

# Database of PANAP & FNSSA Roadmap Activities

StEPPFoS Deliverable Report: D1.4



Funded by  
the European Union

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe Research and Innovation programme under Grant Agreement No. 101136770

**Disclaimer:** This document reflects only the Authors views, and the European Union is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.



**Dissemination  
Notes**

[www.faraafrica.org](http://www.faraafrica.org) | ISSN 2550-9657 FARA Dissemination Note 00 | 0000

## Deliverable NO: D1.4

### Title: Database of PANAP & FNSSA Roadmap Activities

Funding scheme: Horizon Europe

Project Acronym: StEPPFoS

Project Full Title: Strengthening Evidence-Based Policy Practice for Sustainable Food Systems under the EU-AU Partnership

Grant Agreement n°: 101136770

Project duration: 48 months

Published by the StEPPFoS  
Consortium  
Dissemination Level: **Public**



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe Research and Innovation programme under Grant Agreement No. 101136770

### DOCUMENT INFORMATION

<b>Project number</b>	101136770	<b>Acronym</b>	StEPPFoS
<b>Full title</b>	Strengthening Evidence-Based Policy Practice for Sustainable Food Systems under the EU-AU Partnership.		
<b>Project URL</b>	<a href="https://steppfos.faraafrica.org/#">https://steppfos.faraafrica.org/#</a>		
<b>Document URL</b>			
<b>EU Project Officer</b>	Adelma Di Biasio (REA – EC Jan 2024- Nov 2024) / Celine Dondeynaz (REA - EC) Dec 2024 to date		
<b>Deliverable</b>	<b>Number</b>	D1.4	<b>Title</b>
			Database of PANAP & FNSSA Roadmap Activities
<b>Work Package</b>	<b>Number</b>	WP1	<b>Title</b>
			Evidence to support the development of consortium activities
<b>Date of delivery</b>	<b>Contractual</b>	M12	<b>Actual</b>
			V1 M12/ V2 M28
<b>Status</b>	Version 2		Final
<b>Final review</b>	15/12/2025	<b>Formatting by WP8 (FARA)</b>	15/12/2025
<b>Type of document</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> prototype <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>database</b> <input type="checkbox"/> demonstration <input type="checkbox"/> other		
<b>Dissemination level</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>public</b> <input type="checkbox"/> confidential		
<b>Authors (Main Authors)</b>	Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR-STEPRI) Wilhemina Quaye		
<b>Responsible authors and contributors</b>	<b>Name</b>	Wilhemina Quaye	<b>email</b>
	<b>Partner</b>	Justina Onumah (CSIR-STEPRI) Abdalla Mahama (CSIR-STEPRI) Rose Omari (CSIR-STEPRI) Richard Ampadu-Ameyaw (CSIR-STEPRI)	<a href="mailto:quayewilhemina@yahoo.com">quayewilhemina@yahoo.com</a> <a href="mailto:onumahja@gmail.com">onumahja@gmail.com</a> <a href="mailto:abdalla.mahama@gmail.com">abdalla.mahama@gmail.com</a> <a href="mailto:rose.omari@yahoo.com">rose.omari@yahoo.com</a>

<p><b>Abstract</b></p>	<p>This Deliverable D1.4 is built on Task 1.2 is the development of a database of PANAP and FNSSA roadmap activities. Generally, Task 1.2 seeks to map existing policies, projects and stakeholders of the PANAP network. Building on methods developed by the LEAP4FNSSA project (GA. 817663) that established an open and semi-autonomously updating database of FNSSA Partnership projects, Task 1.2 seeks to create a PANAP policy and policy analysis database that will form the basis for analysis conducted on synergies between PANAP member policies and FNSSA Partnership research and innovation. Drawing from PANAP, Consortium partners and other organizations sources this database will synthesis national, regional and continental policies and policy analysis and thematically and geographically relevant FNSSA Partnership project information. The data collection for this report was achieved through an online survey administered to both PANAP and non-PANAP institutions, including potential PANAP members identified for the expansion of the PANAP network, online data search and key informant interviews. For the first stage, two distinct survey instruments were developed: one targeted at policy-related institutions and the other at non-policy institutions. These draft instruments underwent a rigorous review and validation process by the StEPPFoS project consortium members before being finalized and launched. A total of 80 institutions were targeted for participation, comprising both PANAP members and non-members. Of these, 40 institutions completed and returned the survey, resulting in a 50% response rate. Due to the low response rate, an online search was conducted to increase relevant information on policies. Finally, the key informant interviews were conducted with key experts in Africa food systems to assess the policy effectiveness of relevant in-country policies in the database. Finally, the information collated, formed the database of policies and projects relevant to the African agriculture and food systems. The database presents relevant information on 67 projects and programmes and 99 policies in the agriculture and food systems in Africa. The database presents the project the opportunity to continually populate in an open and semi-autonomous model (Live Google Sheet Link), with the aim of creating a PANAP programmes and policy analysis database and will form the basis for analysis conducted on synergies between PANAP member policies and FNSSA Partnership research and innovation in WP3 and WP4.</p>
<p><b>Keywords</b></p>	<p>database, PANAP, projects, programmes, StEPPFoS</p>

**Disclaimer**

This document reflects only the Authors views, and the European Union is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein

## Index

List of Tables .....	v
Abbreviations .....	vi
1. Introduction .....	1
1.1 Purpose, context and scope of this deliverable .....	1
1.2 Objectives .....	1
2 Methodolgy .....	3
2.1 Study design .....	3
2.1 Data collection.....	3
2.2 Database development .....	6
2.3 Data Limitations.....	7
3. Outcomes.....	8
3.1 Portfolio coverage .....	8
3.2 Status and timing.....	8
3.3 Thematic distribution .....	8
3.4 Geographic scope.....	9
3.5 Funding and Budgets.....	9
3.6 Institutional Networks .....	11
3.7 Analysis of Summary Responses from Key Informant Interviews (KIIs).....	12
4. Conclusion and Synthesis of Outcomes .....	16
5. Recommendations for WP3–WP4.....	19
6. References .....	20
5. Annexes.....	21

5.1 Database of projects and programmes implemented by PANAP and non-PANAP members.....	21
5.2 Policy Profiling Guide.....	21

## List of Tables

Table 1: Summary of Stage 2 Search Criteria and Data Extraction Process .....	6
Table 2: Illustrative Summary of Table .....	10

## Abbreviations

AFAAS	African Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services
AU–EU	African Union – European Union
CCSE	Climate Change and Sustainable Energy
CEE	Central and Eastern Europe
CSIR	Council for Scientific and Industrial Research
EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
FNSSA	Food and Nutrition Security and Sustainable Agriculture
IRC	International Research Consortium
JRC	Joint Research Centre
KEOPS	Knowledge Extract or Pipeline System
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
PANAP	Pan-African Network for Economic Analysis of Policies
R&I	Research and Innovation
StEPPFoS	Strengthening Evidence-Based Policy Practice for Sustainable Food Systems under the EU–AU Partnership
STEPRI	Science and Technology Policy Research Institute
STI	Science, Technology and Innovation
WP	Work Package

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Purpose, context and scope of this deliverable

Data management in Africa's food and agriculture domains. Across Africa, data needed for policy design and implementation are abundant but dispersed (FAO, 2018; Stephenson, 2022). Statistics, programme reports, policy texts, and research outputs are frequently stored in siloed systems, project-specific portals, or offline archives (Craig, 2024). Inconsistent metadata and taxonomies, language diversity, uneven connectivity limit access and periodic website changes result in broken links and constrain effective data informed research to policy interlinkages. Many initiatives duplicate earlier efforts because prior evidence is hard to find or verify. Even when datasets exist, weak documentation of methods and unclear provenance undermine trust and re-use (Arinze, 2024). Finally, the cadence of data production is often misaligned with policy windows, so evidence arrives too late for cabinet notes, budget hearings, or regulatory reviews (Craig, 2024). These issues collectively impede coordination, inflate transaction costs for analysts and officials, and reduce the likelihood that research will translate into sustained practice

A structured, living repository that applies common descriptors, preserves provenance, and surfaces linkages between policies, programmes, projects, and analyses can lower search and coordination costs, improve comparability, and strengthen accountability (Munshi and Singla, 2024). Such a resource is especially valuable where regional and continental priorities require cross-country synthesis and where public resources are limited and must be targeted. The work responds to the need for a coherent view of Africa–Europe research and policy activity in food, nutrition and sustainable agriculture. By collating data entries across countries and regions, the database supports evidence use for planning, coordination and monitoring across the partnership.

### 1.2 Objectives

This report forms part of the deliverables for Work Package 1 (WP1) of the StEPPFoS project. WP1's primary goal is to synthesize and document evidence that will support the development of Consortium activities, laying a foundation for the entire project's success. Specifically, WP1 aims to:

1. Identify existing gaps in institutional capacity for policy impact analysis.
2. Examine gaps in research-policy linkages.
3. Explore synergies and trade-offs between economic and agri-food research and policies.

The findings in this report are based on ongoing tasks under Task 1.2 of the StEPPFoS project and utilize data from the combined survey conducted for both Task 1.1 and Task 1.2. Specifically, this report contributes to Deliverable D1.4, which focuses on developing a comprehensive database of PANAP and FNSSA roadmap activities. Specifically,

1. The purpose of this task is to map existing policies, projects and stakeholders relevant to the PANAP network and its alignment with the FNSSA Partnership.
2. Develop a database of policies and projects with relevant information for members of the PANAP network

Against this backdrop, the database and analysis are intended for PANAP members, ministries and agencies, regional bodies and research organizations, to map existing policies, projects, relevant to the PANAP and related networks. Outputs will feed directly into WP3 (knowledge management, monitoring, evaluation and learning) and WP4 (policy–research uptake) to support synergy identification, coherence tracking and timed decision support.

## 2 Methodology

The study employed a mixed-methods design, integrating both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis techniques. This approach was chosen to enable a systematic mapping and characterization of policies, programmes and stakeholders associated with the PANAP network and their linkages to FNSSA roadmap activities.

### 2.1 Study design

The methodological process of the followed three sequential stages: (i) survey instrument design and administration; (ii) online desk-based data collection; and (iii) key informant interviews (KIIs) for validation and contextual interpretation. This methodological process was designed to ensure

comprehensive coverage of both policy and non-policy actors within and beyond the PANAP network and triangulation of data sources to validate findings across survey, secondary and expert-based methods.

The study further employed descriptive approach that allowed for the categorization of institutional programmes and policy information, providing an overview of the existing policy and project landscape in African food and agriculture systems. The qualitative component, derived primarily from key informant interviews, supported the interpretation of findings by offering contextual insights into policy relevance, effectiveness and implementation.

### 2.1 Data collection

Data for this the database was collected through three main stages.

#### 2.1.1 Stage 1: Survey Instrument Design and Administration

Two tailored online survey instruments were developed to collect information from a wide range of institutions engaged in agricultural and food system policy and research activities. The first instrument targeted policy-related institutions, such as government agencies, ministries and policy think tanks, while the second targeted non-policy institutions, including universities, research organisations and civil-society actors involved in implementation or analysis of agricultural policies and projects.

Each instrument was structured to capture:

- Institutional profile (type, geographical scope, mandate);
- Policy or programme focus areas aligned to FNSSA domains;
- Analytical tools and data resources used for policy analysis;
- Partnership networks, collaborations and funding sources; and
- Challenges and opportunities in evidence-informed policy processes.

Draft instruments were subjected to a rigorous review and validation process by StEPPFoS

consortium partners to ensure relevance, consistency and alignment with project objectives. The validated surveys were subsequently hosted on an online platform (KoboCollect) and disseminated through institutional mailing lists and targeted invitations of the PANAP network. A total of 80 institutions were targeted. Comprising both existing PANAP members and strategically identified non-PANAP members to enable future network expansion. Respondents were purposively selected based on their involvement in agricultural policy formulation, implementation, or research. Of these, 40 institutions completed and returned the survey, representing a 50% response rate. The responses were systematically reviewed, coded and stored in the KoboCollect database.

### 2.1.2 Stage 2: Secondary Data Collection through Online Search

Given the moderate response rate, complementary desk-based research was undertaken to expand the coverage of the database. Of the 40 institutions, 53 projects and programmes were inputted in the first stage and updated to 67 projects and 99 policies, totalling 166 programmes and policies after the second stage. Stage 2 focused on identifying national, regional and continental policies relevant to agriculture and food systems across Africa. Data sources included:

- Official government and intergovernmental portals (AU, RECs, NEPAD, FAO, IFAD, etc.);
- Existing FNSSA and LEAP4FNSSA datasets;
- Institutional repositories, publications and grey literature; and
- Reports from donor-funded and regional agricultural initiatives.

The search process followed a structured multi-layered approach combining keyword-based searches, institutional repository reviews and cross-referencing with existing datasets such as the LEAP4FNSSA dataset. Search strings were formulated around thematic and geographic parameters. Common combinations included:

- “Agricultural policy” + “African country name”;
- “Food security programme Africa,” “Nutrition policy framework,” “Sustainable agriculture plan”;
- “Research and innovation in agriculture Africa,” “Agricultural transformation agenda”;
- “Regional food policy Africa,” “PANAP policies,” “continental agricultural initiatives.

All identified policy and strategy entries were systematically catalogued according to their thematic alignment with FNSSA pillars—Food Security, Nutrition and Sustainable Agriculture—and their geographical coverage (national, regional, or continental). Documents were selected based on the following inclusion criteria:

- Focused on agriculture, food security, nutrition, research, or innovation systems;
- Issued by or involving African governments, regional economic communities (RECs), development partners, or PANAP-affiliated institutions;
- Contained sufficient metadata (e.g., title, implementing body, date and geographic

coverage).

Exclusion criteria included:

- Duplicates of already catalogued FNSSA or LEAP4FNSSA entries;
- Non-African or global initiatives without an explicit African implementation component;
- Documents lacking verifiable institutional or policy ownership.

Searches were limited to credible and authoritative platforms, including:

- Official national government websites and policy portals;
- African Union (AU) and AUDA-NEPAD repositories;
- Regional Economic Communities (RECs) websites (ECOWAS, EAC, SADC, COMESA, IGAD, UMA, CEN-SAD);
- Open-access databases (LEAP4FNSSA platform, AGORA, Google Scholar, ResearchGate and institutional libraries).
- Major development partner portals (FAO, IFAD, AfDB, World Bank, GIZ, EU, IDRC, etc.);

Each identified policy or project document was reviewed for relevance and summarised using a standardised metadata extraction template. Metadata such as publication year, responsible agency, scope, funding source, budget and MEL strategies were documented.

### 2.1.3 Stage 3: Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)

To validate the compiled database and enrich interpretation, key informant interviews were conducted with senior experts across Africa's food systems policy space (*Annex 5.2: Interview Guide*). The interviews were conducted with 7 experts from 4 Africa countries, including Nigeria, Ghana, Kenya and South Africa. Participants included representatives from government ministries/agencies regional organisations, research councils and non-governmental organisations.

The choice of KIIs over focus group discussions (FGDs) was deliberate for three reasons:

- To elicit specialised, high-level insights from experts with direct involvement in policy analysis or programme coordination;
- To accommodate geographically dispersed participants while maintaining depth of responses
- To minimise conformity bias and allow confidential reflections on institutional experiences and policy challenges.

The interviews explored perceptions of policy effectiveness, challenges of implementation, plans for extension and recommendations for improved policy effectiveness in the interviewee's resident African country and regional bloc, for informed contextual insights. The findings were used to validate and contextualise the information compiled through surveys and desk research. .

## 2.2 Database development

After downloading and cleaning the information from the survey, the database structure was developed using Google Sheets, designed for open access, version control and live updating. This approach ensures that the database remains adaptable and scalable over time, enabling easy updates as new data becomes available. The database is organized around 21 key variables, each designed to provide a comprehensive overview of various projects and programs related to agri-food systems. These projects and programs are undertaken by both PANAP and non-PANAP members across Africa.

The 21 variables encompass a wide range of critical aspects, including project objectives, start and end year, thematic area, geographic scope, collaborating institutions, funding and data repositories, among others. By capturing detailed information on these variables, the database offers a clear snapshot of ongoing efforts in the agri-food systems sector, highlighting trends, challenges and gaps in research, policy and implementation.

This structure also allows for the semi-automated addition of new projects and initiatives, with an easy-to-use interface for data entry. As new projects are identified or existing ones evolve, the database can be updated without significant manual intervention, ensuring its ongoing relevance and utility for stakeholders involved in the PANAP network and beyond.

**Table 1: Summary of Stage 2 Search Criteria and Data Extraction Process**

Step	Activity / Focus	Details / Description	Key Outputs
1. Keyword Development	Identify relevant search terms and thematic combinations	Keywords combined agricultural, food system and innovation themes with country and regional identifiers. Examples: “Agricultural policy Ghana,” “Food system strategy Kenya,” “Nutrition plan Africa (regional blocs),” “Sustainable agriculture Africa,” “PANAP projects.”	Comprehensive list of search strings reflecting FNSSA domains (food security, nutrition, sustainable agriculture).
2. Source Selection	Identify credible data sources and repositories	Primary sources: national ministry websites, AU/AUDA-NEPAD, RECs (ECOWAS, EAC, SADC, COMESA, IGAD, UMA, CEN-SAD). Secondary sources: FAO, IFAD, AfDB, GIZ, EU, IDRC, World Bank, RUFORUM, CTA, FARA, AERC, ResearchGate, LEAP4FNSSA database.	Verified list of reliable and authoritative repositories.
3. Inclusion Criteria	Define what to include in the review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Published between 2010–2024.</li> <li>- Direct relevance to food, nutrition and sustainable agriculture (FNSSA).</li> <li>- Produced by African governments, RECs, or development partners.</li> </ul>	High-quality, policy-relevant entries representing recent African agricultural policies and projects.

		- Clear institutional attribution and geographic scope.	
4. Exclusion Criteria	Define what to exclude	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Duplicates from LEAP4FNSSA datasets.</li> <li>- Global initiatives without explicit African implementation.</li> <li>- Unverified or incomplete policy references.</li> </ul>	Reduced redundancy and improved data reliability.
5. Data Extraction	Capture standardised information from documents	<p>21 Extracted data fields included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy/Project Title and Year</li> <li>- Lead Institution(s)</li> <li>- Thematic Area</li> <li>- Geographic Scope</li> <li>- Funding/Partners</li> <li>- Implementation Period</li> <li>- Source Link - Notes/Observations</li> </ul>	Structured metadata for integration into the live Google Sheet database.
6. Quality Control and Coding	Validate and code entries for consistency	Data were cross-checked, de-duplicated and assigned unique IDs. Controlled vocabulary applied for thematic coding (e.g., Food Security, Research, Innovation, Climate, Gender).	Clean, validated dataset ready for triangulation and use in other work packages.

### 2.3 Data Limitations

While the methodology was rigorous and multi-sourced, several limitations are acknowledged. The 50% response rate limited representation from some sub-regions and non-English-speaking countries. Although desk research supplemented this gap, some institutional perspectives may remain underrepresented. Not all African countries have centralised or up-to-date online repositories for policy documents, leading to potential underreporting of newer or locally maintained policies. The nature of interviews, booking online appointments for interviews constrained the number of responding experts, even after several follow-up.

## 3. Outcomes

### 3.1 Portfolio coverage

The database captures a multi-level portfolio of policies/programmes/projects spanning national, regional, and international scopes. In the entries, there is a strong presence of regional/multi-country initiatives (e.g., ABEE across Burkina Faso, Niger, Senegal; BIORISKS across 10 West/Central African countries; UPSCALE across five East African countries) alongside country-specific programmes (e.g., Ethiopia potato systems) and bicontinental coordination platforms (e.g., CEA-FIRST, StEPPFoS) that formalise AU–EU research–policy linkages.

### 3.2 Status and timing

Across the visible entries, the portfolio mixes completed work with a strong pipeline of ongoing initiatives. Items recorded as Ended include: the AfCFTA–Nigeria modelling study (2023–2024); PASEC (2017–2022); CSAT (2019–2023); PAPAPE (2014–2022); SMIL (2019–2023); and PAIRED (2020–2022). In contrast, Ongoing projects span near- and medium-term horizons: ABEE (2019–2024); BIORISKS (2020–2024); CEA-FIRST (2023–2027); UPSCALE (2020–2025); PATH2DEA (2023–2025); the Agroecology Partnership (2024–2030); StEPPFoS (2024–2027); MATS (2020–2025); Ethiopia Potato Systems (2023–2025); REEDSAAC (2021–2024); and Prodaf (2020–2025). The time window therefore stretches from legacy programmes that concluded in 2022–2023 (e.g., PAPAPE, CSAT, SMIL) to long-horizon platforms running to 2030 (Agroecology Partnership). This temporal spread offers immediate completion evidence for uptake analysis while ensuring continuity for medium-term synergy (e.g., CEA-FIRST, StEPPFoS, UPSCALE).

### 3.3 Thematic distribution

Entries cluster strongly around the thematic pillars such as food security and nutrition, sustainable agriculture, agroecology, climate resilience and policy/market systems. Reflecting a deliberate alignment with AU–EU priorities and the FNSSA Roadmap. Several records run beyond mid-term project cycles into 2030, indicating a pipeline of long-horizon initiatives that will remain relevant for subsequent work packages on synergy analysis and uptake.

At project level, Food Security, Nutrition and Safety and Sustainable Agriculture and Agroecology are the most frequently occurring tags, often paired with Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation. This pattern reflects interventions that link production and ecosystem outcomes with nutrition and resilience (e.g., push–pull agroecology scaling, seed/breeding systems, and climate-risk management). A smaller but strategically important strand relates to Agricultural Economics, Policy and Market Access, particularly in initiatives focused on the design and governance of trade regimes (e.g., H2020–MATS) and in AU–EU coordination platforms (CEA-FIRST; StEPPFoS), which embed research–policy interfaces within the FNSSA roadmap.

In the policy entries visible, the dominant labels include “Agriculture and Food Security” and

“Sustainable Development and Environmental Conservation,” covering measures such as watershed management, irrigation, climate-resilience programming, and sectoral investment frameworks (e.g., Uganda’s IFPA-CD, EURECCCA, FIEFOC-2; SACRiAC). These policy themes are broader in scope and often multi-sectoral; several records include budget envelopes and implementing authorities and are framed at national level with multilateral co-financing.

### 3.4 Geographic scope

The portfolio spans national, regional, and bicontinental scales, with a strong concentration of multi-country networks alongside country-specific programmes. West and Central Africa host several regional initiatives: ABEE operates across Burkina Faso, Niger, and Senegal with a stated “Regional” scope, targeting productivity and resilience through breeding systems. BIORISKS extends further, covering ten countries—Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, DRC, Gabon, Ghana, Côte d’Ivoire, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, and Togo—to manage cassava viruses, fall armyworm, and fruit flies under a regional coordination frame. In East Africa, UPSCALE is explicitly regional across Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, and Uganda, scaling push–pull agroecology for sustainable intensification and resilience. Alongside these, bicontinental platforms—CEA-FIRST and StEPPFoS—are framed as AU–EU or International efforts that operationalise FNSSA research–policy collaboration and list participating countries across Africa and Europe (e.g., Germany, Ghana, Ireland, Côte d’Ivoire, Kenya, Italy, Netherlands, Senegal, Spain, Uganda, UK). Nationally focused entries provide depth for implementation analysis, notably Ethiopia’s potato technology and knowledge programme (National: Ethiopia) and a set of Niger programmes spanning resilience and productivity (e.g., PASEC, CSAT, SMIL, REEDSAAC, Prodaf) recorded as National or Niger-centred in the geographic field. Collectively, the database documents territorial coverage from single-country interventions to cross-regional disease, breeding and agroecology networks, while AU–EU platforms provide an intercontinental layer for coordination and policy interface—all as recorded in the “Implementing Countries” and “Geographic Scope” fields of the sheet.

### 3.5 Funding and Budgets

The observed database’s financing architecture combines a few large, multi-country platforms with a long tail of smaller, country-level or thematic projects. This architecture delivers scale, infrastructure and cross-border coordination where big platforms operate. However, it also creates dependency risks and uneven absorptive capacity. That is, when major calls cycle or priorities shift, pipelines for continuation, localisation and maintenance can stall. Budget size shapes project logic; sizeable envelopes encourage multi-country consortia, diversified work packages and formal learning architectures, while lean budgets prioritise proof-of-concept, targeted capacity building or narrowly bounded policy support.

Thematically, budgets tend to gravitate toward production-side and agroecological innovation,

with thinner allocations for market governance, trade/logistics, and nutrition-sensitive interventions. However, agronomic gains can stall if downstream price, standards, or distribution bottlenecks remain unaddressed.

As well, an observed trend was the persistent single-source financing with limited co-funding from domestic actors (See Table 2). Without national or regional co-investment, ownership, longevity and post-project scaling are harder to secure, and promising outputs risk remaining project-bound. Transaction costs are another concern: complex, multi-donor compliance regimes can divert managerial bandwidth from evidence generation and stakeholder engagement. Conversely, where harmonised instruments exist (e.g., coordinated calls or joint programming), portfolios exhibit better alignment, fewer duplicates and clearer pathways to policy.

Where budgets are specified in-sheet, financing ranges from national allocations to major framework investments. Regional breeding and bio-risk management programmes list multi-million-euro envelopes funded by the European Union: ABEE is recorded at €8,771,930, and BIORISKS at €5,000,000. The East African UPSCALE project is listed under Horizon 2020 with €7,600,000, while PATH2DEA cites support from the EU (Grant 101060789) and Swiss SERI (Grant 22.00535) totalling €1,999,980. The flagship Agroecology Partnership is recorded under Horizon Europe with a budget of €120,000,000 and participation across multiple European countries (with FNSSA relevance through agroecology transition and infrastructures). National-level financing also appears: Ethiopia’s potato programme lists a public fund entry of 60,000 (currency not specified in the visible cell). Trade-policy work (MATS) shows a textual total of €4,000,000 in the description but €7,000,000 in the budget column, a discrepancy that should be reconciled before publication. Beyond EU sources, the sheet records World Bank support (e.g., PASEC), Norwegian cooperation (e.g., CSAT, REEDSAAC), USAID (e.g., SMIL), and the Islamic Development Bank (e.g., PAPAPE).

**Table 2: Illustrative Summary of Table**

Title (Acronym)	Years	Status	Geographic scope	Funder (where shown)	Budget (where shown)
ABEE (West Africa Breeding Networks)	2019–2024	Ongoing	Regional (BF, NE, SN)	EU	8,771,930
BIORISKS	2020–2024	Ongoing	Regional (10 W/CA countries)	EU	5,000,000
CEA-FIRST	2023–2027	Ongoing	International (AU–EU)	EU/AU	—

UPSCALE	2020–2025	Ongoing	Regional (ET, KE, RW, TZ, UG)	H2020	7,600,000
PATH2DEA	2023–2025	Ongoing	Regional (EU countries)	EU + SERI	1,999,980
Agroecology Partnership	2024–2030	Ongoing	Regional (EU/UK) (FNSSA relevance)	Horizon Europe	-
StEPPFoS	2024–2027	Ongoing	International (AU–EU)	European Commission	—
Ethiopia Potato Systems	2023–2025	Ongoing	National (Ethiopia)	Gov. Ethiopia	60,000
MATS	2020–2025	Ongoing	Multi-country (Africa & EU)	European Commission	7,000,000
PASEC (Niger)	2017–2022	Ended	National (Niger)	World Bank	—
CSAT (Niger)	2019–2023	Ended	Regional (noted “Niger” regional) +	Norwegian Coop.	—
PAPAPE	2014–2022	Ended	Regional (BJ, BF, CM, ML, NE)	Islamic Dev. Bank	11,000*

Source: StEPPFoS D1.4 Database

([https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1spaSp\\_BVyUSEb2ZS0rNsB2dWT66Vavi81nLefyeM42Q/edit?gid=0#gid=0](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1spaSp_BVyUSEb2ZS0rNsB2dWT66Vavi81nLefyeM42Q/edit?gid=0#gid=0))

### 3.6 Institutional Networks

Consortium composition in the database places universities and research organisations at the core of most collaborations, with additional participation from government agencies, regional bodies, non-governmental organisations, and private actors. This structure supports methodological rigour, data stewardship, and cross-country comparability, and it provides clear points of contact for scientific leadership. The presence of public authorities and farmer or value-chain organisations varies across entries, which suggests that pathways from research to operational uptake may take different forms depending on the institutional mix.

Network patterns indicate the recurrence of several “hub” institutions that appear across multiple projects. These hubs facilitate transfer of methods, continuity of thematic attention,

and rapid mobilisation for new calls. At the same time, a long tail of partners occurs in only one or two initiatives, which broadens geographical and organisational representation. Regional inclusivity at the project level is supported by multi-country designs and, in some cases, incentives to include partners from different Regional Economic Communities. Nevertheless, the aggregate portfolio shows uneven participation across African subregions, which implies that knowledge flows and relationship capital are denser in some corridors than others.

Linkages between international platforms and national implementation arrangements are present in several records through advisory groups, policy forums, and technical working links. Where these interfaces are explicit, the route from evidence to administrative action is easier to trace; where they are implicit, translation is more dependent on ad hoc engagement during or after implementation. Data governance emerges as a shared concern across different actor types, with repositories, indicators, and access conditions recorded in project materials.

Overall, the institutional configuration visible in the portfolio is conducive to generating comparable evidence and facilitating cross-project learning. The extent to which results enter routine policy and market practices appears associated with the early involvement of implementing authorities and value-chain stakeholders, the presence of recognised coordination platforms, and clear arrangements for data sharing and curation.

### 3.7 Analysis of Summary Responses from Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)

This section presents a structured synthesis of insights from seven Key Informant Interviews conducted with experts from Nigeria, Ghana, Kenya, and South Africa. The interviews were guided by the Policy Profiling Guide to ensure consistency while allowing respondents to reflect on practical experiences of agrifood policy implementation. Rather than assessing individual policies, the analysis distils cross-cutting patterns related to governance arrangements, resource mobilisation, delivery strategies, data use, learning processes, and prospects for reform. Collectively, the KIIs provide an implementation-focused perspective that complements the documentary and portfolio evidence presented elsewhere in the study.

#### 3.7.1 Policy Implementation and Institutional Arrangements

Interviewees consistently emphasise that institutional arrangements are central to the effectiveness of agrifood policy implementation. Across contexts, respondents describe implementation outcomes as closely linked to how authority, responsibility and accountability are distributed among national ministries, semi-autonomous agencies and subnational institutions. Where roles are clearly articulated and supported by formal coordination mechanisms, policies are more likely to progress from planning into sustained delivery. Conversely, ambiguity in mandates is repeatedly identified as a structural weakness that undermines implementation.

A recurrent issue highlighted across countries is the presence of overlapping responsibilities among institutions responsible for agriculture, environment, trade, and local economic

development. Interviewees note that such overlaps often lead to duplication of activities, delays in decision-making, or reluctance among institutions to assume ownership of implementation tasks. These challenges are particularly evident in decentralised systems, where national policies rely on subnational actors whose authority, incentives, or technical capacity may not be fully aligned with policy ambitions.

Respondents also stress that institutional coordination is often treated as an informal or ad hoc process rather than being embedded in durable governance structures. While inter-ministerial committees or technical working groups may exist on paper, their effectiveness depends on regular engagement, clear mandates, and access to decision-making authority. Without these conditions, coordination platforms risk becoming consultative rather than operational.

These insights underscore that institutional clarity is not merely an administrative concern but a core determinant of policy functionality. The interviews suggest that strengthening agrifood policy implementation requires deliberate investment in governance architecture, including mechanisms that link national strategy-setting with subnational delivery and feedback.

### 3.7.2 Budgetary Visibility and Resource Mobilisation

Budgetary arrangements emerge from the interviews as one of the most decisive factors shaping policy implementation outcomes. Across all country contexts represented, respondents emphasise that policies with clearly defined budget lines or medium-term funding commitments are significantly more likely to be implemented consistently and at scale. Financial visibility within national budgeting systems is viewed as a signal of political commitment and an enabler of coordination across implementing agencies.

Interviewees distinguish between nominal funding commitments and effective resource mobilisation. In several cases, policies are described as formally approved but operationally constrained due to delayed disbursements, rigid financial procedures, or reliance on short-term project financing. Such conditions create uncertainty for implementing agencies and weaken incentives for long-term planning, particularly at subnational levels where resource constraints are most acute.

External financing plays an important role in agrifood systems, yet respondents caution that dependence on donor-funded projects can fragment implementation. While external resources often support innovation and piloting, interviewees note that alignment with national budget cycles and systems is critical for sustainability. Where externally financed initiatives are not integrated into domestic expenditure frameworks, they risk remaining isolated or temporary.

These observations reinforce the idea that implementation challenges are rarely due to a lack of ideas or policy intent, but rather to the absence of predictable and flexible financing arrangements. Ensuring that agrifood policies are embedded within national and subnational budgeting processes is therefore seen as a prerequisite for moving from pilot interventions to systemic impact.

### 3.7.3 Delivery Strategies and Partnerships

Respondents describe a relatively consistent set of delivery strategies across countries, reflecting shared constraints and opportunities within African agrifood systems. Common approaches include the use of demonstration or learning sites, extension and advisory services, and the establishment of producer-led or multi-stakeholder platforms. These mechanisms are valued for their ability to translate policy priorities into locally relevant practices and to facilitate learning among farmers, service providers, and other actors.

Partnerships are repeatedly highlighted as a practical necessity rather than an optional enhancement. Interviewees note that collaboration with private-sector actors such as input suppliers, aggregators, processors, and off-takers, is often essential for extending reach and ensuring market linkage. Civil society organisations and producer organisations are similarly viewed as critical intermediaries, particularly in contexts where public extension capacity is limited.

Digital tools are increasingly incorporated into delivery strategies, including advisory platforms, registries, and monitoring systems. However, respondents caution against treating digitalisation as a standalone solution. Effectiveness depends on interoperability with existing systems, clarity around data governance, and the capacity of users and institutions to maintain and adapt digital tools over time. In the absence of these conditions, digital interventions risk adding complexity without improving outcomes.

These reflections suggest that effective agrifood policy implementation relies on hybrid delivery models that combine public oversight with private and community-based channels, while remaining sensitive to local institutional realities.

### 3.7.4 Monitoring, Evaluation, and Data Constraints

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) is universally recognised by interviewees as essential for accountability and learning, yet its practical application is described as uneven. Respondents report that while M&E responsibilities are often formally assigned, the systems supporting them are frequently underdeveloped. Weak administrative data, inconsistent baselines, and fragmented information systems are cited as persistent challenges across countries.

Interviewees emphasise that data constraints limit not only impact assessment but also adaptive management. Without reliable and timely information, implementing agencies struggle to adjust strategies, reallocate resources, or demonstrate results to decision-makers. In some cases, data collection is described as compliance-driven, aimed at reporting rather than informing operational decisions.

Interoperability emerges as a particular concern, with sectoral data systems often operating in isolation. This fragmentation complicates efforts to capture the multi-dimensional nature of agrifood systems, which span production, markets, nutrition, and environmental outcomes. Respondents also note that subnational data gaps are especially pronounced, undermining the ability to tailor interventions to local conditions.

The interviews highlight a gap between formal M&E frameworks and their functional use, suggesting that strengthening data systems is as much an institutional and governance challenge as a technical one.

### 3.7.5 Policy Impact, Learning, and Stakeholder Feedback

When discussing policy impact in general terms, interviewees describe progress as incremental rather than transformative. Respondents acknowledge achievements such as expanded service delivery, improved coordination among selected actors, and increased awareness or adoption of new practices. However, they also highlight enduring structural constraints that limit broader system-level change.

A key issue raised across interviews is the limited institutionalisation of learning. While stakeholder consultations and feedback mechanisms are increasingly common, respondents question the extent to which these inputs lead to substantive policy adjustments. Feedback from farmers, producer organisations, and local implementers is often collected but not systematically analysed or integrated into revision processes.

Interviewees attribute this gap to several factors, including rigid policy frameworks, limited incentives for adaptation, and weak linkages between implementers and policy designers. As a result, policies may continue along established trajectories even when evidence suggests the need for adjustment.

These observations suggest that improving agrifood policy outcomes requires not only better implementation capacity but also stronger mechanisms for institutional learning and responsiveness to stakeholder experience.

### 3.7.6 Timing, Evidence Uptake, and Policy Cycles

Timing emerges as a critical but often underappreciated factor influencing evidence uptake. Interviewees consistently emphasise that policy influence is most likely when research outputs align with formal planning, budgeting, and regulatory cycles. Opportunities for uptake are described as occurring at predictable moments, such as strategy reviews, budget preparations, or legislative amendments.

Respondents note that evidence produced outside these windows faces significant barriers to uptake, regardless of its relevance or quality. This highlights the importance of synchronising research and analytical work with policy calendars, an insight that has practical implications for programme design and evaluation.

In addition to timing, interviewees stress the importance of how evidence is packaged. Concise technical notes, policy briefs, and decision-support tools are viewed as more actionable than lengthy reports. These formats are most effective when they clearly articulate operational options, resource implications, and institutional requirements.

The interviews suggest that improving evidence uptake requires both strategic timing and deliberate translation of research into policy-relevant formats.

### 3.7.7 Implications for Agrifood Policy Implementation in Africa

Taken together, the KII findings reinforce patterns observed in the broader database while providing critical contextual depth. They suggest that effective agrifood policy implementation depends less on the articulation of objectives and more on the institutional, financial, and procedural conditions that enable action. Clear mandates, predictable financing, coordinated delivery arrangements, and functional data systems emerge as recurring prerequisites.

The interviews further highlight that research-to-policy pathways are most effective when evidence is aligned with policy cycles, translated into operational formats, and supported by mechanisms for learning and adaptation. Capacity-building that reaches subnational implementers and producer organisations is also seen as essential for bridging the gap between national policy intent and local practice.

Overall, the KIIs underscore a central insight for agrifood policy implementation in African countries: durable impact is achieved not through isolated interventions, but through sustained attention to governance, resources, timing, and institutional learning across the policy lifecycle.

## 4. Conclusion and Synthesis of Outcomes

In conclusion, this report plays a key role in the StEPPFoS project's Work Package 1 through the creation of a comprehensive database under Deliverable D1.4. The database maps a wide range of projects and programmes related to agri-food systems across Africa, implemented by PANAP and non-PANAP institutions. Data for the database was collected in three stages. Stage 1 encompassed data from two surveys, which identified capacity gaps and mapped relevant projects and policies (See section 4.2 of D1.1) and stage two using a desk survey (See section 1.2 of D1.2) and stage 3 was validation by national stakeholders. The database organizes this information across 21 key variables, providing an in-depth view of thematic areas. Insights from Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) complement this mapping by providing practitioner-level perspectives on how these projects and policies are implemented in practice, particularly in relation to governance arrangements, institutional roles, and delivery capacity across African agrifood systems.

The results highlight extensive mapping of projects and programmes in agriculture and food systems across Africa, implemented by both PANAP and non-PANAP institutions. The database reveal that the programmes and projects implemented focus on thematic areas such as food security, sustainable agriculture, climate change, rural livelihoods and more, with the possibility to specify additional areas as needed. KII responses reinforce that while thematic coverage is broad and well aligned with development priorities, implementation effectiveness involves institutional clarity, coordination and resource availability.

- Projects were predominantly aligned with national and regional goals, emphasizing the need to address food system challenges in diverse African contexts while fostering collaboration with European partners through the EU-AU framework. The combination of African and European countries working together on these projects demonstrates a model of cross-continental cooperation aimed at addressing shared global challenges. Funding of projects and programmes are largely funded by external donor funding, particularly from the EU, with limited contributions from local governments and private sector actors. Validation through KIIs indicates that this reliance on external funding, while enabling innovation and piloting, can constrain sustainability where projects are not embedded within national budgeting frameworks or aligned with domestic fiscal cycles.
- The list of implementing countries for the projects spans a diverse set of nations, primarily focusing on Africa but with notable participation from European countries as well. The countries involved reflect a mix of both direct beneficiaries of the projects and those providing technical or financial support. The majority of the implementing countries are located in sub-Saharan Africa, particularly in regions like West, East and Southern Africa.
- The review of policy documents also covered a broad range of national and regional policies across Africa and Europe, focusing primarily on food and nutrition security, agricultural innovation, digital transformation and knowledge exchange. Policies

examined included national development plans, sector-specific strategies (e.g., agriculture, health, education) and institutional frameworks that support evidence-informed decision-making and inter-institutional collaboration.

- Moreover, the reviewed policies showed that most policies were funded by a diverse range of international and national institutions, predominantly led by the European Union. Additional support came from multilateral development banks, bilateral agencies and also, national governments, particularly from Africa and Europe. Reflecting a strong international commitment to advancing food systems transformation, agricultural innovation and knowledge exchange across regions.
- Nonetheless, a validation of the funding results by national experts revealed the perception that, the unbalanced nature of policy funding between international partners and local governments often resulted in the unsustainability of policy implementation. However, the involvement of a diverse array of collaborating institutions in the programmes, both regional and international, enhances the effectiveness and scope of the projects. Ensuring a holistic approach to tackling agriculture, food security and climate change challenges in Africa.
- The study finds that, by pooling expertise across different fields such as, policy advocacy and research to capacity building and technical innovation, can drive sustainable, impactful change through programmes to policies. The collaborations foster knowledge exchange, strengthen regional cooperation and ensure that solutions are relevant, scalable and able to meet the long-term needs of the African continent. Further, the translation of research into practice is most tractable when evidence is aligned with formal policy and budgeting cycles and packaged into concise, standardised formats that support operational decision-making
- Furthermore, the database shows the importance of diverse collaborating institutions. Ranging from regional research centres to international organizations. These partnerships are instrumental in driving holistic solutions by pooling expertise in policy, research, capacity building and technical innovation. This collaborative approach not only strengthens regional cooperation but also ensures that the solutions developed are relevant, scalable and able to meet Africa's long-term agricultural and food security needs. Interviewees emphasise that continuous capacity building is critical for closing the gap between national policy intent and local practice.
- Finally, the database provides a valuable tool for continuous mapping of the programme and projects context for agrifood systems in Africa and lays the groundwork for influencing the direction of future synergies and collaborative efforts within the PANAP network and the broader agricultural development community. When interpreted alongside KII insights, the database also functions as an implementation intelligence resource, supporting more realistic programme design, improved timing of evidence for policy uptake, and stronger alignment between research outputs, governance arrangements, and delivery systems.

## 5. Recommendations for WP3–WP4.

To meet WP3’s knowledge management (KM/MEL) and WP4’s evidence-to-uptake objectives, PANAP should deliver a single open, interoperable platform that standardises evidence across AU–EU FNSSA, surfaces synergies, and times decision products to policy windows.

1. **Platform architecture and interoperability:** Build a modular platform with unified search/graph views, offline-first access and automated backups. Ensure the platform works on low bandwidth, mobile devices, and in major working languages (EN/FR/PT/AR), with clear summaries before any long document.
2. **Evidence quality, synthesis and decision products:** Apply an evidence-grading introduction and automated dashboards or maps to generate regular, concise decision notes and instrument comparisons.
3. **MEL system and learning loops:** Track policy and project KPIs, contribution analytics, and outcome harvesting, publishing a quarterly learning digest with a transparent issues log.
4. **Synergy detection and prioritisation:** Use illustrations to flag policy–project clusters, and funding priorities as well as budget windows.
5. **Capacity, incentives & community management:** Provide role-specific training, recognition, and micro-grants/contracts to sustain continuous high-quality data curation and synthesis.
6. **Governance, sustainability and risk:** Establish a knowledge management, monitoring, and evaluation steering group with a sustainability plan and an active risk or incident management regime. Capture negative or mixed results and implementation hurdles. These prevent repetition of costly mistakes and are often more actionable than success stories.
7. **Monitoring indicators:** Track metadata completeness and publication latency, synergy ticket throughput, policy briefings delivered before windows, citations of outputs, and dataset/API reuse.
8. **Protect people and organisations:** Apply clear consent and redaction rules for KII material and sensitive policy drafts so contributors feel safe to share candid insights.
9. **Mind regional balance and inclusion:** Track which countries, RECs, and stakeholder groups are under-represented and plan targeted outreach so the platform does not mirror existing inequities.

## 6. References

1. Arinze, E. D. (2024). A thorough examination of Open Data Initiatives in East Africa, focusing on how they improve the accessibility of data.
2. Craig, S. L., Eaton, A. D., Brooks, A. S., McInroy, L. B., Lozano-Verduzco, I., Austin, A., ... & McDermott, D. T. (2024). Building bridges and breaking down silos: A framework for developing interdisciplinary, international academic-community research collaborations for the benefit of sexual and gender minority youth. *Psychology & Sexuality*, 15(1), 19-37.
3. FAO, F. A. O. S. T. A. T. (2018). Food and agriculture organization of the United Nations. Rome, URL: <http://faostat.fao.org>, 403.
4. Munshi, A., & Singla, A. R. (2024). Economics of Integrated Research Data Management: Enhancing Efficiency and Impact. *Annals of Library and Information Studies*, 71(4), 392-405.
5. Stephenson, P. J., Bakarr, M., Bowles-Newark, N., Kleinschroth, F., Mapendembe, A., Ntiamoa-Baidu, Y., ... & Teferi, T. (2022). Conservation science in Africa: mainstreaming biodiversity information into policy and decision-making. In *Closing the Knowledge-Implementation Gap in Conservation Science: Interdisciplinary Evidence Transfer Across Sectors and Spatiotemporal Scales* (pp. 287-321). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

## 5. Annexes

### Annex 1. Database of projects and programmes implemented by PANAP and non-PANAP members

[https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1spaSp\\_BVyUSEb2ZSOrNsB2dWT66Vavi81nLefyeM42Q/edit?gid=0#gid=0](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1spaSp_BVyUSEb2ZSOrNsB2dWT66Vavi81nLefyeM42Q/edit?gid=0#gid=0)

### Annex 2: Policy Profiling Guide

This Policy profiling guide serves as a framework for the Key Informant Interviews. It ensures focus and consistency across interviews while still allowing flexibility for deeper exploration.

#### 1. Policy Overview

- Policy name
- Enacting authority (ministry/agency)
- Date of enactment
- Implementation period (start – end date)
- Status (active, under review, expired)

#### 2. Policy Objectives and Scope

- Primary goals
- Key focus areas (e.g., food security, climate resilience, agribusiness, rural development, etc.)
- Targeted stakeholders (e.g., farmers, agribusinesses, policymakers, researchers, women, youth, etc.)
- Special provisions (for smallholder farmers, women, youth, etc.)
- Implementation and Governance
- Lead implementing institution(s)
- Budgetary allocation/funding sources
- Key implementation strategies
- Partnerships (e.g., Private Sector, NGOs, International Agencies)
- Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms
- Key performance indicators
- Legal and Regulatory Framework
- Legal basis (laws, acts, regulations supporting the policy)
- Enforcement mechanisms
- Penalties for non-compliance (if applicable)
- Alignment with regional and international commitments (e.g., AU Malabo declaration, SDGs), conflicts or overlaps with other policies

### 3. Policy Impact and Effectiveness

- Observed outcomes since implementation
- Key achievements and successes
- Challenges or barriers to implementation
- Have there been any stakeholder feedback and influence on policy adjustments and what were they?
- Existing reports or evaluations on the policy's effectiveness

### 4. Future Prospects and Policy Reforms

- Plans for extension, revision, or phasing out
- Emerging trends to be integrated (e.g., digital transformation, climate change adaptation)
- Do you have any recommendations for improvement with the policy?

## Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa

No. 9 Flower Avenue, New Achimota Mile 7, PMB CT 173, Accra, Ghana

**Telephone:** +233 302 772823 | +233 302 779421

**Fax:** +233 302 773676

**Email:** [publications@faraafrica.org](mailto:publications@faraafrica.org)

**Website:** [www.faraafrica.org](http://www.faraafrica.org)

**K-Hub:** <https://datainforms.faraafrica.org>

**Library:** <https://aaspace.org>



Funded by  
the European Union

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe Research and Innovation programme under Grant Agreement No. 101136770