

**International Research Partnerships Support to Regional
Collective Action in eastern and central Africa**

DRAFT

By Leonard Oruko

**Senior Technical Officer Monitoring and Evaluation
Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central
Africa (ASARECA)**

1. Introduction

The notable transformation of the world's agricultural economy during the 20th century is largely attributable to agricultural productivity growth generated primarily by investments in agricultural research and development. Although both the rich and the poor countries have benefited from products and services of this research, a large proportion of this investment was made by a few rich countries namely; the United States, Japan, Germany, and France. Over the years therefore, both rich and poor countries have depended on agricultural research conducted in the private and public laboratories of these few countries, even if they have not contributed to financing the activity (Alston, Pardey and Piggot 2006).

Owing to the increasing divergence in research agenda between the rich and the poor countries, it is unlikely that the poor countries will continue to benefit from the spillovers of research investment from the rich countries. The challenges of enhancing productivity, especially of the key staples, very much dominate the agricultural research agenda of most poor countries. By contrast, the cotemporary issues in the rich nations to which research agenda is expected to respond have since shifted. Increasingly, consumer concerns are shaping the research agenda to respond issues such as enhancing dietary attributes of food and designing production systems that address ethical and food safety concerns¹ (Alston, Pardey and Piggot 2006). A consequence of the foregoing, traditional institutional arrangements that made spillovers happen could become irrelevant, and there is need for new configurations in the broad areas of partnerships for technology generation, brokerage and delivery.

Traditionally, agricultural research partnerships between the rich and the poor nations were built around capacity strengthening, especially formal training of staff and provision of research equipment. In the majority of the cases, these capacity development initiatives were part and parcel of bilateral development assistance. In the early 1990's the global community began to take a special interest in strengthening agricultural research in Africa through a regional approach. During this period, the World Bank (mainly through IDA) was becoming the largest source of support to national agricultural research in Africa. Together with a consortium of OECD donors active in research through CDA (Cooperation for Development in Africa), the World Bank created the Special Program for African Agricultural Research (SPAAR), linked closely to the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) through a common chair. With time, SPAAR evolved from a donor support club into a forum for African NARS to participate in affairs of the CGIAR and when the SPAAR chairmanship passed from the policy and research/sustainable development side of the Bank to the African Vice-Presidency, its operational and advocacy roles increased. Later, the World Bank, moved to create the Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR). It is against this background that the sub-regional organizations namely; CORAF, SACCAR and ASARECA were formed and encouraged to act as the voices of their regions in CGIAR meetings.

¹ E.g.organic farming, humane livestock production systems and “fair trade” coffee)

2. Partnerships for Strengthening Research Capacity in ASARECA

The Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa (ASARECA) is a non-political organization Sub regional Agricultural Research Organization (SRO) serving the National Agricultural Research and Extension Systems (NARES) of ten countries: Burundi, D.R. Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar, Rwanda, Sudan, Tanzania and Uganda. ASARECA came into being primarily as a platform to redress market failure in agricultural research and development in ECA region. In the early 1990s it was realized that few countries in the eastern and central Africa region could on their own afford to sustain a national agricultural research system with sufficient capacity to meet the scale and scope of their mandate. The ten countries therefore formed ASARECA as a platform for regional collective action to; 1) make spillovers happen across national boundaries, 2) achieve economies of scale and scope in research, 3) produce regional public goods, 4) provide a mechanism to share benefits and costs of collective action and, 5) find research solutions to transboundary problems.

From 1994-2007, ASARECA was governed by a Committee of Directors comprising the Directors of the National Agricultural Research Institutes of the ten member countries. This Committee of Directors performed both the stewardship and oversight function by setting the research agenda, approving the work-plans and reviewing the progress reports. This governance body was expanded in 2007 to include representatives of; 1) farmers, 2) the private sector, 3) the civil society, 4) the universities, 5) the Common market for eastern and central Africa (COMESA) and, 6) the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR).

“During its first nine years, ASARECA satisfied several different stakeholder interests. For some it was to strengthen the NARS in their relation with advanced research institutes and international centers; for others it was a validation of the power of regional action; while for still others it was a hoped for way of rationalizing research, bringing the cost of networks under control and generating economies of scope and scale.”
(ASARECA Strategic Plan 2005).

From the outset, ASARECA's *raison d'être* has been that of strengthening the capacity of NARS to respond to rural development challenges in the ECA through research for development interventions. Over the years, ASARECA has employed a variety of strategies, all aimed at ensuring that agricultural research responds to the development imperatives of the day.

In the first ten years of its existence (1997-2006), ASARECA delivered on its mandate through 17 commodity and cross cutting networks, programmes and projects (NPP). Employing a networking partnerships arrangement, the activities were implemented by scientists from the CGIAR and other international research centres (IARCs), the national agricultural research institutes (NARI), the universities in the ECA region and the private sector. In some cases, faculty members from universities in developed countries worked together with ASARECA network of scientists directly. In addition to providing solutions to complex research problems, the networking approach provided an effective mechanism for skills transfer and a focus for leverage of funds from other donors who wished to capitalise on the efficiencies of a regional approach.

The NPP contributed to the strengthening of national commodity programmes by; 1) identifying strategic priorities to which individual countries could contribute, 2) providing seed money to support a number of research activities and, 3) organizing short term training to address specific skills gap. However, the approach to capacity development was rather fragmented since each NPP had its own capacity strategy, related specifically to its portfolio of projects. As a consequence, these separate activities did not add up to a coordinated capacity development programme for the ASARECA sub-region.

Partnerships with Donor Agencies

During the first operational plan period between 1995-1997, ASARECA received support from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), International Development Research Centre (IDRC) and the Danish Agency for International Development (DANIDA). Most of this initial support was aimed at strengthening the capacity of the Secretariat to fulfil its mandate as a coordination unit. With the adoption of the ASARECA's first strategic plan 1997, there was a notable increase in funding support for research activities during the second and third operational planning periods (Table 1).

Box1: Strategic Objective of USAID phase II support to ASARECA

USAID's support to ASARECA will consolidate and build on its achievements so far, while at the same time contributing to the objectives of both the U.S. Presidential Initiative to End Hunger in Africa (IEHA) and the regional Mission's SO 10 - "Regional Economic Growth and Integration. "The overall objective of the support from USAID-East Africa will be to contribute to the implementation of ASARECA's strategic plan to enhance sustainable productivity, value added, and competitiveness of the regional agricultural system. But as indicated earlier, the programs and outputs of ASARECA will also add value to USAID's bilateral support for agricultural development in the region.

The year 2000 marked a major turning point in ASARECA's donor relations. During the second operational plan period, ASARECA prepared a proposal within the framework of European Development Fund (8th EDF) for a Regional Support Programme (RSP). Subsequently, a study undertaken for the EC in 1998-99, assessed the proposed support areas of RSP covering commodity and thematic networks; programmes and projects (NPPs); support functions and direct institutional support to ASARECA, and made recommendations on RSP's scope and implementation procedures.

Funding from RSP was targeted towards the following areas: (a) research and capacity building activities of certain NPPs in ASARECA's portfolio (5 for crops, 3 for natural resource management, 1 for livestock and 1 for the cross cutting theme of agricultural policy analysis); (b) support functions in information technology, technology transfer and strengthening NARS capacity to manage NPPs; (c) a competitive grants system for research that provide a basis for progressing to sustainable financing of ASARECA's research in the longer term; (d) increasing capacity of the ASARECA Secretariat for monitoring and

evaluation and impact assessment; and (e) ensuring the Secretariat's sustainability through setting up an endowment fund.

From the foregoing, in addition to strengthening research management and coordination, the RSP supported the establishment of NPPs in response to increasing stakeholder demand and an innovative funding mechanism, the ASARECA Competitive Grants Scheme (CGS). The CGS proved to be an effective mechanism for realizing both inter-institutional and inter country partnership for effective implementation of research for development initiatives in the ASARECA region.

Box 2: Outcomes of RSU support to ASARECA

By strengthening the scope and capacity of ASARECA's regional operations, RSP will enable ASARECA to improve NARS capacity to conduct relevant market-oriented research targeted on smaller scale men and women farmers and agri-business entrepreneurs; generate more profitable, sustainable and locally adaptable research outputs for various clients; demonstrate the adoptability of research outputs; and improve regional and national agricultural policy debate. It will also develop and promote regional information exchange, establish some of determinants of successful technology transfer; enable NARS to manage NPPs; and improve regional agricultural research cooperation.

From the outset, ASARECA's resource mobilization strategy was based on the development of a corporate plan that addressed the agricultural development challenges of the day. The plans were developed in consultation with the key stakeholders and more often than not, the identified intervention areas addressed the strategic objectives of most donors in the region. Accordingly, the partnership arrangement between the donors and ASARECA was based on shared goals that could best be addressed through a regional collective action, without duplicating the efforts of specific bilateral assistance programmes (Box 1 and 2).

In 2005, ASARECA developed research strategy covering the periods 2005-2015, with far reaching implications for the way ASARECA conducts its business. Whilst the strategy recognized the role of research induced productivity growth as a key driver to agricultural development, there was need to develop both forward and backward linkages that include value added along the production-to-consumption chain as well linkages to the seed industry and other input suppliers for broad based agricultural growth to have significant impact on poverty reduction. Following this development, the donors and other stakeholders requested for a new operational plan from ASARECA that clearly spells out how the research for development initiatives would contribute to productivity growth and poverty reduction.

The Department for International Development (DFID) of the United Kingdom funded the development of the operational plan and pledged support to both ASARECA's secretariat and programmes. Some of the notable changes in the ASARECA Operational Plan (2008-2012) include: 1) implementing fewer research for development initiatives of regional significance through seven programmes as opposed to 17 NPP; 2) changing the governance body from a committee of directors to a Board of Directors and expanding its composition to include a wider stakeholder constituency; and 3) strengthening secretariat to enhance its management capacity. Based on the new operational plan, the donors prepared a draft Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that provides a framework for harmonizing

their support to ASARECA. In addition, a multi donor trust fund (MDTF) for ASARECA is being established at the World Bank with initial funding from a no-cost extension of the European Union support to ASARECA.

Promoting Partnerships within ASARECA NARS: the Competitive Grants Scheme

As indicated earlier, ASARECA implements its research activities through a partnership arrangement with the NARS and other actors. In keeping with changing trend world over, the appraisal mission for EU funded Regional Support Unit recommended the establishment of a competitive grants scheme as a mechanism for funding agricultural research. Designed with the principal objective of building partnerships and research alliances between the NARS of ASARECA member countries, the CGS became operational in 2004 and to date, has served as the main finding vehicle for R4D activities.

The CGS is organized into 3 funding categories namely; funding stream A, funding stream B, and funding stream C. In order to qualify for funding stream A, the proposed project must have either national agricultural research institutes (NARI) or a university in ASARECA member country as the lead institution. In addition, the project must be implemented in at least 3 countries by a team from at least institutions² including the CG centre, civil society organizations and the private sector. The proposed projects must address research priorities identified in the ASARECA strategic and operational plans, present a technically sound implementation plan and deliver impact oriented products and services to identified uptake pathways within 3 years. The funding ceiling for stream A projects is four hundred thousand euro and the management support is provided by the CGS management unit at the ASARECA secretariat. The funding stream B projects were designed along the same principles as funding stream A, with a lower budget ceiling and managed by the ASARECA NPP coordination units. Likewise, the eligibility criteria for funding stream C projects are similar to those of funding stream A but, must be led by one of the CG centres and has a funding ceiling of one million United States Dollars.

From numerous reviews and commissioned studies by ASARECA, it is evident that the ASARECA CGS has achieved its strategic objective of fostering inter country and inter institutional collaboration in the implementation of research activities. Given the disparities in resource endowment among the ASARECA member countries, the CGS has served as an effective vehicle for building the capacity of the weaker NARS. Through the process of proposal development and project implementation, scientists from the weaker NARS gain valuable experience out of the interaction with counterparts from the stronger NARS. In some cases, the scientists benefit from shared facilities in the advanced NARS. In addition, given its principal design characteristic, the CGS has facilitated implementation of research for development activities within the IAR4D framework.

Despite the positive achievements cited above, not all the ASARECA member countries have participated in the implementation of the CGGS projects. The eligibility criteria have tended to favour the NARS with adequate to capacity to develop quality proposals. Accordingly, the weaker NARS have been systematically excluded from leading funding

² This criteria have since been reviewed to at least 2 countries and 3 institutions.

stream A projects. To date, ASARECA has issued 3 suites of calls under funding stream A and the majority of the winning proposals are led by NARS from Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania. In addition, the eligibility criteria on number of participating institutions has proved to be a disincentive to some member NARS. Four hundred thousand euro to be shared by a minimum of five institutions in 3 countries raises the transaction cost of proposal development and research implementation substantially. This has discouraged some of the stronger NARS such as Ethiopia from participating in the ASARECA CGS.

Partnerships with the CGIAR Centres

The Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR, or CG for short), was formed in 1971, to support and foster agricultural research in four centers with headquarters in Mexico (CYMMYT), the Philippines (IRRI), Colombia (CIAT) and Nigeria (IITA). Currently the CGIAR supports the work of 15 international agricultural research centers, two of these namely ILRI, ICRAF are with headquarters in the ASARECA region while IITA and WARDA are headquartered in west Africa. Given their Global mandate, most of the 15 CG Centres have a presence Africa. The CGIAR's mission is "To achieve sustainable food security and reduce poverty in developing countries through scientific research and research-related activities in the fields of agriculture, forestry, fisheries, policy, and environment."(CGIAR Science Council 2005)

Many of the ASARECA NPP evolved from the CGIAR Networks and were adopted, often with modification, by ASARECA. Save for ECAPAPA and RAIN, most of NPP were hosted by, or affiliated with, one of the CGIAR Institutes, and in some cases with other International Agricultural Research Centres (Table2). Some of the NPP had relationships with more than one IARC (e.g. SWMNet with ICRISAT; IWMI; ICAR, Stockholm International Water Institute (SIWI), Stockholm Environmental Institute (SEI), and the World Soil Information Centre (ISRIC); A-ARNET with ILRI and Global Livestock CRSP; AHI with CIAT, IFPRI and ICRAF).

The CG Centres had contracts with ASARECA specifying the kinds of services to be supplied and on which they charged a modest overhead (15% typically). An end of programme review of the NPP revealed that the close physical proximity of the NPP Coordination Units with the CGIAR Centres promoted strong personal networks and effective sharing of ideas and information. The CG Centres provided effective scientific and administrative backstopping to the NPP, a service that the ASARECA secretariat could not provide given its lean configuration. In addition, the CG Centres acted as brokerage agencies between the advanced international research institutes of the developed world and ASARECA, thereby facilitating access to international public goods (e.g. genetic materials from other continents, expertise developed in other environments and training opportunities in international centres of excellence) The range of contributions made by the Centres is given in Table 3, which balances these benefits with some of the potential and real downsides.

The CGIAR Centres with a presence in the eastern and central Africa region have recently rationalized their activities and ASARECA contributed to the development of their regional medium term plan for eastern and southern Africa. The plan will be implemented through network clusters, hub units and flagships to tackle specific and programmatic issues in the

region. The flagships will consist of combination of three elements - alignment, integrated projects and platforms in identification of problems, sourcing utilization of resources to solve the problems. Coincidentally, the flagships are aligned to the ASARECA programmatic areas as shown in Table 4. Following the shift from NPP to programmes, ASARECA has developed a new strategy for continued engagement with the CG Centres in the region. Building on the past, the CG Centres will remain close partners of ASARECA, both at strategic and operational levels. The CG Centres representative in the new ASARECA BoD will provide both strategic guidance and oversight to ASARECA programmes. Likewise, both the commodity and cross cutting programs of ASARECA will maintain the existing links with CG centres through strategic planning and project implementation. Where there is a clear comparative advantage, a CG Centre will be commissioned to implement a given research for development activity. Through competitive grants system funding stream C, the CG centres will continue to lead regional projects and provide backstopping role to the NARS implementers. It is also envisaged that the CG centres will sit in the technical advisory committees of the new programmes. On a case by case basis, the ASARECA develop joint funding proposals with CG centres that contribute to the implementation of its operational plan and CG Network Cluster Flagship Themes.

3. The way forward for effective international partnerships in agricultural research for development

For close to two decades, there was a decline in funding available to agricultural research. Whilst the contribution of research in agricultural productivity growth and the central role of agriculture in overall economic growth were never in doubt, it became increasingly evident that in the absence of corresponding investment in other sectors to create the requisite forward and backward linkages, utilization of agricultural research outputs as a viable pathway out of poverty would remain a hard sell. It is against this background that the African governments pledged to allocate at least 10% of the public expenditure budget to the agricultural sector. In the international arena, there is renewed interest in supporting agriculture as an engine to for economic growth in the less developed countries, as evidenced by the fall meeting at the World Bank. Given these recent developments, a number of questions come to mind.

- Do Africa and indeed the global research community have the capacity to address the rural development challenges in developing countries?
- If the capacity exists, what institutional arrangements should be put in place to harness this capacity?

A scoping study on capacity strengthening needs for AR4D in the ASARECA region I research institutes and universities claim to be moving towards or already doing research for development. These initiatives are labeled with terminologies such as “Integrated Agricultural Research for Development” (IAR4D); “Innovation System”, “Demand-led” or “Market-led” research.

“These claims indicate pervasive confusion around the understanding of these terminologies which seem to be simply used as trendy buzz words. Adoption of these labels of research is further influenced by donors’ flagship of these terminologies as the new research and development paradigms. Without a common understanding of what these terminologies actually imply in operational terms, the principles behind and the key success indicators, everyone can claim to be doing research for development.” (ASARECA 2007)

It is critical that the concepts related to research for development be further developed, tested and operationalized in the African context. There is for example need to clarify on issues such as:

- Characteristics of and guiding principles for R4D and innovation systems
- Success indicators of R4D
- How to develop and get an innovation platform functioning to create both the forward and backward linkages for agricultural development.

In addition to the above, the study identified the need to build management capacity of research scientists. All persons consulted emphasize the urgent need to introduce a basic management training programme for the current research managers/leaders at all levels. Furthermore, managing partnerships and alliances as opposed to hierarchies and bureaucracies require changes in mindsets and systemic thinking. Needless to say therefore, additional investment is required to develop and harness the relevant management capacity among the research scientists.

Towards a new agenda for international Partnerships

The Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP) identifies capacity weaknesses and systematic fragmentation between elements of the overall innovation system as some of the main constraints to agricultural sector growth in Africa. Accordingly, institutional reform and capacity strengthening is one of the key intervention areas identified in the Framework for African Agricultural Productivity (FAAP).

There is need to develop new institutional frameworks that will allow African agricultural research actors to benefit from knowledge and information generated in the developed economies. The developed world needs to put policies in place that catalyze spillover of new knowledge and information to Africa. Given the increasing role of the private sector in knowledge, technology and information generation, part of the development assistance could go towards underwriting the cost of these technologies. Within this framework, the public universities in the developed world with a strong third world development research agenda could play a critical role in brokerage and ensuring compliance with intellectual property rights regimes. By the same token, the developing world could play a critical role in catalyzing the spill-ins by reforming their policies and institutions³.

Following from above, a second institutional arrangement would involve supporting the establishment of additional, centres of excellence across Africa, to augment the efforts of

³ For example, review of SPS to facilitate trans-boundary movement of plant and animal materials, ratifying material transfer agreement and developing biosafety policies

AU-NEPAD. In addition to state of the art facilities, these centres would provide conducive environments for scientists from advanced research institutes in the developed world and those from the developed world to work together. More importantly, these centres of excellence would provide opportunities for top rate African research scientists in the Diaspora to come back to Africa and address critical development challenges.

Centres of Excellence have potential for providing a regional critical mass of well trained scientists and the opportunity to pool, human and physical resources. To some extent, the CG Centres assume this function but in the long-run, Africa will require Centres staffed by Africans and funded by African governments out of savings from national programmes. The system will not be affordable if CoEs are simply an additional resource over and above the NARS. ASARECA, through its capacity building initiative, play a critical role in the development of these centres.

The third partnership arrangement framework should focus on facilitating south-south cooperation in capacity development. In the last 3 decades, countries such as Brazil and India have made tremendous progress in the area of science and technology. Part of the official development assistance could be used to facilitate exchange of knowledge technology and information between these emerging economies and Africa. Given that they have a more recent experience with approaches to overcoming development challenges, the south-south cooperation in science and technology could catalyze a “leapfrogging” phenomenon.

The fourth partnership arrangement involves building effective innovation platforms for impact oriented research. AR4D initiatives should not be seen as stand alone; rather they should be part and parcel of integrated regional or national initiatives. Implementation of the CAADP agenda, with the 4 pillars and clearly defined institutional responsibilities provides some direction. Sufficient investments should be made in building viable innovation platforms where incentives for participation by different partners are aligned. At national level there may be need to mainstream AR4D initiatives a into the existing government programmes.

al partnerships

Table 1: Trends in donor support to ASARECA

Donor	OP-1 1994-1996	OP-2 1997-1999	OP-3 2000-2002*	Total US\$
USAID	580,617	1,136,472	2,777,935	4,495,024
IDRC	71,753	201,5699	307,096	580,418
SDC	-	207,247	248,532	455,779
CTA	-	176,210	173,814	350,024
DANIDA	100,000	50,000	142,505	292,505
SIDA	-	284,643	-	284,643
AfDB	-	4,715	262,410	267,124
MSU	-	-	128,944	128,944
EU	-	63,962	61,640	125,602
UNDP	-	6,623	84,251	90,874
GFAR	-	-	34,968	34,968
NARIs	27,000	90,000	130,000	247,000
Total....	779,370	2,221,441	4,352,094	7,352,905

Table 2: ASARECA Networks and partnership Arrangements

Network	Major Donors	Backstopping Institution	Other Partners
The ASARECA Animal Agricultural Research Network (A-AARNET)	European Union	ILRI,	AU/IBAR, GL-CRSP, FAO, NARS
The Africa Highland Initiative (AHI)	Swiss Development Corporation (SDC)	ICRAF	CIP, IFPRI, IPGRI, ILRI, CIAT-TSBF
The Banana Research Network for Eastern and Southern Africa (BARNESA)	INIBAP (IPGRI)	INIBAP	INIBAP (IPGRI), NARS
Eastern and Central Africa Biotechnology and Biosafety Programme (ECABIO)	USAID-EA	Various	USAID/PBS, ILRI, NARS
Coffee Research Network (CORNET)	European Union	CABI Africa	NARS
The Eastern Africa Plant Genetic Resources Network (EAPGREN)	SIDA	IPGRI	NARS
East Africa Root Crops Research Network	USAID-EA	IITA	NARS
East and Central Africa Bean Research Network	USAID-EA	CIAT	NARS
The Eastern and Central Africa Maize and Wheat Network (ECAMAW)	EU	CIMMYT	NARS
-Eastern and Central Africa Program for Policy Analysis	USAID-EA, IDRC, CTA, SDC, EU and BMZ/GT		IFPRI, NARS
The Eastern and Central Africa Regional Sorghum and Millet Network (ECARSAM),	EU	ICRISAT and INTSORMIL	INTSORMIL
The East and Central Africa Rice Research Network (ECARRN)	EU	WARDA	NARS
The Postharvest Processing Network (FOODNET)	USAID-EA	IITA	KACE
The Regional Potato and Sweet potato Improvement Network (PRAPACE)	USAID-EA	CIP	NRI, NARS
Regional Agricultural Informational Network (RAIN)	EU, AFDB		CTA, NARS
Soil and Water Management	EU, IFAD	ICRISAT	IWMI, NARS

Network (SWMNET)			
Trees on-Farm Network (TOFNET)	EU	ICRAF	NARS

Table 3: Services provided to NPP by IARCs

Services provided by backstopping organisations	Potential or real disadvantages to the relationship	Comments
Representation on the ASARECA Board and participation in NPP Regional Steering Committees (review of progress and assessment of forward work plans)	Potential for dominance of the process	No evidence for dominance: CG staff provided technical support. Some CGS projects follow on from previous GCIAR led work.
Participation in priority setting exercise	Potential for dominance of the process	No evidence for dominance. CG staff provided technical support to the prioritisation exercise, and ensure that there is congruence between their (international) mandate and the sub-regional mandate of ASARECA.
Participation in project planning and implementation	<p>Potential for CG Centres taking the credit for work done by Networks and NARS.</p> <p>CG Centre staff increasingly working with farmers, with consequent potential for conflict with NARS mandates.</p>	<p>This occasionally happens when academic publications or conferences do not acknowledge partners.</p> <p>Difficult to determine contribution to impact of ASARECA through ECABREN in overall PABRA programme but members do not see this as an issue.</p>
Technical backstopping to projects (methodologies; analysis, international expertise - e.g. bringing experience from Latin America and Asia to smallholder dairy development in the ECA.	Potential for stunting the growth of NARS expertise	It appears that this is a real effect. The fact that a centre of excellence is present means that the international expertise of national scientists is not developed.
Visits by CG scientists to projects to give advice, Brokering knowledge exchange (e.g. between Asia and Africa on watershed management), Provision of materials (germplasm etc)		Networks benefit from international materials, sharing of knowledge and experiences
Provision of facilities (offices, laboratories, communications, databases,		The facilities are of high quality, contributing to the efficiency of the Coordination Units

printing, legal and diplomatic cover, administrative and logistical support etc)		
Provision of training		<p>Training mostly short-medium term. Either in country or international (NB training outside the sub-region (e.g. at ICRISAT in India) can be cheaper than in Africa.</p> <p>Many training costs are not charged, so get a quality product at well below full economic cost.</p>
Gap-plugging if funding does not come on time		The CG Centres can only provide temporary financial cover if the topic is also one which an ongoing core activity of the CG Centre.

Source: ASARECA end of programme review for the NPP

Table 4: Possible areas of partnerships between the CG centres and ASARECA

CGIAR/ESA Research Flagships	Possible corresponding ASARECA Programmes
1. INRM: Concepts, Resilience and Risk Management	Natural Resources Management and Forestry
2. Information: for Policy, Strategy Formulation and in Scaling Up	Information & Knowledge Management, Policy and Advocacy, TUUSI
3. Agro-biodiversity and Genetic Diversity	Staple Crops, Non-staple Crops, Livestock ,Agricultural Biodiversity and Biotechnology
4. Strategic Research for Agricultural Rehabilitation in Post-Disaster and Post-Conflict Contexts	[Not an explicit ASARECA priority but importance has been discussed]

References

1. Pardey, P. G., J. M. Alston, and R. R. Piggott, eds (2006). *Agricultural R&D in the developing world: Too little, too late?* Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute.
2. ASARECA, 2000 ,Regional Programme to Support Agricultural Research in Eastern Africa, funding proposal to the European Commission
3. ASARECA , 2005. Strategic Plan 2005-2015: Fighting Poverty, Reducing Hunger and Enhancing Resources through Regional Collective Action in Agricultural Research for Development. ASARECEA Secreatariat August 2005. 92pp
4. ASARECA, 2007. Operational Plan, 2007-2011. Towards the Improved Delivery and Impact of Regional Agricultural Research. January 31. 68 pp.
5. ASARECA, 2007. ASARECA Strategic Plan, 2006-2016. Agricultural Research-for-Development in Eastern and Central Africa. 50 pp.
6. ASARECA 2007. Report of the Scoping Study on Capacity Strengthening Needs Assessment in the ASARECA Region
- 7.
8. T. Chancellor, T. Defoer, and J. Mbwika, 2005. First Report of the ASARECA Programme Review and Monitoring Panel. Final Report. 18 February. 101 pp.
9. CGIAR Science Council. 2005. Our Mission.<http://www.sciencecouncil.cgiar.org/who.html>.
10. J. Mukhiibi, W. Otim-Nape and A. Kilewe, 2006. Rationalisation of ASARECA NPPs. Consultancy Report. Final Report. June 26.
11. S. W.Omamo,. X. Diao, S. Wood, J. Chamberlin, L.You, S. Benin, U. Wood-Sichra, and A. Tatwangire, 2006. Strategic Priorities for Agricultural Development in Eastern and Central Africa. IFPRI Research Report No. 150. Washington, DC: IFPRI/ASARECA.