicated that the ULP was an interesting concept because it was supporting the development of “science for impact”. ULP coordinators observed that European stakeholders representing the private sector were more encouraged to join the ULP when they could see the opportunities to develop new business in Africa.

Furthermore, engaging in the ULP was also seen as an opportunity to develop experiences and skills in working in MSHP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest to share and exchange knowledge on the federating theme</th>
<th>Working with user/science for impact</th>
<th>Developing business opportunities in Africa</th>
<th>Gain experience working with African stakeholders</th>
<th>Gain experience in MSHP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The ULP coordinators perceived that the major constraint to European stakeholders’ engagement was funding (Table 3). In their responses, ULP coordinators explained that financial compensation was often requested by European stakeholders (researchers), specifically to support their participation in step four of the process (the MSRIRQ inception workshop and/or the core group meetings). This constraint was further clarified in the response of one European researcher involved in the ULP:

“The organization cannot afford to spend a lot of time on unpaid acquisition time and implement projects that do not cover our fees as this would mean that we are operating at a loss. Although the work might be very interesting, no organization can afford to operate at a loss.”

Limited funding
Limited availability
Length of the process (too long)
Language barrier
Research results and intellectual property rights

TABLE 1: Constraints to EU stakeholders’ engagement and collaboration

Coordinators indicated that the limited availability of the European stakeholders was a constraint to their engagement and collaboration. Furthermore, the length of the process was mentioned as a constraint – especially by European stakeholders from the private sector who were seeking quick returns on investment. Responses from the COLEACP-ULP (private sector) indicated that the agro-industry seemed reluctant to engage in the ULP. Sharing results with other stakeholders is often not in line with developing and maintaining a competitive advantage and, therefore, the private sector is generally seeking for exclusivity of the results.

In the Francophone ULP consortia led by PRO-PAC and COLEACP, an inability to speak English was seen as a barrier for collaboration with PAEPARD partners. The coordinators for both ULP emphasized that translating documents and emails was crucial to keep partners informed, to respond to donor calls, and to mobilize EU actors. However, this was time consuming for ULP coordinators and slowed down the process at all stages. Moreover, the PRO-PAC-ULP coordinator indicated that the difficulty in preparing to apply for a call when it was only available in English.

Power dynamics and the level of trust between African and European stakeholders

Power dynamics and levels of trust between African and European stakeholders were assessed by examining the responses of the ULP coordinators to Q.15-20 of the questionnaire (Annex 2.1). Responses of the ULP stakeholders to questions Q.11-15 (Annex 2.2) were used to clarify the responses of the ULP coordinators.

- Level of trust in the ULP (Figure 11)
  
  The level of trust between the European and African stakeholders was perceived to be lower in the ULP consortia than in the non-ULP consortia. Although the level of trust was perceived to be low, the response of the coordinators was rather diverse. ULP coordinators explained that trust was a problem due to the low level of commitment demonstrated by the European stakeholders. Nevertheless, coordinators of the EAF-ULP and FARNPAN-ULP observed that once European stakeholder engagement was high, the level of trust increased. The PRO-PAC-ULP coordinator indicated that African stakeholders were not always motivated and this attitude may have affected European stakeholders’ level of trust in African stakeholders.

- Trust in the five PAEPARD non-ULP consortia

Responses of the PAEPARD consortium stakeholders indicated that trust between European and African stakeholders progressively improved with time in the consortium. The African stakeholders described that they observed the Europeans demonstrating more interest in priorities identified by African partners, and started to link African stakeholders to other European experts.

Two reasons for these changes were offered by consortium stakeholders: first, by working together, the partners learned from each other and therefore appreciated the partnership; second, once the African stakeholders were able to demonstrate results, trust in them by the European stakeholders increased. This is described in this following excerpt: “It [trust] changed positively because as they work together they know each other and benefit from your partners.” “This level [of trust] has changed slightly over time, in the light of the results achieved by African actors.”

- Power dynamics in the ULP

Power dynamics and trust were often linked in questionnaire responses from ULP and non-ULP stakeholders. In addition, power dynamics between European and African stakeholders were described differently across the responses. In the responses from ULP coordinators and ULP stakeholders, two major arguments were used to describe the power relations between African and European knowledge and funding.

The sharing of information and knowledge was seen as an important factor driving power dynamics. ULP coordinators perceived that the European stakeholders were more willing to exchange information than the African stakeholders – especially at step two.

The coordinator of the EAF-ULP perceived European stakeholders to have more power because of a greater access to European ARD funding – even if the funding is essentially targeting developing countries, notably in Africa. This point is further elaborated and supported in the following excerpts: “Usually the European stakeholders’ opinion and way of carrying out research prevails over African stakeholders. I think this is mainly due to the fact that the Europeans are the ones in a position to support the research work.”

The FARNPAN-ULP coordinator indicated that low engagement by European stakeholders resulted in higher power among African stakeholders. This was especially the case during the first four steps of the ULP. However, once the European stakeholders became engaged in the ULP, the coordinator and stakeholders perceived that the power dynamic changed. In fact, power dynamics changed with the type of activity (e.g. proposal development) or when a new partner is involved, notably at the concept note/proposal development stage.
Knowledge creation and sharing between European and African stakeholders

Knowledge creation and sharing was assessed by examining the responses of the ULP coordinators to Q.23-24 of the questionnaire and the responses of the ULP stakeholders to Q.18 and Q.20 of the questionnaire presented in Annex 2.2.

From their responses, the African stakeholders seem to value the capacity of Europeans to publish ARD results. From the African perspective, users value more research, and researchers value users’ experience – as shown in the following excerpt: “Non-research stakeholders understood the problems from the scientific point of view (e.g. that mycotoxins such as aflatoxin are difficult to remove from contaminated food or feed) and researchers learned a lot on farmers’ priorities.”

Furthermore, the exchange of knowledge and experience has allowed researchers to gain a better understanding of users’ needs, such as the necessity for users to obtain short-term benefits, as described in the following excerpt: “Users most of the time look for the solutions to immediate challenges but may not be very much interested in the long-term sustainable solutions if the benefits are not immediate.”

Knowledge sharing was sometimes constrained by the different perspectives of research in ARD. Research and non-research actors have different perspectives and experiences in the development of research projects, as illustrated in the following excerpt: “What can be noted is the differences in the way research and development projects are formulated. Non-researchers are not used to research projects and researchers are not used to development projects. It was necessary to agree on certain ways of formulating. The two groups have mutually reinforced their skills.”

The ULP has helped change views or perceptions on user-led research. From an African perspective, users are able to lead a research agenda once it is based on their priorities and knowledge. Furthermore, in their responses, stakeholders pointed out that there is still a mismatch between the users’ (demand-led) research priorities and the funding streams. The following excerpt demonstrates the need for flexibility to respond to funding opportunities: “There is need to consider the end-users’ needs first and bend it towards donor needs.”

However, the responses show that the user-led research approach remains a long process and needs time and several initiatives to yield desired impacts. Furthermore, in their responses, stakeholders demonstrated the need for flexibility to respond to funding opportunities: “There is need to consider the end-users’ needs first and bend it towards donor needs.”

Users-led R&I partnerships, the view of the PAEPARD community

In total, 102 people responded to the online survey that was shared with the PAEPARD Dgroup. The majority of survey respondents were African (76%), followed by European (14%) and then by respondents from other regions, including Asia, and north and South America (Figure 12). A large portion of respondents were between 50 and 65 years old (Figure 13). Fifty eight per cent of respondents were researchers and 42% non-researchers; researchers who responded to the survey were mostly working in the public sector (Figure 14). The most popular words used in the responses of the English-speakers were displayed on a word cloud (Figure 15). The words ‘Africa’, ‘knowledge’ and ‘stakeholders’ were the most prominent. We note that the words ‘farmers’ and ‘researchers’ were often used to describe stakeholders involved in the user-led R&I partnerships.

Collaboration between research and non-research ARD stakeholders

A large proportion of the respondents were familiar with multi-stakeholder R&I partnerships (83%) and the concept of demand-led research (65%) and less familiar with the PAEPARD ULP (25%) (Figure 16).

When analyzing the response to the question “Who should set the demand?” a large number of user categories (12) was identified. The highest was ‘end-user’ (36%), nevertheless, Figure 17 indicates that the category ‘end-user’ was often correlated with many other categories (Table 4). The end-user is frequently associated with the farmer (Figure 17).

When analyzing the response to the question “Who should set the demand?” a large number of user categories (12) was identified. The highest was ‘end-user’ (36%), nevertheless, Figure 17 indicates that the category ‘end-user’ was often correlated with many other categories (Table 4). The end-user is frequently associated with the farmer (Figure 17).
According to the survey respondents, the engagement of non-research stakeholders stimulates the development of adequate or relevant research. Moreover, respondents acknowledged the importance and the relevance of non-research stakeholders’ knowledge and expertise in R&I partnerships (Table 5). Respondents also indicated that the engagement of non-research stakeholders improves research uptake and impact on the ground (Table 5).

Respondents recognized that the different levels of knowledge between non-research and research stakeholders were a major constraint to the engagement of non-research stakeholders (Table 6). The following excerpt demonstrates the (non-researcher) difficulty in translating the development problems into research questions: “Researchers are not practical, are often obsessed with understanding everything before moving forward.”

**Power dynamics and level of trust between research and non-research stakeholders**

Overall, more survey respondents perceived that power resides with the research stakeholders (65%). The researchers perceived the power to be in their hands (65%), whereas the same proportion of non-research stakeholders indicated the power to be more balanced, and slightly in favour of non-research stakeholders (Figure 18).

Overall, survey respondents perceive the level of trust between research and non-research stakeholders to be moderate. There is no clear difference in terms of research and non-research stakeholders’ views regarding the level of trust (Figure 19).

**Constraints and benefits to the engagement of non-research stakeholders in R&I partnerships (Q.14 Annex 2.4)**

More than half of respondents clearly recognized the benefits of sharing knowledge and experiences (Table 7). In addition, 12% of respondents indicated that African and European ARD and ARI partnerships can improve research progress in ARD, as well as generate new technologies and products (such as long-life process of soya milk or aflatoxin detection in food) and products (such as Trichoderma-based bio-fertilizers and bio-protection for vegetable crops) (Table 7).

Several constraints to the development of R&I partnerships were identified among the responses, with funding being the most frequently mentioned. In addition, the differences in terms of agenda or objectives were seen as important constraints to African/European ARD or ARI partnerships. In the category ‘other constraints’ (Table 8), respondents perceived that African-European ARD or ARI partnerships were slow processes. Respondents also think that the research agenda is often donor-driven and consider this a constraint to African-European ARD or ARI partnerships. Respondents also mentioned the lack of awareness and monitoring among them for this type of partnership.

**Sharing, developing, and integrating information and knowledge from and via PAEPARD Dgroup**

Responses to the questionnaire show that the PAEPARD community recognizes the importance of the information shared on the Dgroup platform. A large proportion (65%) of the respondents indicated that they have developed new skills and knowledge from this platform, and have often integrated this information into their work. However, despite this positive response, 53% of respondents suggested that they are not sharing as much information with the Dgroup (Figure 20).

---

**Table 5: Benefits of non-research stakeholder engagement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Relative Number of Respondents N=61 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of adequate and relevant research</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-research stakeholders knowledge/expertise</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing and exchanging of knowledge and expertise</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better research uptake</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced development impact</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to the development of different research approaches (bottom-up, holistic)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6: Constraints to the engagement of non-research stakeholders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraints</th>
<th>Relative Number of Respondents N=60 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differences in knowledge and approach to develop research</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of or inadequate financing or resources</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different timeframe (shorter) to develop research</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity of governance and management of the relationships/partnership</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time consuming (meetings, discussions)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication between various stakeholders (language or culture barriers)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low level of participation/motivation by non-research stakeholders</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-research/research stakeholders have different interests/priorities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7: Benefits of African-European ARD or ARI partnerships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Relative Number of Respondents N=50 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The exchange of knowledge and experience between actors</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve research progress in agricultural research for development</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of new technology and products</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to form multi-stakeholder partnerships</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance development impact</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little benefit</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other benefits</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8: Constraints to African-European ARD or ARI partnerships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraints</th>
<th>Relative Number of Respondents N=96 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of or inadequate access to funding</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different research agenda/objective between African and European stakeholders</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity of governance and management of the relationships/partnership</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication: language and cultural differences</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research agenda is driven by European stakeholders</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unbalanced level of knowledge and experience</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low engagement of European actors</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other constraints</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6: Benefits of non-research stakeholder engagement**

**Table 7: Benefits of African-European ARD or ARI partnerships**

**Figure 18: Overall, researchers’ and non-researchers’ perception of the power dynamics between research and non-research stakeholders in R&I partnerships (n=63).**

**Figure 19: Overall, researchers’ and non-researchers’ perception of the level of trust between research and non-research stakeholders in R&I partnerships (n=63).**

**Figure 20: Sharing, developing, and integrating information and knowledge from and via PAEPARD Dgroup (n=66).**
In 2011, PAEPARD launched the ULP to better articulate users’ needs in a multi-stakeholder RRI partnership. In this study, the evolution of the five organizations that implemented this process was reviewed and their activities were presented on a timeline. This timeline highlighted that the six-step ULP is long and can take 2 to 5 years to complete. From step four (the MSHRQ workshop), the time taken for project implementation and success varied depending on the organization. Among the five organizations, the FO (ROPRA) stopped its activities after the MSHRQ workshop, two other organizations (COLEACP and PROPOC) have reached the concept note or proposal development stage, and the final two (FANRPAN and EAFF) went further than the last step of the cycle and implemented funded projects. In parallel, the four regional FO used the ULP to initiate, strengthen and sustain the dynamics of a regional dialogue between farmers’ and research organizations.

The barriers that slow down or constrain the implementation of the ULP were identified at the different steps. For example, the definition of the research questions was not always accomplished during the MSHRQ workshop (step four) and the federating theme needed to be further refined, which often required the core group to be re-formed. Furthermore, the participation of core group members was voluntary and, consequently, participation was often irregular. Concept notes were developed (step five) by all consortia but, in many cases, no funding was available at the time to support the research. Further, when funding was available, it was not always accessible to non-research actors involved in the consortia. Full proposals were developed (step six) in most of the cases, however a significant number have been rejected, leading to frustration and the subsequent dissolution of some consortia.

The organizations that received funding and have implemented funded projects – i.e. EAFF and FANRPAN – developed a flexible and opportunistic approach during the process. In fact, the literature review showed that they often needed to adjust their federating theme or work on a different priority. This is in keeping with a regular criticism or perceived norm that donor-funding often drives the research agenda. Furthermore, the social network analyses indicated that these organizations had to collaborate with (EU) stakeholders that were not engaged in the previous steps of the ULP. As a result, the consortia had to be re-structured toward the end of the process to respond to the criteria of the funding agencies. In total, the ULP led to the development of about 19 partnerships. These consortia produced about 14 proposals which resulted in five funded projects (two were user-led). However, these results may be underestimated as some organizations may have failed to document and report some of their activities within the PAEPARD ULP.

Although the number of proposals/funded projects is often used as one of the main indicators of success, other achievements were highlighted in this study. Multi-stakeholder dialogues on the priorities identified by end-users (i.e. the federating theme) has led to a better integration of development issues into research priorities and to the empowerment of regional FO. Furthermore, it has built and/or strengthened ARD exchanges between farmers, researchers and policy-makers. The ULP has enhanced capacity, trust and commitment of both non-researchers and researchers (African/EU) in addressing users’ priorities. The ULP has helped to develop and strengthen users’ skills, especially in understanding and conforming to the requirements of different funding mechanisms and developing research proposals. This was notably reinforced by the writing workshops organized by PAEPARD and aimed at increasing preparedness before a funding opportunity or a call for proposals [15]. In some cases, collaboration with European stakeholders has been strengthened. Nevertheless, the overall EU-African collaboration was constrained by the limited engagement of European actors in the ULP.

In this study, it was observed that the engagement of European stakeholders was low (14%), and those who participated were mainly from North and Western Europe and participated relatively late in the ULP. Although European stakeholders expressed their interest and motivation to exchange experiences and knowledge with users, their engagement in the ULP was constrained by several factors. For example, the length of the ULP is seen as a key constraint by European stakeholders. As described through the social network analyses, European stakeholders are committing more towards the end of the process (step six) when consortia are targeting ARD funding windows. Similarly, one could observe from the two calls launched by PAEPARD in 2010/2011 that European research scientists were reluctant to engage in an MSHRQ because the two calls were not linked to a specific funding opportunity from a donor [16]. Core funding was identified as another major constraint, especially for European researchers with little or no core funding to engage in the ULP. This was observed by African stakeholders and expressed by European stakeholders at different stages of the ULP. The combination of both factors i.e. the long time span for engaging in multi-stakeholder collaboration and no adequate budget to support the process were the main limiting factors to the engagement of EU stakeholders identified in this study.

Power dynamics between European and African stakeholders during the implementation of the ULP was linked to knowledge and funding access. This study showed that at the beginning of the process, power was more on the side of the African stakeholders, but that the power sometimes shifted to the European partners toward the end of the process as they are better positioned to access EU funds. Trust between European and African actors was built over the course of the process, and the level of trust seemed to increase with increased European stakeholder engagement. In addition, African stakeholders involved in the consortia from the two calls launched by PAEPARD in 2010/2011 observed that trust between themselves and European stakeholders increased once they had demonstrated significant results, notably via the implementation of the CRF obtained via the PAEPARD project.

The PAEPARD-supported bottom-up ULP has provided resources, time and opportunities for European and African stakeholders – including research and non-research actors – to understand each other’s capacity, knowledge, motivation and constraints. As a result, non-research actors value the research and become pro-active and engaged with the federating theme. Some European scientists have gained further understanding of users’ needs. Nevertheless, knowledge co-creation between research and non-researchers remains constrained due to different perspectives on the role of research in the innovation process. For instance, during the MSHRQ workshops (step four), the non-research and research actors faced challenges related to articulating users’ needs, developing applicable research questions together. This challenge was reinforced as a major constraint in the responses of the ARD stakeholders of the PAEPARD Dgroup community. Finally, African and European stakeholders continue to view the user-led research approach as a long-winded process that requires time, adequate resources (financial and technical) and interventions, including facilitation [26], to achieve the desired development impacts.
The EU-funded CDAIS project, which is being implemented in the framework of the Tropical Agricultural Platform, may provide additional lessons for capacity development [3].

**Capacity strengthening** of non-research actors in R&I partnerships is an important achievement of the ULP. As the emphasis on R&I is progressively placed on the learning processes at the individual, group or institutional level [17], there is a need to understand to what extent knowledge and skills developed throughout the ULP have been integrated at institutional level. Furthermore, standardizing the approach to learning should be considered as it would bring transparency to mobilizing funding to develop the skills of non-research actors, and build collaborations among diverse stakeholders; thereby increasing users’ access to R&I grants. The EU-funded COAIS project, which is being implemented in the framework of the Tropical Agricultural Platform, may provide additional lessons for capacity development [3].

Social capital has been enhanced through an increase in trust between European and African stakeholders, mainly toward the end of the process, therefore the impacts may only be visible beyond the project period.

Although increasing importance is placed on the networks, procedures and human relationships in understanding agricultural innovation, there is still a lack of understanding regarding the influence of social capital in this field [19]. Integrating social network analysis into some of these agricultural R&I projects can be a valuable tool for users to reflect on their networks, and to identify gaps and opportunities to extend their network with other European/African and/or research/non-research stakeholders. This assessment has helped determine how the networking has evolved among the five ULP-consortia, however, it has been carried out in hindsight and if it had been monitored more closely over the years, could have yielded valuable lessons on what worked well and why.

Funding was recognized as a major constraint to European-African R&I collaboration by the ULP stakeholders and the PAEPARD stakeholders and the PAEPARD consortium. Furthermore, the lack of funding for agricultural innovation targeting the engagement of non-researcher or smallholder farmers is common [20], and limits users’ ability to access funds to support their engagement in research that can have greater impact.

Donor agencies tend to limit themselves to funding MSHP, often through competitive procedures and it was recently pointed out by the EC that more could be done in terms of coordination between their instruments to maximize the effectiveness of their interventions [18]. With the flexible IF instrument, PAEPARD has supported consortia activities to develop concept notes (inception workshops, write-shops, exchange visits and studies).

The importance of this instrument, particularly in supporting the engagement of European stakeholders in African-Europe ARD partnerships, should be studied. Diversified funding sources and instruments are needed to ensure the creation and sustainability of European-African MSHP that support R&I, which respond to addressing development priorities and results in greater development impact.

Core funding is needed if European and African researchers are to engage in North-South multi-stakeholder R&I partnerships that respond to users’ needs, and contribute to faster uptake of research results.

EFARD should lobby for core funding to be made available to support the European ARD community so that their contribution to achieving the sustainable development goals can be enhanced.

At the same time, they should support ARD stakeholders from the South to advocate for more funding from their national systems for R&I that will deliver greater development impacts.
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Questionnaire sent to the PAEPARD ULP coordinators

**Annex 2.1**

**Theme:** Appraising the participation of European partners in the PAEPARD Users-Led Process

**Introduction Questions**
- Q.1: I am: African; European; Other.

**Federating Theme Establishment**
- Q.2: How is the federating theme?
- Q.3: Who is federated as user(s) in this Users-Led Process (ULP)?
- Q.4: Was the federating theme a problem, challenge or opportunity to the users?
- Q.5: Which type of stakeholder(s) were consulted?
- Q.6: Have all types of stakeholders’ responses been taken in to account for the identification of the federating theme?
- Q.7: Has the federating theme changed over the time? If so, what are the main reason(s) for this change?
- Q.8: Did the users agree with the federating theme?
- Q.9: Could you describe how and when was/were the European/African stakeholders identified in this ULP?
- Q.10: How has the ULP process helped in identifying new European stakeholders?
- Q.11: In your opinion, what were the motivations/interests of European/African partners to be engaged in this ULP?
- Q.12: What was the key constraint(s) to their engagement?

**Collaboration between European and African Stakeholders**
- Q.13: How would you describe the power dynamics between European and African stakeholders in the ULPs you have been involved in? Has this level changed over the time? Why?
- Q.14: How would you rate the power dynamics between African and European stakeholders?
- Q.15: How would you rate the power dynamics between research and non-research stakeholders?
- Q.16: How would you describe the power dynamics between African and European stakeholders in the ULPs you have been involved in? Has this level changed over the time? Why?
- Q.17: How would you rate the power dynamics between research and non-research stakeholders?
- Q.18: What is your perception(s) regarding the level of trust between European and African stakeholders in the ULPs you have been involved? Has this level changed over the time? Why?
- Q.19: How would you describe the level of trust between European and African stakeholders?
- Q.20: In your opinion, how did the communication between European and African stakeholders in the ULP(s) you have been involved? What were the bottlenecks?
- Q.21: Were there any unexpected “benefits” (Intended/Intended/Unintended) that you had not identified at the beginning? To collaborate with European (if you are African) or African (if you are European) stakeholders?
- Q.22: What was the key constraint(s) to the collaboration of European partners? As you see it, what were the reasons for this (these constraints)?

**Role in Terms of Knowledge Building and Sharing**
- Q.23: In your opinion, did African/European stakeholders play the same role in terms of integrating and sharing information into the process of generating new knowledge?
- Q.24: In your opinion, did African/European stakeholders participate in identifying research/innovation gaps? Please specify at which step of this ULP this step?
- Q.25: Did European/African stakeholders develop new capacities or knowledge by working with other partners in the research and/or research team?
- Q.26: Did you develop new skills/capacities or new knowledge if so, please describe in your answer.
- Q.27: In your opinion, has this experience changed African/European views or perception of research and/or research team?
- Q.28: In your opinion, has this experience changed African/European views or perception of research and/or research team?
- Q.29: Have access to funding for research involving non-researchers improved? Please, give an example(s) to support your response.
- Q.30: What did you learn from managing a ULP?
- Q.31: In your opinion, what are the main successes of the ULPs you have been involved?

Questionnaire sent to the PAEPARD ULP stakeholders

**Annex 2.2**

**Theme:** Appraising the participation of European partners in the PAEPARD Users-Led Process

**Introduction Questions**
- Q.1: I am: African; European; Other.

**Awareness and Interest for the PAEPARD Project**
- Q.2: Are you familiar with the PAEPARD Users-Led Process (ULP)?
- Q.3: Are you familiar with the different ULP steps?
- Q.4: In which of the 5 ULPs have you been involved?
- Q.5: What is/are your main contribution to this/these ULP? Please specify e.g. the name of the concept note, proposal and/or project you were involved in one of these steps.
- Q.6: What was/were your motivations/interests to be engaged in the ULPs? If you have been involved?
- Q.7: In which of the ULP steps have you been involved?
- Q.8: How would you describe the power dynamics between European and African stakeholders in the ULPs you have been involved? Has this level changed over the time? Why?
- Q.9: How would you rate the power dynamics between African and European stakeholders?
- Q.10: How would you rate the power dynamics between research and non-research stakeholders?
- Q.11: How would you describe the level of trust between European and African stakeholders in the ULPs you have been involved? Has this level changed over the time? Why?
- Q.12: How would you rate the level of trust between European and African stakeholders?
- Q.13: How would you rate the power dynamics between research and non-research stakeholders?
- Q.14: What is your perception(s) regarding the level of trust between European and African stakeholders in the ULPs you have been involved? Has this level changed over the time? Why?
- Q.15: What is your perception(s) regarding the level of trust between European and African stakeholders in the ULPs you have been involved? Has this level changed over the time? Why?
- Q.16: How would you describe the level of trust between European and African stakeholders in the ULP(s) you have been involved? Has this level changed over the time? Why?
- Q.17: Who were there any unexpected “benefits” (Intended/Intended/Unintended) that you had not identified at the beginning? To collaborate with European (if you are African) or African (if you are European) stakeholders?

**Role in Terms of Knowledge Building and Sharing**
- Q.18: What was your role in terms of integrating and sharing information in the process of generating new knowledge? Please give a specific example(s) to describe your response.
- Q.19: What did you do in terms of identifying research/innovation gaps? Please specify at which step of the ULP and (a) specific example(s) to describe your response.
- Q.20: What was/were the benefits for you or your organization to share information/knowledge?
- Q.21: Did European/African stakeholders developed new capacities or knowledge by working with other partner in the research and/or research team?
- Q.22: Did you develop new skills/capacities or new knowledge if so, please describe in your answer.
- Q.23: In your opinion, how did the communication between European and African stakeholders in the ULP(s) you have been involved? What were the bottlenecks?
- Q.24: In your opinion, did the communication between European and African stakeholders in the ULP(s) you have been involved? What were the bottlenecks?
- Q.25: In your opinion, what is the main success of the ULPs you have been involved?
- Q.26: Did you share this success? Why?
- Q.27: In your opinion, what is the main success(es) of PAEPARD?
### Annex 2.3

**Questionnaire sent to the PAEPARD non-ULP stakeholders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTRODUCTORY QUESTIONS</strong></td>
<td>I am an African, European</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AWARENESS AND (NON) INTEREST FOR THE PAEPARD PROJECT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EUROPEAN AND AFRICAN STAKEHOLDERS’ ENGAGEMENT AND COMMITMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLLABORATION BETWEEN EUROCEN AND AFRICAN STAKEHOLDERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROLE IN TERMS OF KNOWLEDGE ACQUISITION AND SHARING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEARNING PROCESS CAPACITY FOR REFLECTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annex 2.4

**Questionnaire of the PAEPARD Dgroup survey**

|-------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
Additional results from the PAEPARD Dgroup survey

**Respondents’ awareness and interest for the PAEPARD project**

On a scale of 1-5, the survey respondents estimated to be moderately familiar with the PAEPARD project (Average = 2.9). However, 77% of the respondents indicated to not being familiar with any of the PAEPARD funded research projects. The same proportion of the respondents declared not been involved in any joint research project (77%).

Regarding their awareness of the PAEPARD funding mechanisms, 34% of the respondents are familiar with the Competitive Research Fund (CRF) and 15% with the Incentive Fund (IF).

When asked to describe their motivation(s) and/or interest(s) to follow or collaborate with PAEPARD, participant’s responses can be grouped into four categories. Obtaining information and knowledge was the primary motivation/interest. Under this category, getting information was the most important – notably information related to funding opportunities. Connecting and engaging with stakeholders was the second most important interest/motivation, which includes networking (18%) and collaborating (11%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTIVATION/INTEREST</th>
<th>PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS N= 105 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring information &amp; knowledge</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting &amp; engaging with stakeholders</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in PAEPARD Projects/activities/Objectives/outcomes</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchanging information &amp; knowledge/skills</td>
<td>experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Respondents’ opinion on the main success(es) of PAEPARD**

Communicating information and knowledge as well as connecting and engaging stakeholders were recognized as PAEPARD main successes. The Dgroup respondents also valued the platform as a place for knowledge and experience exchange.

**Survey respondents’ knowledge of the PAEPARD project on a scale of 1 to 5.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF RESPONSE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N= 62 (% )</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List of acronyms

- **ADG**: Aide au Développement Gembloux
- **AIF**: Agricultural Innovation Facilitators
- **AR4D**: Agricultural Research for Development
- **ARI**: Agricultural Research and Innovation
- **CIRAD**: French Center for International Cooperation in Agricultural Research
- **COLEACP**: Comité de Liaison Europe-Afrique-Caraïbes-Pacifique pour la promotion des exportations de fruits et légumes (Europe-Africa-Caribbean-Pacific liaison committee for the promotion of fruit and vegetables exports)
- **CRF**: Competitive Research Fund
- **CTA**: Centre Technique de coopération Agricole et rurale
- **EAAF**: East Africa Farmers Federation
- **EFARD**: European Commission
- **EFARD**: European Forum on Agricultural Research for Development
- **EU**: European Union
- **FARA**: Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa
- **FIRCA**: Interprofessional fund for agricultural research and development (Fonds Interprofessionnel pour la Recherche et le Conseil Agricoles)
- **GFAR**: Global Forum on Agricultural Research
- **ICRA**: International Centre for development oriented Research in Agriculture
- **IF**: Incentive Fund
- **IRD**: L’Institut national de recherche agricole pour le développement (Institute of Agricultural Research for Development)
- **MSHP**: Multi-Stakeholder Partnership
- **MSHQ**: Multi-Stakeholder Research Question
- **NASFAM**: National Smallholder Farmers’ Association of Malawi
- **NGO**: Non-government organization
- **NRI**: Natural Resources Institute (UK)
- **PAEPARD**: Platform for African European Partnership on Agricultural Research for Development
- **PAFO**: Pan-African Federation of Farmer’s organizations
- **PROPAC**: Plateforme Sous-Régionale des Organisations Paysannes d’Afrique Centrale (Sub-regional Platform of Farmers’ Organizations in Central Africa)
- **R&I**: Research and Innovation
- **ROPPA**: Network of farmers’ and agricultural producers’ organisations of West Africa (Réseau des Organisations paysannes et de producteurs de l’Afrique de l’Ouest)
- **ULP**: Users-Led Process
- **WUR**: Wageningen University and Research Center (NL)
The Platform for Africa-Europe Partnership in Agricultural Research for Development (PAEPARD) is a 8-year project sponsored by the European Commission (80%) and partners’ own contribution (20%). It is coordinated by the Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa (FARA) since December 2009, and extended until end of 2017. It aims at building joint African-European multi-stakeholder partnerships in agricultural research for development (ARD) contributing to achieving the Millennium Development Goals. On the European side, the partners are AGRINATURA (The European Alliance on Agriculture Knowledge for Development, coordinating the European partners), COLEACP (representing the private sector), CSA (representing the NGOs), ICRA, specialized in capacity building in ARD, and the Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation (CTA). On the African side and in addition to FARA, the partners are the Pan-African Farmers Organization (PAFO), the Regional Universities Forum for Capacity Building in Agriculture (RUFORUM) based in Kampala, and the Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Analysis Network (FANRPAN) based in Pretoria. PAFO involves its members that are the Eastern Africa Farmers Federation (EAFF) based in Nairobi, the Réseaux des Organisations Paysannes et des Producteurs d’Afrique de l’Ouest (ROPPA) based in Ouagadougou, and the Plate-forme Régionale des Organisations Paysannes d’Afrique Centrale (PROPAC) based in Yaoundé. The Southern African Confederation of Agricultural Unions (SACAU) is an associate partner of PAEPARD.

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