



**Report
of the**

2017 Annual Technical and Business Meeting

Theme:

***Future of European Agricultural Research and Innovation
Partnerships***

**Venue: CDMA, DG Research and Innovation, Room -1/044,
21 rue du champ de Mars, 1050 Ixelles, Brussels**

11 December 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ACRONYMS	3
INTRODUCTION	4
Background.....	4
Objectives.....	5
Expected Outcomes	5
Participants	6
KEY MESSAGES	7
Technical meeting	7
Business Meeting	8
TECHNICAL MEETING	9
Welcome Remarks and Vision for EFARD.....	9
Opening Remarks - EC Support for Research and Innovation and Perspectives on EFARD's Role'	9
Tracking the Evolution of the PAEPARD Users'-Led Process: Lessons Learned	14
Seed Money as a Catalyst for Innovation Partnerships: the PAEPARD Soybean Consortium	16
EU-Africa Knowledge Exchange & EU Researcher Experience in Multi-Stakeholder Research and Innovation Partnerships	18
PAEPARD External Evaluation: Lessons for EFARD	20
Fostering Processes of Participation between Family Farming Organisations and Research Institutes: GFAR Collective Action	22
TAP and CDAIS Project Mid-Term Review – Strengthening Agricultural Innovation Systems in Developing Countries.....	23
World Café	25
BUSINESS MEETING	26
Presentation – EFARD Management Report 2016-2017 & Draft EFARD 2018-2020 Governance and Strategy	26
Working Groups Session – Charting the future of EFARD: Role, Governance Mechanism, Priorities and Strategies to respond to EC and Development Priorities	27

List of Acronyms

ADG: Aide au Développement Gembloux

AFAAS : African Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services

AR4D: Agricultural Research for Development

ARF: Applied Research Fund

AU : Africa Union

CABI : Centre for Agriculture and Biosciences International

CD: Capacity development

CDAIS: Capacity Development for Agricultural Innovation Systems

CIRAD: French Center for International Cooperation in Agricultural Research for Development

COLEACP: Europe-Africa Caribbean-Pacific liaison committee for the promotion of fruit and vegetables exports

CRF: Competitive Research Fund

CSO : Civil Society Organisation

CULS: Czech University of Life Sciences Prague

DEVCO: The European Commission Directorate General for Development and Cooperation

CTA: Centre Technique de coopération Agricole et rurale (Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation)

EAFF: East Africa Farmers Federation

EC: European Commission

EFARD: European Forum on Agricultural Research for Development

EU: European Union

EU-DCI : European Union - Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI)

FANRPAN: Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Analysis Network

FARA: Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa

FNSSA: Food and Nutrition Security and Sustainable Agriculture

GFAR: Global Forum on Agricultural Research

ICRA: International Centre for development oriented Research in Agriculture

IF: Incentive Fund

IITA : The International Institute of Tropical Agriculture

MSHP: Multi-Stakeholder Partnership

MSHRQ: Multi-Stakeholder Research Question

NGO: Non-government organization

NRI: Natural Resources Institute (UK)

PAEPARD: Platform for African European Partnership on Agricultural Research for Development

PROPAC: 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

SCAR-ARCH: Standing Committee on Agricultural Research – Agricultural Research towards greater impact on Global Challenges

SROs: Sub-regional organizations

TAP: Tropical Agriculture Platform

ULP: Users-Led Process

WUR: Wageningen University and Research Center (NL)

Introduction

Background

The European Forum on Agricultural Research for Development is a multi-actor platform which provides opportunity for dialogue on issues of strategic importance for European agricultural research and non-research actors. Each year, platform members meet to present and review their achievements of the previous year and develop strategies for possible (re)alignment of EFARD's priorities with those of key partners such as the European Commission (EC), the Global Forum for Agricultural Research (GFAR) and partners in the South. The future of agricultural research and innovation partnerships for greater development impact and increasing the engagement of European stakeholders was the focus of this year's meeting.

The European Commission Directorate General for Development and Cooperation (DEVCO) recognises and supports multi-stakeholder agricultural research and innovation partnerships as a crucial instrument for building effective Agricultural Innovation Systems. The EC has supported the implementation of such partnerships via the EU DCI, the European Development Fund and EU FP7, and more recently through the EU Horizon 2020 funding mechanisms. To some degree, individual EU Member states are also contributing - directly or indirectly - to fostering multi-stakeholder research and innovation platforms for greater development impacts as is the case of the ARF funding in the Netherlands.

Collectively, the European Union is the biggest international funder of agricultural research for development (AR4D) and a major source of expertise. A key pillar of the DEVCO strategy 2014-2020 on research and innovation focuses on "improving European leadership, coordination and influence". To achieve this objective, the EC and European Member States have to create opportunities for greater involvement of European researchers and research stakeholders in AR4D, and EFARD has a role to play in supporting this process.

Currently, a number of EU-supported innovative multi-stakeholder agricultural research and innovation partnerships, for example, the EIP-Agri, PAEPARD and CDAIS projects in which EFARD members have been well-represented, are at an advanced stage of implementation or almost in the completion phase. The EFARD 2016-2017 study on "Appraising the participation of European partners in the PAEPARD Users-Led Process", revealed low participation of EU researchers. A combination of factors, the long time required for engaging in innovation partnerships involving non-research actors and little or no core funding, constrain the participation of EU research and private actors in important consortium activities.

Capacity built during the innovation process is also advanced as a catalyst for achieving impact. Hainzelin et al. (2017) demonstrated that the impacts of AR4D are very diverse and are realized over a long period of time, creating challenges for both research organisations and funders to measure development impacts. Furthermore, achieving impacts in the long-term contrasts with the increasing demand of donors to demonstrate impact in the short-term.

A light evaluation of the Africa-EU Research and Innovation partnership on Food and Nutrition Security and Sustainable Agriculture (FNSSA) in the context of the EU-Africa High Level Policy

Dialogue, provides some additional insight, particularly in terms of capacity building, research uptake and dissemination. For example, while individual capacities of researchers and other actors have been indirectly built through their involvement in collaborative EU-supported actions, inadequate or lack of funding is a main constraint to enhance or sustain the capacity developed post project.

This year, the EFARD annual meeting sought to explore lessons learned including those from the mid-term review of CDAIS, the final evaluation of PAEPARD and from EFARD members to advise on the way forward for strengthening the engagement, enhancing the contribution and achieving longer-term commitment of EU stakeholders and advocate for multi-stakeholder agricultural research and innovation partnerships for achieving greater development impact. The latest PAEPARD publication on lessons learned on AR4D funding was also presented and released.

Upstream, EFARD formally installed its new management team 2017-2019. Preliminary results of a survey showed that members continue to appreciate EFARD's vision and mission. Nevertheless, members pointed out the challenges EFARD faces to realise its various objectives considering its limited resources. EFARD's future governance, including the different options for hosting the EFARD Secretariat, as well as its relationship with the EC were discussed in-depth during this year's meeting.

Objectives

- Deliberate on how to support and finance the engagement, contribution and long-term commitment of EU researchers in North-South and multi-stakeholder agricultural research and innovation partnerships in an era of dwindling financial resources.
- Deliberate on EFARD's future relevance and 2018-2020 governance.

Expected Outcomes

- EC (funding) mechanisms to support EU stakeholders in multi-stakeholder agricultural research and innovation partnerships are acknowledged.
- Critical challenges for various EU stakeholders as well as best practices to access and manage ARD funding for multi-stakeholder agricultural research and innovation partnerships are identified and suggestions on way forward are advanced.
- EU stakeholders' experiences regarding research uptake and development impact are captured.
- Consensus achieved on the new EFARD governance document and work programme for 2018 – 2020.

Participants

Last name	First name	Organization	Country
Anthofer	Juergen	GIZ	Germany
Aparicio	Roberto	DEVCO	Belgium
Babah Daouda	Falylath	Marketing and Consumer Behavior group / Wageningen University	The Netherlands
Francis	Judith Ann	CTA	The Netherlands
Hansen	Anja	University of Copenhagen	Denmark
Helmer	Thierry	Agrinatura/CIRAD	France
Kahane	Remi	CIRAD - Agrinatura	France
Larose	Christophe	DG-DEVCO	Belgium
Ollivier	Laurianne	EFARD/CTA	The Netherlands
Sers	Jean-Michel	CIRAD	France
Sewade	Patrice	SOJAGNON-NGO	Benin
Barrial	Stéphanie	World Rural Forum	Spain
Stepman	Francois	PAEPARD	Belgium
Van Damme	Patrick	Ghent University	Belgium
van der Mheen	Jennie	Wageningen University & Research	The Netherlands
Wyss	Rahel	YPARD / BFH HAFL	Switzerland

Apologies:

- Tim Chancellor – NRI
- Richard Hawkins – ICRA
- Michael Hauser - BUKU
- Hariet Hinz – CABI
- Marc Holderness – GFAR
- Anna Kroutilova – Agrinatura
- Bader Mahaman – Action Contre la Faim
- Phillippe Petithuguenin – CIRAD
- George Rothschild – UK-FARD
- Murat Sartas - IITA
- Joël Sor – Agrinatura/Cirad
- Vladimir Verner – CULS
- Morag Webb - COLEACP

Key Messages

Technical meeting

- DEVCO has taken a keen interest in innovation and will focus on two major questions: how to boost innovation for food and nutrition security and sustainable agriculture, and food systems and how to bring more science into DEVCO programmes in these sectors.

Lessons learned

- System transformation and partnership building takes generally 10-15 years and cannot be reached in a 3-year project.
- The PAEPARD ULP is a long process but allows for the development of the social capital and capacity strengthening of non-research actors, which is essential for sustaining their engagement in research beyond a project's life cycle.
- More thought should be given to how research outcomes are being used by policy-makers and other stakeholders such as private sector and development practitioners.
- Seed money plays a central role in the establishment of MSH partnerships. It helps partners to gain trust and develop capacity in managing MSH partnerships.
- Sandwich PhD students can be key contacts in building multi-stakeholder research and innovation partnerships. They facilitate a knowledge flow from Africa back to Europe and vice versa. They make EU researchers part of important change processes in developing and emerging markets and connect them with other local stakeholders.

Challenges

- Knowledge co-creation requires a lot of time, notably in developing and maintaining shared interests and project strategies.
- Key challenges such as how to make use of strengths and overcome possible weaknesses of leadership by local organisations and how to share rewards of joint learning hamper the process of knowledge co-creation.
- Farmer organisations can define their own research priorities but there is a mismatch between users' research priorities and funding streams. Furthermore, farmer organisations often do not have the resources to support the full costs of the participation of the (EU) researchers (PAEPARD experience).

Business Meeting

EC recommendations for EFARD

- DEVCO is supportive of EFARD, EIARD and SCAR-ARCH and expects that each platform has a key mandate and plays a key role.
- DEVCO encourages EFARD to work around the following three questions:
How to contribute to innovation by embedding more science in local programmes?
How to support more efficient agricultural research at continental and global level?
How to provide more evidence on impact as a basis for policy dialogue?
- EFARD could focus on specific issues such as impact of development research and innovation investments. DEVCO encourages EFARD to select specific events where EFARD's key messages can be presented.

EFARD should capitalize and showcase its reach and impacts

- EFARD has played a key role in the initiation of some programmes such as PAEPARD and the Tropical Agriculture Platform. EFARD must showcase its reach and impacts with the right balance between communicating on outputs, outcomes, impact and on processes.

Suggested topics that EFARD can address in the coming year (2018-2020)

- EFARD could identify the challenges and the benefits of the AR4D collaboration with the private sector. EFARD could provide more insight on the incentives for private sector to engage with research, the benefits, challenges and best practices for strengthening collaboration between research and the private sector.
- EFARD could address the issue related to mobilising core funding for research. European Union (EU) researchers with no institutional core funding are constrained to engage in (an early stage of) a Multi-Stakeholder Research and Innovation Partnership.
- EFARD is advised to continue advocating, drawing lessons learned from programmes and projects, which provide a basis for discussion among European actors.

Strengthening EFARD management and structure

- EFARD needs to find more effective ways to strengthen engagement, facilitate active participation, and foster clear division and complementarity of roles of its members. EFARD needs more resources to reach its objectives. EFARD members are invited to send their ideas/options for mobilising funding for EFARD actions/activities.

Technical Meeting

Overview of Presentations and Summary of Discussions

Welcome Remarks and Vision for EFARD

Patrick Van Damme, Chair, EFARD, Belgium.

This year, EFARD MT put together a short programme which focuses on Future of European Agricultural Research and Innovation Partnerships. In 2017, EFARD participated in several GFAR partners' meetings. Each of the GFAR partners brought their own concrete issues and together defined Key Focus Area for GFAR's Collective Actions. EFARD's mandate is more complex and does not focus on concrete questions in AR4D. EFARD does not necessarily represent EU agricultural research alone but has tended to focus on its collaborative work in the South. Hence EFARD differs from the other continental fora. EFARD could broaden its actions and focus on concrete (European agriculture-linked) subjects but this will need to be discussed among and endorsed by members. EFARD tried to open up the constituency to Eastern Europe but dealing with expectations of diverse stakeholders remains a challenge.

Roll Call

Judith Francis (EFARD Executive Secretary) introduced the new EFARD management team (MT) (2017-2019) and thanked Jennie van der Mheen who had agreed to serve as Vice Chair. She thanked former MT members with special reference to Dr Ann Waters-Bayer who had served a full term and stepped down as vice-chair. She officially welcomed new EFARD members :

- CABI represented by Dr. Harriet Hinz, Country Director at CABI, and*
- Rhine-Waal University of Applied Sciences (HSRW) represented by Prof. Dietrich Darr, professor of agribusiness*

Jürgen Anthofer informed that he has been appointed as Executive Secretary of the European Initiative for Agricultural Research for Development (EIARD) since April 2017.

Opening Remarks - EC Support for Research and Innovation and Perspectives on EFARD's Role'

Christophe Larose, Head of Sector: Sustainable Agriculture, DEVCO C1 – Rural Development, Food Security and Nutrition, Belgium.

Summary

The European Commission Directorate General for Development and Cooperation (DEVCO) has taken a keen interest in innovation. Christophe Larose introduced the key principles of DEVCO, namely that they play a small role in research per se but would like to bring more Agricultural Research for Development in their development-oriented programmes, e.g. for generating innovations such as bringing users' perspectives, or encourage multi-stakeholders to discuss and jointly foster and implement innovations. These principles are already embedded in many programmes such as PAEPARD and CDAIS.

The EU 2014-2020 Food and Nutrition Security and Sustainable Agriculture (FNS-SA) portfolio is about 8 billion € for 60 countries, which represents 1/3 of the total budget including EU member states for agricultural development in these countries. DEVCO will further develop and refine its engagement, and will position itself more prominently, especially on how to mobilize science and research to accompany this investment in support of its programmes.

By the end of 2017, 200 million € of open project contracts were available of which 50% was to support actions in Africa and African institutions such as FARA, AU, AFAAS, SROs. The contribution to the CGIAR represented 30% of which 80-85% is dedicated to Africa. DEVCO also supports programmes of network organisations such as GFAR and CDAIS. Christophe Larose emphasized the significant part committed to Africa in the portfolio of DEVCO.

In the coming years, DEVCO will focus on 2 key issues:

- how to boost innovation for FNS-SA and food systems, especially considering climate change challenges, and
- how to bring more science into EU (incl. EU MS) FNS-SA programmes.

In parallel, DEVCO wants to address a number of challenges including:

- the notion of impact (how can science help measuring impact);
- the notion of scaling-up of innovations, especially its implementation to 'the last mile' – what does this mean in practice? and
- relevant approaches to support local capacities with a long term perspective.

DEVCO has embarked on a process which intends to pool human and financial capacities of EU member states, and other actors (e.g DeSIRA initiative). Attention given to country-based approach where EU experts or institutions would partner with local entities in support to EU and/or EU MS programmes will be significant. DEVCO is finalizing a three-year programme (DeSIRA) and is trying to mobilize additional funds.

DEVCO encourages EFARD to work around the following three questions:

- How to contribute to innovation by bringing more science to local programmes?
- How to support more efficient agricultural research at continental and global level (e.g GFAR, CGIAR)?
- How to bring more evidence as the basis for policy dialogue?

Depending on its capacity and resources, EFARD could focus on specific issues (e.g impact assessment). Christophe Larose indicated that DEVCO does have financial resources but restricted human resources. EFARD is also encouraged to share key messages with DEVCO, which can then be presented/discussed during specific events, for instance during the 1st FAO International Symposium on Innovation for Smallholders and Family Farmers (late 2018). Furthermore, DEVCO does also support EFARD, EIARD and SCAR-ARCH and expects that each one has clear key mandates and role.

Discussion/Q&A

Q: A potential role for EFARD is to bring the collective knowledge and innovation into national programmes. How can EFARD address European issues as well as development issues from the South?

In response, Judith Francis explained that in the context of the CAASNET + project, many challenges were experienced in collecting the results; outputs and impacts from EU funded bi-regional (Africa-EU) FNS-SA projects because the landscape was too vast. Data from member states are generally gathered and stored in different ways per country, using different languages. Therefore, any exercise to harness EU knowledge requires significant resources and capacities.

Q: What is the place of Civil Society Organisation (CSO) in EFARD?

Q: EFARD's specificity is the multi-stakeholders platform dimension but with the risk that, currently research institutions make up the largest constituent group. This raises the question to know what would be the long-term interest and benefit for the private sector to participate in EFARD?

Judith clarified that CSOs have always been represented in EFARD and the former vice-chair, Ann Waters-Bayer represented CSOs on the management team. Despite the efforts made in the past to engage with the private sector and some have attended meetings, EFARD continues to struggle to keep non-research actors engaged on a continuous basis. An approach has been made to Bader Mahaman, Action Contre la Faim, to represent CSOs on the MT for 2017-2019 and a response is expected.

Patrick Van Damme indicated that YPARD is also a constituent of EFARD and contributed to the 2016 EFARD annual meeting. EFARD provides a platform for CSOs to extend their network and to get informed about new opportunities. By taking the lead and being more proactive, CSOs could take concrete opportunities out of EFARD's membership.

Christophe Larose explained that DEVCO is aware that many organisations e.g. FARA, a number of SROs and GFAR are under threat and governance issues are very important. However, DEVCO also recognizes that these organisations or networks still have major roles to play. He also explained that there is a role for DEVCO to organize this discussion. EFARD could share lessons and give suggestions on how DEVCO can facilitate these discussions. These could take place under the new umbrella programme (DeSIRA) as this would provide opportunities for joint programming and implementation.

Q: Could EFARD help its members to reflect on the new instruments that have been emerging from DEVCO – e.g., the DeSIRA mechanism or the new External Investment Plan for Africa.

Q: Do you still see a role for the World Bank in the Trust Fund?

Christophe Larose clarified that the Trust Fund is meant to be a tool for joint programming first. He explained that the programme is still in the process of being formalized, and informed that the instruments will follow as it is too premature to refer to a specific instrument. Furthermore, he made clear that the World Bank contributed to important collective policy debates, and helped to strengthen the institutional capacities of a number of organisations (FARA and SROs in particular).

Judith Francis acknowledged the importance of this topic for EFARD members but noted that EFARD annual meetings are generally too short to have this type of in-depth discussion. Other consultative processes and opportunities are necessary.

The Dutch Experience in AR4D Funded Projects

Full presentation title: **Applied Research Fund (ARF): the Dutch Experience**

Speaker: Jennie van der Mheen

Jennie van der Mheen is Manager International Cooperation Africa at Wageningen University & Research (WUR) in the Netherlands.

Link to the presentation: [The Dutch Experience in AR4D Funded Projects](#)

Summary

The ARF is a pioneering funding instrument focusing on innovation through short, applied research. The objective of the ARF is to support innovations that would have tangible, positive impact on people's food and nutrition security as well as to improve the policy and business environment for fostering sustainable and equitable food systems. The key concepts of the ARF approach are to: generate innovation through applied research, use transdisciplinary research as key for tackling complex food security problems, develop co-creation of knowledge by multi-stakeholder consortia, and develop integrated strategies for research uptake. Both the NWO-WOTRO and the Dutch Food & Business Knowledge Platform have supported consortia in their efforts towards co-creation, knowledge exchange and research uptake.

The ARF mid-term evaluation showed that projects have addressed relevant research needs. They focus on increasing production and productivity, and on the uptake of new agri-production techniques, and local knowledge. The demand-driven and transdisciplinary approach developed by the ARF is successful but can be strengthened. In contrast, knowledge co-creation remains a challenge. Knowledge co-creation requires a lot of time, notably in developing and maintaining shared interests and project strategies. Additionally, key challenges such as how to make use of strengths and overcome possible weaknesses of local organisations' leadership, and how to face challenges and share rewards of joint learning, hamper the process of knowledge creation.

ARF grants vary between 50,000 € (for 6 months) up to 300,000 (for 3 years), whereby private sector participation is expected to contribute cash and/or in kind co-funding of at least 20% of the grant. In the first ARF call, 13 consortia requested collaboration with WUR researchers. However, a mismatch in the ARF funding modality did not allow for the participation of Dutch research institutes such as WUR. While the Fund specifically invited Netherlands Applied Research Institutions to take part, these institutes were not allowed to charge their daily fees to the ARF. This hampered participation of all contract research institutes that do not receive any core funding. As a result, few applications were received after which the modalities of the ARF were adjusted. This change allowed for the participation of researchers from Dutch

research institutes in several consortia and this learning has since being integrated in other programmes such as LEAP Agri.

Lessons learned from the ARF mid-term evaluation indicate that the funding mechanism determines who can(not) participate. For instance, local organisations do not always have the capacity to lead the consortia. Although the ARF funding instrument has a vast ambition, system transformation and partnership building generally take 10-15 years and cannot be reached through 300,000 € for a 3 years' support.

Few policy makers and practitioners use the outcomes of research. The Food & Business Knowledge Platform is making a specific effort to ensure connection between the outcome of the ARF mechanism and Dutch policy makers. Furthermore, the Dutch government wants to give more thought into how research outcomes are being used by private sector and development practitioners.

Jennie van der Mheen pointed out the need to start considering more the type of impact that is meant to be reached. She suggested a different approach that is reasoning from impact to research. In theory, this implies a shift from "Research FOR development", in which developing, testing and disseminating options is key, toward "Research IN development", in which development and the research process are equally important.

Discussion/Q&A

Q: Although this type of R4D funding is small, it is a key element for the establishment of these consortia. They have gained experiences in managing such funds and furthermore they have stimulated consortia partners to continue to work together. Nevertheless, scaling up is still a challenge but the importance of such small grants should not be underestimated.

A: Jennie van der Mheen agreed with this remark and emphasised that the issue here is about the kind of impact the ARF wanted to achieve. In this case, it is not realistic to expect an impact such as agriculture transformation after a relatively small project of short duration.

Q: How is the Dutch government going to feed these lessons learned back into its policy?

A: The Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs has initiated five platforms for knowledge management, including the Food & Business Knowledge Platform. The Food & Business Knowledge Platform operates in coordination with two Food & Business Research funds managed by NWO-WOTRO: the Food and Business Global Challenges Programme (GCP) and the Food & Business Applied Research Fund (ARF). The close link between the platforms and the ministry is key to the uptake of the lessons learned.

Links:

The Food & Business Knowledge Platform :

<http://knowledge4food.net/about/visionmission/>

Applied Research Fund : <https://www.nwo.nl/en/research-and->

[results/programmes/food+%26+business+research/applied+research+fund](https://www.nwo.nl/en/research-and-results/programmes/food+%26+business+research/applied+research+fund)

Tracking the Evolution of the PAEPARD Users'-Led Process: Lessons Learned

Speaker: *Judith A. Francis & Laurianne Ollivier*

Judith Ann Francis is Senior Programme Coordinator, Science and Technology Policy at the Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation ACP-EU (CTA) based in the Netherlands. She is EFARD Executive Secretary and since recently she is the Chair of TAP steering committee.

Laurianne Ollivier has a MSc degree in Agriculture and a MSC degree in Forest and Nature Conservation. Last year, as EFARD intern, she supported EFARD's secretariat and conducted the study on "Appraising the participation of European partners in the PAEPARD Users-Led Process".

Link to the presentation: [Tracking the Evolution of the PAEPARD Users'-Led Process: Lessons Learned](#)

Summary

In 2011, the Platform for African European Partnership on Agricultural Research for Development (PAEPARD) launched a new brokerage mechanism, 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 (MSHRQ) inception workshop; (5) concept note development; (6) full proposal development.

In this study, the evolution of the ULP as implemented by five non-research organisations (EAFF, PROPAC, ROPPA, COLEACP and FANRPAN) was reviewed. The study identified the ULP stage at which European partners became 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.

Overall, the study showed a low engagement of EU actors and the social network analysis, performed on 4 of the ULPs, provided more details on European partners engagement. In the case of the ULP led by PROPAC, three EU stakeholders (COLEACP, AGRISUD, CIRAD) were engaged at the MSHRQ inception workshop stage and two were further committed at the proposal development stage (CIRAD and AGRISUD). The ULP led by PROPAC developed three full proposals but none of them were funded. Four EU stakeholders participated in the ULP led by COLEACP and three full concept notes were developed but none were funded.

In both of the ULPs led by EAFF and FANRPAN, few EU partners participated in the MSHRQ inception workshop and key stakeholders (particularly EU) committed themselves towards the end of the process. Out of the six full proposals developed by the ULP led by EAFF only two were funded. In contrast, ULP led by FANRPAN was more successful as three proposals were funded, including their success in the PAEPARD-Competitive Research fund (CRF) project.

In total, 19 partnerships were developed and 14 research proposals were submitted for funding, resulting in five funded projects.

This study helped to draw key lessons learned on this new brokerage mechanism. Although stakeholder motivation was high, the ULP process is too long and takes two to five years to complete. In fact, building trust between researchers and non-researchers, and strengthening the engagement of European and African stakeholders takes time and financial resources.

There is a mismatch between users' research priorities and funding streams. EU researchers with no institutional core 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. Finally, the ULP contributed to developing the social capital of non-research actors, which is essential for sustaining their engagement in the research process and uptake beyond a project's life cycle.

Links:

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

http://paepard.org/wakka.php?wiki=PublicationsPaepard/download&file=Rapport_ULP_European_EngagementEN.pdf

EFARD website: <https://www.efard.eu/paepard>

Seed Money as a Catalyst for Innovation Partnerships: the PAEPARD Soybean Consortium

Full presentation title: *Instruments de financement du Consortium soja du Bénin: rôles et durabilité*

Speaker: Patrice Sewade

Patrice Sewade is the Coordinator of SOJAGNON-NGO, the leader of the Benin soybean innovation platform, the coordinator of the CRF-Benin/ProSAM (Projet Soja Afitin Milk) project funded by PAEPARD/EC and the coordinator of the ProSeSS project funded by NOW/WOTRO.

Link to the presentation: [Seed Money as a Catalyst for Innovation Partnerships: the PAEPARD Soybean Consortium](#)

Summary

The Soybean Consortium of Benin (CSB) was created in 2011 by SOJAGNON, a local NGO, with the technical and financial support from the PAEPARD. The CSB aims to create a positive environment for public-private partnerships for the development of the Soybean Agricultural Value Chain (AVC). The CSB develops multi-stakeholder research and development projects which aim to reduce the constraints in soybean AVC. At the beginning, the consortium faced challenges, especially the mobilisation of research funds and low commitment of some of the partners.

In 2013, the consortium received its first seed money through the PAEPARD Competitive Research fund (CRF) to implement the Soja Afitin-Milk project (ProSAM). The PAEPARD CRF played a central role in building capacity of the partners, especially in managing multi-stakeholder partnerships and financially managing this type of grant. Furthermore, it has helped the consortium to gain national and international visibility and facilitated the mobilization of partners for the development of complementary projects. The seed money has supported the participation of 2 BSc, 15 MSc students, and 1 Postdoc.

Before receiving the PAEPARD CRF, the consortium participated in several writeshops, organised by PAEPARD, and developed several proposals. Nevertheless, none received funding. However, since the consortium received its first seed money through the PAEPARD CRF, the commitment of partners has been strengthened which in turn has stimulated the development of positive changes in soybean value chains by addressing the challenges faced by the processors. The consortium received 2 more funding grants through the Applied Research Fund (ARF), each for a period of 3 years. The strong involvement of end-users (women processors) in the innovation process, the development and signing of a consortium agreement and the seed money were, among others, the keys to the success of this consortium.

Discussion/Q&A

Q: What was/were the objective(s) of building this partnership?

A: In Benin, women who process soy in milk using traditional methods, were facing problems with milk quality, which was only steady for some hours. Therefore, this partnership's objective is to develop improved soybean processing technologies (stabilized soybean milk), based on processor needs and consumer preferences to deliver good-quality soybean milk. The consortium created a suitable technology that allows for the conservation of the soya milk for at least 3 months.

Judith Francis clarified that the PAEPARD presentations aim to bring the EU perceptive to the thematic debates. She pointed out that they repond to the EC interest to understand how EU knowledge contributes to such a project and the challenges for EU researchers to commit to such a process when core funding is limited or unavailable. Patrick Van Damme observed that in this consortium the initial cost was worth the money given the results achieved.

Links:

ProSeSS project - Matching grain quality attributes to the requirements of soybean processors in Benin: <https://www.nwo.nl/en/research-and-results/research-projects/i/35/13735.html>;

ProSAM project: <http://paepard.blogspot.nl/2017/03/dissemination-de-la-technologie-de.html>

EU-Africa Knowledge Exchange & EU Researcher Experience in Multi-Stakeholder Research and Innovation Partnerships

Speaker: Falylath Babah Daouda and Paul Ingenbleek

Paul Ingenbleek is associate professor of marketing at the Marketing and Consumer Behaviour Group of Wageningen University and Research. His current research focuses on the role of strategic marketing in sustainable development, especially in developing and emerging markets in Africa, Asia and Latin America. In 2014, he began collaborating with the PAEPARD soybean consortium on the ProSeSS, Doyiwé Project.

Falylath Babah Daouda is a postdoc working on the ProSeSS, Doyiwé project at Wageningen University. She is also assistant professor at the University of Parakou, Benin.

Link to the presentation: [EU-Africa Knowledge Exchange & EU Researcher Experience in Multi-Stakeholder Research and Innovation Partnerships](#)

Summary

The Marketing and Consumer Behaviour group of WUR focuses on developing and emerging markets in Africa, Asia (and Latin America). In the context of concrete agri- and food projects, the Marketing and Consumer Behaviour (MCB) group develops market-based solutions, usually with public and/or private partners. In 2017, the group had 14 projects focusing on creating new markets. Paul Ingenbleek and Falylath Babah Daouda shared their experience as European and African researchers involved in the ARF-funded project “*Matching grain quality attributes to the requirements of soybean processors in Benin - ProSeSS- Doyiwé*”.

From the European side, participating in this project has several benefits. The ARF project is not just about applying knowledge, but offers opportunities to create new knowledge as the project operates at the development frontier. European researchers work with and learn from a new generation of “change makers” in Africa that are engaged in interdisciplinary collaboration. This generation bridges the African and European context and facilitates a knowledge flow from Africa to Europe and vice versa. From the beginning, the ARF project was demand-driven. It was driven by former PhD researchers of the MCB, their advisers, and their new public and private sector partners. This is a new experience for European researchers as their African partners make them part of important change processes in developing and emerging markets. This type of partnership increases the chance that project results are used and also offers Europeans partners opportunities to appreciate the impact of their work.

From the African perspective, collaboration is sometimes challenging and constrained by the difference in budget and time. European partners’ fees are expensive while budgets are often restricted. African stakeholders must consider that more involvement in the research process by European partners comes at a price. In contrast, more distance with Europeans may hinder knowledge flow. Both European and African researchers expressed their interest to increase the period of the project to 4 years, to allow for the training of sandwich PhD students, who are key contacts in building multi-stakeholder research and innovation partnerships.

Links:

Dr Paul Ingenbleek testimonial - PAEPARD Soybean consortium:

<https://www.efard.eu/paulingenbleek>

Marketing and Consumer Behaviour Group : <https://www.wur.nl/en/Expertise-Services/Chair-groups/Social-Sciences/Marketing-and-Consumer-Behaviour-Group.htm> ;
<http://www.marketingandconsumerbehaviour.nl/>

PAEPARD External Evaluation: Lessons for EFARD

Full presentation title: **Lessons for EFARD from the internal and external evaluations of PAEPARD**

Speaker: *Remi Kahane*

Remi Kahane is project manager at CIRAD and he is specialized on horticulture for development.

He is the co-manager of PAEPARD.

Link to the presentation: [PAEPARD External Evaluation: Lessons for EFARD](#)

Summary

PAEPARD's specific objectives are to enhance more equitable, more demand-driven and mutually beneficial collaboration between Africa and Europe on agricultural research for development (AR4D) with the aim of attaining the MDGs. To reach these objectives, PAEPARD developed four instruments: the Users-Led Process (ULP), Incentive Funds (IF), Competitive Research Funds (CRF), and a communication and advocacy strategy for managing knowledge and strengthening capacities.

PAEPARD has shown several achievements and has various lessons learned to share. The Users-Led Process has provided valuable lessons and should be used as a basis for future inter-continental collaboration. Even though the ULP process is a long one, the time spent is necessary to change the mind-set of all stakeholders and to build trust between partners. Refining and improving the implementation strategy of the ULP is key in scaling up this mechanism. Through the project, users' capacities to develop multi-stakeholder partnerships and to develop research proposals have been strengthened. Furthermore, failures and successes observed during the projects have demonstrated the importance of facilitation at several levels (project and consortium level) and the role of the leader as a broker between partners. Brokerage activities are considered as the key engine of any innovation platform.

Recommendations from the partners and stakeholders of PAEPARD (internal review) are to continue and set up (new) mechanisms enabling partnerships and brokerage such as writeshops, the use of innovation facilitators as well as to institutionalize some of the brokerage activities. PAEPARD could consider building a communication and advocacy strategy as well as to reinforce and upscale mechanisms to strengthen stakeholders' capacities in project management and coordination.

PAEPARD's external review has recommended a no cost-extension to allow for, among others, the documenting of PAEPARD lessons learned, the assessment of impacts, and to address some training in the context of stronger Public-Private Partnership. Lessons learned and recommendations will be disseminated to funders, policy-makers and other stakeholders both nationally and internationally.

In the context of preparing the new era of PAEPARD, the external review suggested the positioning of PAEPARD as broker or integrator, putting together co-learning, co-innovation

and commercialisation of ARD-related processes and products. PAEPARD is to continue to develop capacity strengthening in synergy with sub-regional organizations and other initiatives (e.g. WAAPP, CDAIS). Transforming a pure information system to a knowledge management system is also a challenge for the after PAEPARD-period

Discussion/Q&A

Q: Why did PAEPARD form consortia without having clearly defined funding calls to respond to? Why not create clusters around a theme/field and build a mechanism to respond to relevant calls? PAEPARD focused too much on processes. Learning and bringing multi-stakeholders together is important but these should be means to achieve other goals. Furthermore, being demand-driven is important but shouldn't be a religion. Change makers of innovations do not necessary solely come from demands of users. Another important aspect for PAEPARD to consider is scaling-up: will PAEPARD scale up the process(es) developed or the technologies generated?

A: Judith Francis' remarks are that through PAEPARD we observed that non-research actors had a greater appreciation of the relevance of research and the uptake of research results has improved. Furthermore, we see more interest to involve research users in several programmes (e.g. EIP). Indeed, these approaches have costs attached but their lessons learned are informing donors.

A: Roberto Aparicio clarified that currently research is too much led by researchers. Hence, DEVCO wants to see more user-led (farmer) research and therefore DEVCO is supporting PAEPARD.

Links:

Policy N° 5 - Capitalizing on PAEPARD experience of multi-stakeholder partnerships in agricultural research for development:

<http://paepard.org/wakka.php?wiki=PublicationsPaepard/download&file=policy5enV2.pdf>

Fostering Processes of Participation between Family Farming Organisations and Research Institutes: GFAR Collective Action

Speaker: Stéphanie Barrial

Stéphanie Barrial is knowledge management expert and coordinator at the World Rural Forum, in Spain.

Link to the presentation: [Fostering Processes of Participation between Family Farming Organisations and Research Institutes: GFAR Collective Action](#)

Summary

The World Rural Forum (WRF) is a plural network that works in favour of family farming and sustainable rural development. The Forum is composed of family farming and rural development organisations, agriculture cooperatives and research centres. WRF is also the Civil Society Organizations' representative in the global constituency of the Global Forum on Agricultural Research.

In 2017, the United Nations General Assembly has adopted the Decade of Family Farming 2019-2028, which aims to serve as a framework to promote better public policies on Family Farming, contribute to end hunger, and to reduce poverty in the context of achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

In this context, WFR joining with other Partners (COPROFAM) proposed to the GFAR Partners' Assembly the following Collective Action: *"To enhance participatory research processes between family farmers, rural communities and research"*. This collective action is operating under Key Focus Area 1: "Strengthening the role of Rural Communities as drivers of innovation in agriculture".

The mismatch observed between the object of research and the reality in the field, as well as a clear demand from both farmer and research organisations has motivated the selection of this collective action. Furthermore, through this collective action, GFAR intends to be more efficient and effective at meeting specific challenges. The collective action will create a learning space, provide advocacy, promote exchange of knowledge and strengthen farmers' capacity. The collective action aims at a comprehensive and widespread adoption of the results. This approach is holistic, consultative and interactive, and will be implemented at three levels (global, regional and local). A global workshop, led by farmer organisations and facilitated by the WRF will initiate the collective action

Links:

Empowering Rural Communities as drivers of agricultural innovation: a Collective Action within Key Focus Area (KFA) 1 of GFAR's Medium Term Plan 2018-2021 :

<https://agrifood.net/gfar/263-empowering-rural-communities-as-drivers-of-agricultural-innovation/file>

TAP and CDAIS Project Mid-Term Review – Strengthening Agricultural Innovation Systems in Developing Countries

Speaker: Jean Michel Sers & Karin Nichterlein

Jean-Michel Sers is the European Affairs Coordinator at French research institute, CIRAD.

Karin Nichterlein works as agricultural research officer at the FAO office of Knowledge Exchange, Research and Extension. She facilitates FAO/GCIAR collaboration and supports the Tropical Agriculture Platform (TAP).

Link to the presentation: [TAP and CDAIS Project Mid-Term Review – Strengthening Agricultural Innovation Systems in Developing Countries](#)

Summary

Initiated by the G20 and supported by the European Union, the main focus of the Tropical Agriculture Platform (TAP) is the development of national capacities for agricultural innovation in the tropics, where most of the developing countries are located and the capacity gap is especially important. To address this capacity gap, TAP partners have adopted a new approach for Capacity Development (CD) taking an Agricultural Innovation Systems (AIS) perspective. This system recognises agricultural innovation as a process involving many different actors. The implementation of the TAP action plan is supported by the EU-funded CDAIS project (2015-2018), jointly implemented by Agrinatura and FAO.

The TAP Framework has three levels of intervention. In term of capacity development, important concepts and key principles have been identified. The framework offers operational guidance on assessing capacities, analysing needs and designing, monitoring and evaluating CD interventions. The framework also provides advocacy and policy dialogue to create an enabling environment, areas often neglected in traditional CD initiatives. Another intervention of TAP is the Tapipedia, online library, which allows for TAP's partners and other stakeholders to share their CD for AIS resources and initiatives. Tapipedia allows, for instance, to add resources, search for content and to explore organizational network.

TAP, via the implementation of the CDAIS project made important progress at both global and country level. At the global level, TAP Partners met during the Assembly in Rwanda (January 2016), virtually in December 2016 and in Lao in September 2017. Among others publications, TAP finalized the publication of practical guides on the different stages of CD and factsheets on the tools of the Capacity Development for AIS. TAP organised an E-conference on "*Innovation systems for food security and nutrition: understanding the capacities needed*" and a half day symposium during which the findings were discussed.

At country level, baselines studies and inception workshops were completed in the eight pilot countries by April 2016. In total, four to six innovation niches for CD interventions have been identified and training for innovation facilitators development were developed in 7 of the 8 CDAIS countries. European researchers' contribution to the application of the CD framework

in the pilot countries is major. Many of them are engaged, connected and exchange with each other.

In the next stage of TAP partners will finalize and endorse the new TAP Action Plan (2018-2021). At the global level, TAP is to intensify policy advocacy and resource mobilisation for greater coherence on CDAIS and encourage a wider adoption and integration of the TAP “Common Framework”, especially at organizational and institutional capacity development (CD) level. In 2018, TAP will also support the 1st FAO International Symposium on Innovation for Smallholders and Family Farmers.

TAP will continue lobbying for additional project funding to support the CD framework for AIS. In this perspective, funding has already been mobilised for pilots in 4 new countries. TAP is an active platform and is on track towards achieving more coherence for capacity development for agricultural innovation.

Discussion/Q&A

Q: Judith Francis shared some additional information regarding TAP and EFARD. For more clarity, she explained that EFARD has been a member of TAP since its inception. Agrinatura, as EFARD member, is also a partner in the implementation of the CDAIS project. Christian Hoste has stepped down as a Chair of the TAP Steering Committee and Judith Francis (EFARD/CTA) has taken over the position. The presentation highlighted the large numbers of partners. Judith Francis also presented the diversity of partners engaged in TAP, including donors such as EC, USAID, GIZ, as well as partners who are implementing the project such as AGRINATURA. Furthermore, she also pointed out that EFARD will have to better define its role as an individual TAP partner representing multiple stakeholders.

Q: What is the exit strategy of CDAIS?

A: The project has developed promising examples of CD practices and the project’s model could interest donors to expand into new pilot countries.

Links:

Tropical Agriculture Platform :

<http://www.fao.org/in-action/tropical-agriculture-platform/en/>

Tapipedia: <http://tapipedia.org/>

CDAIS project: <http://cdais.net/home/>

World Café

Key questions were discussed by small groups of participants. They expressed their vision on the critical challenges and best practices for engaging EU stakeholders in Multi-stakeholder Agricultural Research and Innovation Partnerships.

The participants were invited to reflect on the 3 following questions:

1: How can we address the Funding Challenges?

- Core funding/compensation for staff time
- Seed funding for building partnerships
- Funding the research
- Funding the research uptake

The groups were asked to draw key messages to EC, EU Member states and EU institutions

In terms of core funding, participants suggested to diversify finances of projects by engaging others actors, governments and other sources of funding. For instance, a percentage from the products and services produced by a project could be invested for the next phase of the project.

In term of seed funding for building partnerships, the group discussed the need to use sponsoring. This type of contract does not require extensive reporting, which is often time-consuming for the consortia.

To address the challenges of funding research, participants recommended to advocate with national organisations for funding.

In terms of research uptake and dissemination, the group suggested that this should be defined and budgetted for in the proposal as activities during the last 2 years of the project.

The key message is to improve financing of AR4D by increasing funds and creating more opportunities for AR4D multi-stakeholder partnerships through reviewing the eligibility criteria.

2: Examples of best practices and incentives for engaging EU actors in MSH Research and Innovation Partnerships.

The group agreed that offering a win-win partnership is key to the engagement of EU partners. To engage EU actors in multi-stakeholder partnerships, the partnership should provided to EU actors the opportunity to improve their expertise and their connections.

3: What role for EFARD in addressing the critical challenges (funding)?

Three main roles were suggested by the participants.

- EFARD could suggest alternative models to competitive calls.

Currently competitive calls are not very attractive to NGOs, private sector and farmer organisations. These are time-consuming and the chance of winning funding is often about 10 %. In terms of alternative approaches, one could think of commissioning research. In this perceptive, PAEPARD project has increased the capacity of farmer organisations to help them identify their research priorities. However, PAEPARD experiences also show that once farmer organisations have defined their priorities they do not have the money to pay the (EU) researchers to support them.

1. EFARD could identify the ‘blessings’ (opportunities and benefits) and the ‘curses’ (challenges) of collaborating with the private sector in AR4D.

Many donors, including DEVCO, are now putting a lot of emphasis on agribusiness. From the researcher’s perceptive, collaboration with the private sector has its limits, especially in the case of intellectual property rights and confidentiality. In fact, if the private sector claims research results as its property right, this may constrain upscaling and dissemination of research results.

2. Advocate for more core funding to meet cost of EU researcher’s engagement in Africa-EU partnership projects

Not all participants agreed to this suggestion. At a global level, EU researchers are competing with other important countries such as China and India and top researchers will only engage if they are competitive at global level. This suggestion pointed out challenges encountered by one or more PAEPARD consortium where partners had to face a trade-off between the (high) cost of EU researchers and supporting other activities of the project.

Business Meeting

Presentation – EFARD Management Report 2016-2017 & Draft EFARD 2018-2020 Governance and Strategy

Judith A. Francis, Executive Secretary - EFARD, CTA, The Netherlands.

Link to the presentation: [EFARD Management Report 2016-2017 & Draft EFARD 2018-2020 Governance and Strategy](#)

Summary

EFARD objectives are to:

- encourage dialogue between European ARD stakeholders promoting awareness, innovative approaches and partnerships for ARD;
- support global ARD initiatives within the framework of GFAR (GCARD process & GFAR Collective Actions) and;
- promote inter-regional partnerships and collaborative ARD activities for joint research initiatives, capacity strengthening and greater impact.

In 2017, EFARD renewed its management team and is awaiting confirmation Bader Mahaman, Sustainable Agriculture Senior Advisor, Action Against Hunger, to join the the EFARD management team to represent civil society organisations. In terms of EFARD activities, EFARD participated and played an important role in influencing the CD Framework of the Tropical Agriculture Platform. EFARD has been very active in PAEPARD and members have played a significant role. PAEPARD has supported EFARD Secretariat, which allowed EFARD to conduct a study on *“Appraising the participation of European partners in the PAEPARD Users-Led Process”*. Furthermore, EFARD supported PAEPARD in organising a EU-

research project partners' stand at European Development Days 2017 and a sessions on the Future of PAEPARD. EFARD (chair) participated in GFAR's Strategic Workshop and Steering Committee Meetings and shared EFARD vision and exchange with CARDI. Lastly, EFARD launched its new website which featured the experiences of selected EU researchers involved in PAEPARD projects.

In preparation of the EFARD 2018-2020 governance and strategy, EFARD launched a survey to collect EFARD members' views and suggestions. In term of relevance, members approved the vision and mission of EFARD. Nevertheless, members pointed out the inequity between EFARD objectives and EFARD current resources and its potential overlap with other organisations (e.g AGRINATURA).

At the global level, members suggested EFARD to strengthen partnerships with GFAR and CGIAR. EFARD could, for instance, contribute to the GFAR Key Focus Area focusing on increasing knowledge flow for development impact and could play a stronger role in the Tropical Agriculture Platform.

Members indicated that EFARD has demonstrated impact in terms of communication and networking but more could have been done in terms of advocacy and brokerage.

Members suggested 3 major topics that EFARD could address to strengthen AR4D and Innovation Partnerships between Europe and countries in the South and Eastern Europe:

1. lobby for core funding for EFARD;
2. research priority setting; and
3. capacity development.

Regarding EFARD management structure, secretariat and statutes, members consider the current management structure functional but think that it could be improved. Finally, the results of the survey suggest that a stronger engagement from members and additional funding is needed for EFARD to meet its objectives.

Working Groups Session – Charting the future of EFARD: Role, Governance Mechanism, Priorities and Strategies to respond to EC and Development Priorities

To discuss the future of EFARD, participants were invited to reflect on 5 key questions.

1. What are the activities that EFARD should embark for 2018-2020?

EFARD should appreciate its added value(s) compared to other existing organisations (e.g emphasize its multi-stakeholder membership) and build on it/them.

EFARD should select a few topics such as studying the engagement of private sector in AR4D or, capacity development for example, and identify key key events (in 2018) where EFARD members can collectively make a contribution. The FAO International Symposium on Innovation for Smallholders and Family Farmers and the SDGs conference organised by Wageningen University and Research are two events suggested by the participants to showcase EFARD.

EFARD could play a role in the EU-AU FNSSA dialogue. For instance, EFARD can team up with FARA, which is part of the consultation process, and EFARD could also play a role. Moreover, DevCo would like to explore the possibility to discuss upcoming programming. Would it be possible to set up thematic working groups like RTD already has when preparing calls? E.g. there will be specific attention to 'soil' in upcoming programming.

EFARD should seek for alignment with other continental organisation such as FARA and APPARI.

2. What are the topics that EFARD should address?

Two topics were mentioned by the participants.

EFARD should address the issue related to core funding for research. In some EU countries, research institutes receive core funding from their government, whereas other countries are less supported by their government. This seems to have consequences on the commitment and participation of EU researchers in joint research projects. EFARD could provide more substance on this issue.

The second topic suggested was the engagement of private sector. EFARD could provide more insight in the incentives for private sector to engage with research, the benefits, challenges and best practices for collaboration between research and the private sector.

3. How can EFARD expand its reach and improve its relevance within Europe and among European constituents?

EFARD has played a key role in the initiation of some programmes such as PAEPARD and TAP. EFARD must showcase its impacts with the right balance between communicating on impact and on processes. EFARD could also showcase the added value of such multi-stakeholder platforms. Furthermore, EFARD is advised to continue advocating and drawing lessons learned, which provide basis for discussion among European actors.

4. Strategies to strengthen EFARD relation with EC and its impact on EC decision making on Agricultural research and innovation for development

EFARD could be positioned as a Think Tank on agricultural research and innovation for development. However, this would require substantial funding for EFARD. Considering impact measurements, EFARD could produce a review of the current work (e.g. ImpresS method developed by CIRAD) and facilitate discussion among members. EFARD has a cross-cutting position across several EC-DGs and could take advantage of its positioning to develop more strategic partnerships and explore co-funding opportunities. DEVCO is open to inviting EFARD to further discuss an operational relationship. This could be via a working group or more through partnership approach.

5. How can EFARD improve its management structure?

EFARD needs to find more effective ways to strengthen engagement, active participation, and clear division of roles of its members as some continue to perceive possible duplication (e.g.

EFARD vis a vis AGRINATURA). EFARD needs to receive more concrete proposals from members on ways to actively engage and expand members. Members could agree on a few topics/thematic issues and events and build a team that will support the management team on a regular basis. EFARD could expand representation from the diaspora. With respect to financial structure, EFARD members are invited to send their ideas/ options for funding.

