



Fostering Higher Education, Science, Technology and Innovation

Joint Stakeholders Conference of the
ACP-EU EDULINK and Science & Technology Programmes
Brussels, 26 – 28 October 2011

CONFERENCE REPORT

EDULINK – ACP S&T PMUs

November 2011



“This report represents solely the views of its author and cannot in any circumstances be regarded as the official position of the European Commission or as a formal commitment from the EC”

Report prepared by the Programme Management Units of the EDULINK and the ACP-S&T Programmes.

<http://www.acp-edulink.eu/>

<http://www.acp-st.eu/>

CONTENTS

- 1. TECHNICAL REPORT 4
 - 1.1 Conference agenda..... 4
 - 1.2 Target group 5
 - 1.3 Objectives 5
 - 1.4 Conference assessment..... 5
- 2. CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS 7
 - 2.1 Day I: EDULINK conference..... 7
 - 2.2 Day II: Joint Conference EDULINK and ACP S&T Programmes 8
 - 2.3 Day III: ACP S&T Programme Conference..... 10
 - 2.4 Questions & Answers 12
 - 2.5 Bilateral meetings..... 15
- 3. APPENDICES 16
 - 1. Conference Agenda 16
 - 2. List of Participants 25
 - 3. Conference evaluation questionnaire 29
 - 4. Evaluation results 31
 - 5. Comments and suggestions from the questionnaires..... 32
 - 6. Project monitoring table..... 36
 - 7. Financial Report checklist 37
 - 8. List of bilateral meetings 39

1. TECHNICAL REPORT

1.1 Conference agenda

This was the second Joint Stakeholders' Conference of the two ACP-EU Programmes. Originally, each programme used to organize its own individual event. For the meeting of 2010, it was decided to combine these events into a single 3-day conference, which was held between the 26th and 28th of October 2010 at the ACP House in Brussels. The joint solution was appreciated as it allowed to share views among different projects and address issues from different angles, as well as to make the best use of the organization and resources allocated to the event.

For this reason, the Steering Committees of the two programmes have decided to repeat the scheme and organize a second joint conference to be held in autumn 2011. Like the first one the year before, this conference was held between the 26th and 28th of October 2011 at the ACP House in Brussels.

The agenda was structured over three days, with one day dedicated to each of both Programmes and one day for joints sessions, as follows:

- 26 October: EDULINK
- 27 October: EDULINK + ACP S&T
- 28 October: ACP S&T

However, the content of all sessions was defined with the purpose of attracting the interest of all participants, whether working in one of the two grant programmes or not. Emphasis was given to general topics (sustainability, networking, project management, etc.) rather than to sectorial or technical issues.

On the first day the conference addressed the issues of the projects' sustainability and the achievement of their goals, taking into account the experience of several EDULINK projects which are already concluded or close to their end.

The joint sessions on the second day explored other common issues, such as institutional networking and project reporting. In addition, it offered an overview of other ACP-EU cooperation programmes in the education sector.

The third day, dedicated to the ACP S&T, provided an overview of two years of project experiences. Some projects presented their findings and an external party gave an analysis on best practices of capacity building in STI on the basis of a survey hold among the ACP S&T projects. Another external consultant introduced the mid-term review of the ACP S&T Programme which is currently underway. The day was closed with an open debate on how to address important issues during the finalisation of the projects.

During the whole conference the project managers had the opportunity for bilateral meetings with the programmes PMUs, ACP and EC officers, to review specific contractual and reporting issues.

See attached Draft Agenda (Annex 1).

1.2 Target group

The core target group of this 2nd joint conference was the representatives (coordinators or partners) of all 66 EDULINK projects including those which are already concluded and of the 36 projects financed under the ACP S&T Programme. All project representatives were invited to participate to the whole conference.

In addition, an open invitation has been sent to numerous stakeholders and interested institutions (representatives of other HEIs, S&T organisations, NGOs, ministries, diplomatic offices, etc.) all over the EU and ACP countries, based on the programmes mail lists which include more than 3,000 names.

The total number of participants was 142, of which 88 represented the projects of the two programmes. There were 46 participants from EDULINK projects, 34 participants from ACP-S&T projects and 8 working in both programmes. Other 54 participants came from different organizations (embassies, other programmes, etc.).

See attached List of participants (Annex 2).

1.3 Objectives

The main objective of the conference was *the evaluation of the implementation and achievements of the projects and the assessment of their sustainability after the end of the EC financing.*

Further objectives of the conference were:

- To exchange views and experiences between beneficiaries of the two ACP-EU programmes.
- To learn from other projects
- To have opportunities for networking and contact building
- To review critical issues which are affecting the implementation of the projects and find common solutions
- In particular, to review and improve the financial management and reporting of the projects
- To highlight the efforts and the impact on the ACP countries of the ACP – EU cooperation in the sectors of Education, Science and Technology.
- At individual level, to meet the PMU, ACP and EC officers and clarify contractual issues

Based on the feedback received from the participants (see following chapter) these objectives can be considered widely achieved.

1.4 Conference assessment

A few days after the event, an evaluation questionnaire was sent to all projects representatives who participated to the conference (*see Annex 3*). The questionnaire included 16 questions to be rated with a qualitative score: *very good* or *sufficient* or *insufficient*. It also provided space for comments and suggestions.

We have received 32 completed questionnaires. The results are summarized in the table *in Annex 4*. The qualitative rating system has been transformed into a simple numeric rating system to allow the calculation of the total score for each question¹.

The overall evaluation is very positive. All questionnaires reported a wide majority of *very good* scores, with some *sufficient* scores and very rare *insufficient* scores (as the total high score reached in all questions, over 0.70, can prove).

The conference agenda was highly appreciated (score 0.94), as well as the **structure of conference** - 3 days, shared conference (score 0.86). It is a clear indication that the joint conference should be repeated, and that the agenda should keep covering topics of interest for all participants, regardless the programme they are involved in.

A confirmation of these conclusions comes from the fact that the majority of participants highly appreciated the conference as an **opportunity to share views with other projects** (score 0.91) and as **opportunity to learn from other projects** (score 0.86).

The comments of participants stress on the importance of the conference as **networking opportunity**. Some of them suggest to better structure the networking opportunity, through initiatives such as individual presentations by all project representatives, the organization of thematic workshops, the invitation of more participants from the partner institutions, the organization of a cultural tour, etc. For this purpose, the organization of the sub-group meetings should have been better structured.

The participants also appreciated the opportunity for **meeting the PMU, ACP and EC officers and clarify contractual issues** (score 0.85) as it was done in several bilateral meetings (*see chapter 2.5*), and welcomed the **presentations on technical and financial reporting**. Some participants wrote that the requirements and contractual commitments on reporting are clearer now than before.

The standard of the **moderators** was judged very high (score 0.89). The **quality of the presentations** was also generally appreciated. Most participants found the technical presentations very interesting and some of them were surprised to see how many links exist between projects from apparently different fields.

Some participants suggested to concentrate the agenda on **project results** and to discuss further how to exploit successful projects after the project end. It seems clear that the participants wish to use the conference to learn from the best experiences and to establish **networking** relations aimed in particular to find **sustainable solutions** for their projects.

The comments and suggestions from the questionnaires are reported in Annex 5.

¹ The conversion system is the following: very good = 1.00; sufficient = 0.50; insufficient = 0.00. The closer to 1.00 a total score is, the higher the number of *very good* scores received.

2. CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

2.1 Day I: EDULINK conference

The conference opened with welcome addresses by Mrs Michèle Dominique Raymond, Assistant Secretary-General, Political Affairs and Human Development, ACP Secretariat, and Mr. Jerome Lebouc, Regional Programmes Sub-Saharan Africa and ACP wide, Development and Cooperation – EuropeAid, European Commission. They also opened the other two days of conference.

Session I: Planning for sustainability – the future of the EDULINK projects

The objective of this session was to assess the sustainability of the EDULINK projects after the end of the EDF financing. Two completed projects and two projects in their closing phase were invited to present their experience.

Marisa De Rosa, Interuniversity Consortium of Bologna (Italy) represented the project: *“MEDISHARE - Improving capacity of Health Sector Researchers in ACP HEIs by sharing worldwide recognised IT Tools and Experiences”*, which ended in November 2010. The project has set up an online/offline platform to collect and analyse epidemiological data on HIV/AIDS, Malaria and TB in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda. MEDISHARE represents a sustainable model for Health Data Management in Africa as it cuts costs on local infrastructure and technological obsolescence by using centralized shared services (cloud computing) and allowing its re-use for different countries or diseases.

David Anipa, University of Science & Technology (Ghana), represented the project *“REEP - Renewable Energy Education Project”*. The project developed curricula and training programmes in Renewable Energy (Solar PV, biofuels, wind) for engineers and technicians, undergraduate and postgraduate students and professional staff in public and private sector in Ghana and Burkina Faso. The presentation stressed that strong collaboration between HEI and Industry, particularly in research, is strategic to ensure the sustainability of the project.

Hilary Jones and Cathy Svensson, University of Roehampton (UK), represented the project: *“Bridging the gap at pre- and primary school through training for special educational needs”*, which ended in August 2010. The project developed a model (accredited Professional Development Certificate) in Inclusive Education for capacity building in mainstream pre and primary school teachers in Grenada and Seychelles. The involvement of stakeholders and the application of the Train-the-Trainer model are key factors for the sustainability of the project.

Raphael Wahome, University of Nairobi (Kenya), represented *“PREPARE-PhD -Promoting Excellence in Ph.D. Research Programmes in East Africa”*. The project created Ph.D. training systems in agriculture, veterinary science, human nutrition, natural resource management and related fields, through strengthening local research capacity and regional networking in Eastern Africa. The project has demonstrated that good practices at PhD training pay; however, it has not lasted long enough to build a tradition or culture of these approaches as well as to develop productive supervisor-student interactions.

The presentations were followed by questions and answers, moderated by **David Rampersad**, University of the West Indies, Trinidad and Tobago.

Session II: Achieving the academic and institutional goals of the EDULINK projects

The objective of this session was to share views about the approach to achieve the project goals, the constraints met and the solutions found, and to recommend best practices.

Gianni Vaggi, University of Pavia (Italy) presented the project “*TNet - Trade and Development Training, Research and Policy Network*”. The project aims to improve policy making on trade and development in ACP countries and to strengthen regional integration among eastern African economies. The analysis of the project experience focused on management issues such as partners’ collaboration and administration difficulties.

Dina Bak, ISET (Mozambique), represented the project: “*IU-IEPALA-R.B.-UCM, ISET and UAN produce excellent teacher trainers for Mozambique and Angola*”. The project objective is to strengthen the capacity of ISET, Mozambique, and pave the way for equal capacity in Angola, and to produce excellent trainers of primary school teachers, through cooperation between the three HEIs. The presentation illustrated the ISET approach and methods for training the teachers based on student-centered teaching, investigation, action-research and specialization.

Peter Weesie, University of Groningen (the Netherlands), presented: “*ESPRIT: Environmental Sustainability: Priority education and Research in the Tropics*”. The project objective is to strengthen education, research and outreach capacity and synergy of the African partner institutions to work for sustainable dry-land management in Benin, Burkina Faso and Cameroon. The presentation concentrated on project management and in particular on the difficulties faced in the financial management of the grant contract.

Marco Galeotti, University of Udine (Italy) presented: “*LIVE - Linking Institutions for Veterinary Education in Africa*”. The project seeks the improvement of university education models, programmes and management methods for veterinary medicine and animal production sciences, in five African countries. The presentation provided several useful recommendations for achieving the project goals, stressing on experienced management, strong networking and partners’ ownership.

The presentations were followed by questions and answers, moderated by **Paul Kibwika**, Makerere University (Uganda).

2.2 Day II: Joint Conference EDULINK and ACP S&T Programmes

Session I: Towards an effective institutional network

Setting up a strong institutional network is a key success factor for the beneficiary projects. Two representatives from each programme presented their experience about networking and collaboration, the difficulties encountered and the solutions found towards improved and/or sustainable networks.

Andrew Lawrence, University of the West Indies (Trinidad & Tobago), represented the EDULINK project “*Development of an MSc in Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Development for the Caribbean*”. Mr Lawrence offered an interesting presentation, outlining his networking experience based on the EDULINK project. The presentation highlighted the process from Project Partnership to building an effective Institutional Network, with an ultimate goal toward a wider Regional Network, with the relevant constraints and recommendations.

Wolfram Schmidt, Federal Institute for Materials Research and Testing – BAM (Germany), presented the ACP-S&T project “*Spearhead network for innovative, clean and safe cement & concrete technologies (SPIN)*”. Mr. Schmidt stressed the importance of networking, joint dissemination activities, and spin-off activities. Problems within the partnership were discussed as well as the ways these were solved. A strong dependency on the project coordinator resulted in a lot of administrative work and financial pre-loading of the partners from the coordinator’s own financial sources. The African partners’ lack of ability to conduct independent research was a concern that certainly needs to be tackled in this and future projects.

Apostolos Malamakis, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (Greece), representing the EDULINK CODWAP project, made a presentation titled “*Working with several institutions towards an effective institutional network: Some EU-project based lessons*”. The presentation centred on extra-institutional barriers, in particular administrative and regulatory ones, faced by large EU-ACP consortia.

Pieter van der Bijl, Southern African Research and Innovation Management Association –SARIMA (South Africa), presented the ACP-S&T project “*The improvement of Research & Innovation Management Capacity in Africa and the Caribbean for the successful stimulation and dissemination of research results (RIMI4AC)*”. The large size of the consortium and an inaccurate planning at the beginning of the project resulted in problems with financial reporting and tiresome communications with partners. A plea was made for contract training possibilities, more information from the Programme, and flexibility in the starting date of possible future contracts.

The presentations were followed by questions and answers, moderated by **Asad Mohammed**, University of the West Indies, St. Augustine, Trinidad and Tobago.

[Session II: Other ACP-EU cooperation programmes in the field of Higher Education](#)

Joachim Fronia, from the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA), made a presentation on other EU initiatives that support higher education in the ACP regions, including the Intra-ACP Academic Mobility Scheme and the Erasmus Mundus programme. The first programme is financing mobility throughout the ACP countries for students at master and doctoral levels and academic staff, with an annual budget of 9 million euro; the second programme offers master and doctoral courses, mobility schemes and scholarships to students throughout the world. The lot allocated for the ACP countries by the Erasmus Mundus programme for 2012 is 6million euro.

[Session III: Technical and financial reporting](#)

This session was specially prepared by the PMUs and the ACP Secretariat for the project coordinators of the two programmes, in order to review the reporting requirements, discuss the problems encountered from both sides and produce recommendations for improving the reporting process.

Gerard der Ouden, PMU, ACP S&T Programme, opened the session with a presentation on technical reporting. The presentation explained the approach to technical reporting based on the use of the project description and log-frame, included in each grant contract, and included a useful template for technical reporting (see Annex 6).

Daniele Mazzanti, PMU, EDULINK, followed with a presentation on financial reporting. The presentation stressed on the need of setting up a good project management and administration system at the outset of the grant project, in order to improve the accounting and reporting capability

of the beneficiary, and be able to comply with the contractual reporting requirements. The presentation also included a useful check-list for financial reporting, to be used by the grant beneficiaries before issuing the financial report (*see Annex 7*). The text of this presentation was distributed among the participants.

The presentations were followed by an animated session of questions and answers, moderated by **John Kakule**, project manager of the two programmes at the ACP Secretariat.

2.3 Day III: ACP S&T Programme Conference

Session I: Two years of experiences of the projects: results achieved

The objective of this session was, with the majority of the projects approaching their final stage, to look at the project goals: What results have been achieved so far? How are they being used and by whom? Will all results have been achieved by the end of the project?

Philip Stevenson, University of Greenwich – Natural Resources Institute (NRI-UoG), United Kingdom, represented the project “*African Dryland Alliance for Pesticidal-Plant Technologies: A network for optimising and promoting the use of indigenous botanical knowledge for food security and poverty alleviation in Africa (ADAPPT)*”. He compared the Programme objectives with the outputs from the project and presented some difficulties with respect to legalising results in African countries. The network is very active and was very visible in several conferences. Training of postgraduate students and other target groups is on track. A good number of publications has been made and is in progress. So far, the outcomes are encouraging.

Faridath Aboudou, Laboratoire d’Analyse Régionale et d’Expertise Sociale (LARES), Bénin represented the project “*Réseau d’analyse des facteurs d’offres vivrières, de mise en marché et de diversification agricole (AFOMDnet)*”. She compared the envisaged Programme results with the outputs from the project. Specific reference was given to the project website, the training workshops, and the Internet capitalizing tools. More trainees participated than was anticipated, and one training component has even been incorporated in the curriculum of one Partner University. So far, the outcomes are promising.

Mafaniso Hara, University of the Western Cape, Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies (PLAAS), South Africa, represented the project “*Defragmenting African Resource Management (DARMA)*”. He gave an overview of the project and showed an example of the project approach in one case area. Problems were related to the production and the approval of the annual report, getting the approval of the Reserve Bank of South Africa for transfer of funds to partners, and the late receipt of the Year 2 funding. There is confidence among all partners that the project objectives will be achieved within the project period.

Angela Melodia, Cooperazione Rurale in Africa e America Latina (ACRA), Italy, represented the project “*Recherche appliquée pour la valorisation et la transformation des ressources naturelles dans un processus de lutte contre la pauvreté au Tchad et Cameroun*”. She commented on the slow start of the project due to long-distance communication difficulties, the complexity of performing high-level research in the rural environments, and the challenges of sustainability and the transfer of results to the local populations. The project is well on its way and its results are well utilised by the final beneficiaries. Linkages with the Programme objectives were clearly stated.

The presentations were followed by questions and answers, moderated by **Adrian Trotman**, Caribbean Institute for Meteorology and Hydrology (CIMH), Barbados.

Session II: Inventory of good practices from projects in STI capacity building

An analysis of the feedback received from a mid-term survey from the ACP S&T projects resulted in a preliminary grouping of capacity building models that could be applied in future actions by the participating institutions and/or other potential organisations, and as such could contribute to increasing the Programme's impact.

Christine Robinson, Technology Innovation Information (Luxemburg), presented the outcomes of her analysis. A full report will follow and will be published on the ACP S&T website.

The presentations were followed by questions and answers, moderated by **Gerard den Ouden**, PMU, ACP S&T Programme.

Session III: Reflections on the Mid-Term Review of the ACP Science and Technology Programme and expectations on the next Call for Proposals

Giorgio Brandolini, leader of the review team, introduced the mid-term review which is currently underway. It is an ideal opportunity for a programme to take stock of its achievements, to assess the likelihood of attaining its outcomes and impact, to reflect on the strengths and weaknesses and to strategize about the best options for the future. This review is also an opportunity to use the knowledge gained during the first half of implementation to validate assumptions made in the original analysis and to adjust accordingly. The review team may need to finetune activities and outputs to achieve the programme's intended outcomes on schedule. Suggestions and recommendations made in the review report should address the programme's performance as well as the possibility for a next Call for Proposals.

The presentations were followed by an animated questions and answers session, moderated by **John Kakule**, project manager of the ACP S&T Programme at the ACP Secretariat.

Session IV: What to do in the last year? Collaboration among project participants, projects and programme visibility, management of results and impacts: open discussion

The objective of this session was, following the previous presentations of this day, for the project representatives to comment on the topics presented, as well as to report similar and/or their particular issues/problems/concerns regarding their projects. In an open debate, moderated by **John Briggs**, University of Glasgow (UK), recommendations were provided to assist in the management of the projects and results.

From the discussion, which was wide-ranging though supportive, four main themes emerged: the balance between achieving the project objectives and the Programme objectives, the challenges of capacity building with or without research training and time period needed to be able to perceive its impact, the sustainability at the end of the current Programme/projects of the networks that have been established, and the dissemination of results, findings and outcomes.

Closing of the Joint Conference

The conference was closed at 17:00 on October 27th by Michèle Dominique Raymond, Assistant Secretary-General, Political Affairs and Human Development, ACP Secretariat, and Jérôme Lebouc, Regional Programmes Sub-Saharan Africa and ACP wide, Development and Cooperation – EuropeAid, European Commission.

2.4 Questions & Answers

The lively *Questions & Answers* sessions gave wide opportunity to all participants to present their ideas and to make questions to the speakers and the programme managers (ACP, EC, PMU officers). A synthesis of the main comments and recommendations emerged from the sessions is presented below.

Sustainability of the projects

Support by government and local authorities is generally needed to achieve sustainability.

The ownership of partner institutions is an essential factor for sustainability. Involvement of the institutions' directors at the highest level is to be pursued to support the project.

Market demand is also necessary to stimulate the sustainability of the projects.

Difference must be made between sustainability of results and activities. Some results in education programmes stay after the project end (e.g. *students educated*), while the concerned activity might be discontinued (e.g. *teaching provided*).

To improve the chances of sustainability, projects should put more emphasis on *training the trainers* rather than *training the students*.

A sustainable partnership needs sustainable activities.

The partners need to invest in own capacity building allowing them to enter in the international scientific community.

Managing the projects

Frequent meetings among partners (more than the once a year as normally planned) are required to manage the projects effectively.

Ownership of the project must reside in the institutions and not remain with the individual staff, as often happens. However, a very good and motivated project manager is needed to give a strong impulse and guidance to the implementation.

Academic staff managing the projects, although highly skilled in technical design and implementation, often lacks the necessary administrative skills to manage an EC funded project. Therefore, good administrative staff to support the academic coordinator is needed.

Adequate incentives should be offered to supervisors and project staff to ensure quality.

Once the grant contract is signed, the grant beneficiary must work within the set contractual rules (including the EC rules and regulations) which cannot be changed. Therefore, be pragmatic and realistic when planning and managing the implementation, but at the same time be ready to cope with unexpected situations.

The projects in the ACP S&T Programme are not primarily focused on research, but on the capacity building component with respect to science, technology and innovation within the levels of: (a)

institution, administration and policy making; (b) academic research and technology; and (c) business and civil society.

Networking and partners participation

Projects with partnership built long before the project have much more chance to be effective. The choice of good partners for the consortium is a key success factor for the projects.

The smaller consortia are more effective than the larger ones. Increasing the number of partners, although it might enlarge the impact of the project, will drastically reduce the chance of an effective implementation. However, an increased south-to-south partnership will benefit the know-how transfer.

Make an intelligent use of associates, who can be a valuable added resource and easier to manage than partners.

For partnerships to be strong and sustainable, frequent personal contacts (*face to face*) among the partners is needed. Distance contacts are not sufficient. For this reason, partnerships between neighboring countries have far more chances to survive than those between remote countries.

A bottom-up approach to build partnership is preferred. The focal points of the partnership should be academic, and a collegiate management approach is more effective than a top-down institutional approach. However, once a solid academic partnership has been established, an institutional endorsement is needed.

In general, the technical management of the partnership is effective, while the administrative management is poor.

A clear Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the grant beneficiary and each partner is necessary to set the basis of an efficient collaboration. Even more, due to the legal and financial implications of the grant contract, legal contracts between partners could also be used, although enforcing legal requirements between remote institutions is not easy. Therefore, such MoUs or contracts are not sufficient to guarantee a full and responsible collaboration by all partners, which requires in addition a proper ethical framework.

IT facilities for long distance partnership are not always effective as needed, due to e.g. power failures; therefore, it is suggested to develop off-lines tools.

Financial management and reporting

Key problems in project financial management are the use of different accounting systems by the partners and poor administration systems, which lead to poor reporting to the lead institution.

Due to the slow grant financing mechanism, it becomes mandatory for the consortium to pre-finance the project, to avoid delays in the implementation of the work plan. When the partners do not have the financial capacity for that, the whole financial burden lays on the lead institution, which therefore must have the administrative capacity to manage such a task.

The consortium should set-up a project financial management and reporting system from the start of its implementation.

Reporting (financial and narrative) from the partners to the lead institution should be done frequently during the year (even monthly). If possible, set up an internal on-line reporting system.

The lead institution should involve the external auditor in the project from its start. The auditor could provide advice on financial issues whenever needed and perform an interim audit every year, to help improving the financial management and reporting process.

Lead partners should have a good project-based accounting system. All partners should have good accounting staff allocated to the project.

When preparing the reports, the beneficiary must always follow the grant contract and its annexes. In narrative reporting, follow the project description and make use of the logframe to provide indicators of achievement. In financial reporting, adhere strictly to the budget, use the correct templates and follow the instructions.

The grant beneficiaries should indicate the PMUs when they expect to submit their interim and final reports.

The audience asked for a checklist or other sort of instrument that would assist the grant beneficiary in correctly completing the reporting documents. Such check-list was distributed by the PMU as part of the presentation on financial reporting.

Next Calls for Proposals

The EC should simplify the administrative requirements for grant contracts. More flexibility should be given to the grant beneficiary to adjust the project set-up (partnerships, work plan, budget, etc.) during its implementation, to quickly respond to changing needs.

The duration of the tender should be extended to allow the applicants to establish solid partnerships.

The guidelines for the call should be clearer, including the evaluation criteria.

More emphasis is needed to promote the Calls in the ACP regions and provide training in proposal drafting.

A checklist of successful projects proposals, e.g. in the form of case studies, would be welcomed.

It is important for all partners to meet each other during the preparation of the proposal before the submission deadline.

Project monitoring should be clearly described in the proposal.

In the selection of the projects, stress the solidity of the partnership and its chances for sustainability.

A substantial budget to include sufficient management and administrative staff for the consortium should be included in the grant contracts.

The planned duration of the grant contracts should be extended since the current maximum period of 3 years is too short for capacity building projects to achieve their results. In general, all projects need about six months as inception phase, before starting the activities.

Be aware of the different academic cycles between the northern and southern hemisphere when defining the project time plan.

Furthermore, a mechanism to renew the grant contracts should be put in place to ensure the consolidation of the results being achieved.

Do not sign the grant contracts in December.

A specific starting date for the project should be negotiated between the grant beneficiary and the Contracting Authority.

The PMU should have more staff to allow faster processing of beneficiaries' requests and reports.

A workshop between PMU and beneficiaries' project managers should be organized at the start of the implementation phase and repeated on a yearly basis, so to ensure proper transfer of knowledge on contractual and financial management and reporting.

2.5 Bilateral meetings

The two PMUs, with the ACP Secretariat and the EC officers used the occasion for bilateral talks with several projects. These meetings were extremely useful for the project managers as they received indications and clarifications on contractual and reporting issues.

The list of the people met, with projects' titles and numbers, is in Annex 8.

1. Conference Agenda



Fostering Higher Education, Science, Technology and Innovation

**Joint Stakeholders Conference of the
ACP-EU EDULINK and Science & Technology Programmes**

26 – 28 October 2011

**ACP House, Room C, Avenue George Henri 451, 1200 Brussels,
Belgium**

- AGENDA -

Objectives

The objective of the Joint Stakeholders Conference is to allow project participants from the ACP-EU collaborative programmes EDULINK and the ACP Science and Technology Programme meeting each other and becoming acquainted with both programmes which have many similarities (programme structure, Call for Proposals, management of contracts). Through the exchange of experiences and information, project participants will gain knowledge on appropriately managing their projects and disseminating knowledge and results.

Since 2006, EDULINK has held three Calls for Proposals. A new Call for Proposal is expected to be launched by the end of 2011. The three Calls for Proposals have awarded 66 grant projects, for a total financing from the EDF of € 30 M. 30 projects have been finalised so far and 36 will end between December 2011 and December 2012.

The ACP S&T Programme has only held one Call for Proposals (in 2008) from which 36 proposals were granted (€ 32 M; financed by the EDF and the general EC BUDGET). One of these finished last year and all others will have been finalised by the end of 2012 – beginning of 2013.

The objectives of both programmes have their own specificities:

- EDULINK's overall objective is to foster capacity building and regional integration in the field of higher education through institutional networking. Its specific objective is to support a higher education system of quality, which is efficient and relevant to the needs of the labour market, and consistent with socio-economic development priorities of ACP countries.

- The overall objective of the ACP S&T Programme is to support ACP countries in formulating and implementing science and technology policies that can lead to sustainable development and to poverty reduction through economic growth and progressive integration in the world economy. The purpose of the Programme is to strengthen the internal science and technology capacity of ACP countries at: (a) Institutional, administrative and policy making levels; (b) Academic research and technology; and (c) Business and civil society.

The two programmes have in common the fostering of capacity building in the ACP regions and countries, either in the domain of Education or in the domains of Science, Technology and Innovation (STI). The grant beneficiaries are sometimes the same universities or university platforms in ACP and EU countries. In addition, among the grantees of the ACP S&T Programme also belong other public, academic, private and civil sector organizations.

After respectively 4 (EDULINK) and 2 years (ACP S&T) of working experience, all on-going and completed projects should be in a position to see whether they are on track within the scope of the Programmes and if they are achieving their own specific objectives. This conference will provide the opportunity to exchange experiences, to increase the knowledge on project management and outcomes, and to make links for future collaborations.

This Joint Stakeholders Conference will be set up in a consecutive nature with a bridge day in-between, enabling both programmes to tackle programme-specific issues as well as to deal with matters of common interest.

Wednesday 26 October	
09:00 – 09:30	Registration
09:30 – 10:00	Opening of the EDULINK Conference
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Ms. Michèle Dominique Raymond, Assistant Secretary-General, Political Affairs and Human Development, ACP Secretariat – Mr. Jérôme Lebouc, Regional Programmes Sub-Saharan Africa and ACP wide, Development and Cooperation – EuropeAid, European Commission
10:00 – 11:15	Planning for sustainability – the future of the EDULINK projects
	<p><i>The objective of this session is to assess the sustainability of the EDULINK projects after the end of the EDF financing. Two completed projects and two projects in their closing phase will present their experience. They will report about the results achieved by the project members, the continuation of their partnership and their plans to guarantee its sustainability in the long term.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Ms. Marisa De Rosa, CINECA Interuniversity Consortium, Bologna, Italy: <i>“MEDISHARE - Improving capacity of Health Sector Researchers in ACP HEIs by sharing worldwide recognised IT Tools and Experiences”</i> – Mr. David Anipa, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science & Technology, Ghana: <i>“REEP - Renewable Energy Education Project”</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Questions and Answers</i>
11:15 – 11:45	Coffee Break
11:45 – 13:00	Planning for sustainability (<i>continued</i>)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Hilary Jones and Cathy Svensson, University of Roehampton, London, UK: <i>“Bridging the gap at pre- and primary school through training for special educational needs”</i> – Mr. Raphael Wahome, University of Nairobi, Kenya: <i>“PREPARE-PhD - Promoting Excellence in Ph.D. Research Programmes in East Africa”</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Questions and Answers</i> <p>Moderator: Mr. David Rampersad, The University of the West Indies, St. Augustine, Trinidad and Tobago</p> <p>Rapporteur: EDULINK PMU</p>
13:00 – 14:30	Lunch Break

14:30 – 16:30	Achieving the academic and institutional goals of the EDULINK projects
	<p><i>Some representatives of on-going projects will report on their approach to achieve their goals. They will also report on constraints met and solutions found, and will recommend best practices. Their experience will be the basis for the discussion with the other project managers and stakeholders, aimed at identifying the best solutions for achieving the academic and institutional goals of the EDULINK projects.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Mr. Gianni Vaggi, University of Pavia, Italy: “<i>TDNet - Trade and Development Training, Research and Policy Network</i>” – Ms. Dina Bak, ISET, Mozambique: “<i>IU-IEPALA-R.B.-UCM, ISET and UAN produce excellent teacher trainers for Mozambique and Angola</i>” – Mr. Peter Weesie, University of Groningen, The Netherlands: “<i>ESPRIT: Environmental Sustainability: Priority education and Research in the Tropics</i>” – Mr. Marco Galeotti, University of Udine, Italy: “<i>LIVE - Linking Institutions for Veterinary Education in Africa</i>” <p style="padding-left: 40px;">➤ <i>Questions and Answers</i></p> <p>Moderator: Paul Kibwika, Makerere University (Uganda). Rapporteur: EDULINK PMU</p>
16:30 – 17:00	Coffee Break
17:00 – 19:00	Work sessions for participants representing EDULINK projects
	<p>Bilateral meetings</p> <p>The representatives of the EC, ACP Secretariat and the EDULINK PMU will use the occasion for bilateral talks with some projects. The time schedule will be arranged during the conference.</p> <hr/> <p>Sub-group meetings</p> <p>EDULINK beneficiaries involved in similar thematic projects have the opportunity to meet and discuss on common issues. The time schedule will be arranged during the conference.</p>

Thursday 27 October

09:00 – 09:30	Registration
09:30 – 10:00	Opening of the Joint Conference EDULINK and ACP S&T Programmes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Mr. Jérôme Lebouc, Regional Programmes Sub-Saharan Africa and ACP wide, Development and Cooperation – EuropeAid, European Commission – Dr. Mohamed Ibn Chambas, Secretary-General ACP Secretariat (tbc)
10:00 – 11:15	Towards an effective institutional network
	<p><i>Working with several institutions in a network has a multitude of advantages with respect to synergies in performing activities and expanding knowledge. But there are also the extra tasks of coordinating plans and activities, managing other people, frequently adjusting time schedules, to name a few.</i></p> <p><i>Some projects will tell their story about networking and collaboration, the difficulties encountered and the solutions found towards improved and/or sustainable networks. From the debate, the participants will gain knowledge on the creation of suitable partnerships, formalising the relations, overcoming constraints and obtaining quality deliverables.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Mr. Andrew Lawrence, University of the West Indies (UWI), Trinidad & Tobago – “<i>Development of an MSc in Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Development for the Caribbean</i>” – Mr. Wolfram Schmidt, Federal Institute for Materials Research and Testing (BAM), Germany – “<i>Spearhead network for innovative, clean and safe cement & concrete technologies (SPIN)</i>” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Questions and Answers</i>
11:15 – 11:45	Coffee Break
11:45 – 13:00	Towards an effective institutional network (<i>continued</i>)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Mr. Avraam Karagiannidis, Mr. Apostolos Malamakis, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece: “<i>Working with several institutions towards an effective institutional network: Some EU-project based lessons</i>” – Mr. Pieter van der Bijl, Southern African Research and Innovation Management Association (SARIMA), South Africa - “<i>The improvement of Research & Innovation Management Capacity in Africa and the Caribbean for the successful stimulation and dissemination of research results (RIMI4AC)</i>” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Questions and Answers</i> <p>Moderator: Mr. Asad Mohammed, University of the West Indies, St. Augustine, Trinidad and Tobago</p> <p>Rapporteur: EDULINK and ACP S&T PMUs</p>
13:00 – 14:30	Lunch Break

14:30 – 15:15	Other ACP-EU cooperation programmes in the field of Higher Education
	<p><i>This session will provide an overview of other EU-ACP initiatives that support higher education in the ACP regions, including the Intra-ACP Academic Mobility Scheme and the Erasmus Mundus programme.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Mr. Joachim Fronia, Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Questions and Answers</i> <p>Moderator: Ms. Michèle Dominique Raymond, Assistant Secretary-General, Political Affairs and Human Development, ACP Secretariat.</p> <p>Rapporteur: EDULINK PMU</p>
15:15 – 16:00	Coffee Break
16:00 – 17:30	Technical and financial reporting
	<p><i>Reporting is a contractual obligation and the main communication tool between the beneficiaries and the Contracting Authority. It is also an essential monitoring tool for all actors involved. This session will highlight the reporting requirements, including problems encountered and solutions found, examples of good practices and recommendations to improve the reporting process. Through the exchange of experiences and information, project participants will gain knowledge on appropriately monitoring and reporting on their project activities and results.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – EDULINK and ACP S&T PMUs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Questions and Answers</i> <p>Moderator: Mr. John Kakule, ACP Secretariat</p> <p>Rapporteur: EDULINK and ACP S&T PMUs</p>
18:00 – 20:00	Reception
	Foyer ACP House

Friday, 28 October	
08:30 – 09:00	Registration
09:00 – 09:30	Opening of the Conference ACP S&T Programmes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Ms. Michèle Dominique Raymond, Assistant Secretary-General, Political Affairs and Human Development, ACP Secretariat – Mr. Jérôme Lebouc, Regional Programmes Sub-Saharan Africa and ACP wide, Development and Cooperation – EuropeAid, European Commission
9:30 – 11:30	2 years of experiences of the projects: results achieved
	<p><i>With the second year coming to an end, the majority of the projects are approaching the final stage of their projects. When looking at the project goals: What results have been achieved so far? How are they being used and by whom? Will all results have been achieved by the end of the project?</i></p> <p><i>Expected outcome: Through the exchange of experiences and information, project participants will gain knowledge on appropriately managing their projects and staying on track with the focus on project and programme objectives.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Mr. Philip Stevenson, University of Greenwich – Natural Resources Institute (NRI-UoG), United Kingdom – “African Dryland Alliance for Pesticidal-Plant Technologies: A network for optimising and promoting the use of indigenous botanical knowledge for food security and poverty alleviation in Africa (ADAPPT)” – Ms. Faridath Aboudou, Laboratoire d’Analyse Régionale et d’Expertise Sociale (LARES), Bénin – “Réseau d’analyse des facteurs d’offres vivrières, de mise en marché et de diversification agricole (AFOMDnet)” – Mr. Mafaniso Hara, University of the Western Cape, Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies (PLAAS), South Africa – “Defragmenting African Resource Management” – Ms. Angela Melodia, Cooperazione Rurale in Africa e America Latina (ACRA), Italy – “Recherche appliquée pour la valorisation et la transformation des ressources naturelles dans un processus de lutte contre la pauvreté au Tchad et Cameroun” <p style="padding-left: 40px;">➤ <i>Questions and Answers</i></p> <p>Moderator: Mr. Adrian Trotman, CAMI Rapporteur: ACP S&T PMU</p>
11:30 – 12:00	Coffee Break

12:00 – 13:00	Inventory of good practices from projects in STI capacity building
	<p><i>Based on the analysis of the feedback received on a quick survey from the ACP S&T projects and on the information provided in their first interim reports, the issues dealing with capacity building in the domain of STI will be discussed.</i></p> <p><i>Expected outcome: Results from this study can result in capacity building models that can be applied in future actions from the participating institutions and/or other potential organisations, and as such contribute to increasing the Programme’s impact.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Ms. C. Robinson, Technology Innovation Information (TII) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Questions and Answers</i> <p>Moderator and Rapporteur: ACP S&T PMU</p>
13:00 – 14:30	Lunch Break
14:30 – 15:30	Reflections on the Mid-Term Review of the ACP Science and Technology Programme and expectations on the next Call for Proposals
	<p><i>A mid-term review is a learning process and an ideal opportunity for a programme to take stock of its achievements, to assess the likelihood of attaining its outcomes and impact, to reflect on the strengths and weaknesses and to strategize about the best options for the future. This review is also an opportunity to use the knowledge gained during the first half of implementation to validate assumptions made in the original analysis and to adjust accordingly. The review team may need to fine tune activities and outputs to achieve the programme’s intended outcomes on schedule. Suggestions and recommendations made in the review report should address the programme’s performance as well as the possibility for a next call for Proposals.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Mr. Giorgio Brandolini, leader of the review team <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Questions and Answers</i> <p>Moderator: John Kakule, ACP Secretariat</p> <p>Rapporteur: ACP S&T PMU</p>

15:30 – 16:30	What to do in the last year? Collaboration among project participants, projects and programme visibility, management of results and impacts: open discussion
	<p><i>Following the previous presentations, projects' representatives will have the opportunity to comment on the topics of the first session and on related ones, as well as to report similar and/or their particular issues/problems/concerns regarding their projects. Moreover, recommendations will be provided to assist in the management of the projects and results.</i></p> <p><i>Expected outcome: Through the exchange of experiences and information, project participants will gain knowledge on appropriately managing their projects in the contract and post-contract phases.</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">➤ <i>Open debate</i></p> <p>Moderator: Mr. John Briggs, University of Glasgow, United Kingdom Rapporteur: ACP S&T PMU</p>
16:30 – 16:45	Closing of the Joint Conference
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Ms. Michèle Dominique Raymond, Assistant Secretary-General, Political Affairs and Human Development, ACP Secretariat – Mr. Jérôme Lebouc, Regional Programmes Sub-Saharan Africa and ACP wide, Development and Cooperation – EuropeAid, European Commission
16:45 – 17:15	Coffee break
17:15 – 19:00	Work sessions for participants representing ACP S&T projects
	<p>Bilateral meetings</p> <p>The representatives of the EC, ACP Secretariat and the S&T PMU will use the occasion of the conference for bilateral talks with some projects. The time schedule will be arranged during the conference.</p> <hr/> <p>Sub-group meetings</p> <p>Programme's beneficiaries involved in similar thematic projects have the opportunity to meet and discuss on common issues. The time schedule will be arranged during the conference.</p>

2. List of Participants

<i>First name</i>	<i>Last name</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>Programme</i>
Blandine	Martin	Belgium	Both programmes
Bruno	Dujardin	Belgium	Both programmes
Ablasse	Bilgo	Burkina Faso	Both programmes
Heiner	Michel	Germany	Both programmes
Asad	Mohammed	Trinidad & Tobago	Both programmes
David	Rampersad	Trinidad & Tobago	Both programmes
Wellington	Ekaya	Uganda	Both programmes
John	Briggs	United Kingdom	Both programmes
Mark	Thomas	Barbados	EDULINK
Maria Cristina	Macovei	Belgium	EDULINK
Josephinah Gopolang	Makoba	Botswana	EDULINK
Dime	Papa Ciré	Burkina Faso	EDULINK
Christian	Gregart	Denmark	EDULINK
Niels	Ørnbjerg	Denmark	EDULINK
Eric	Maertens	France	EDULINK
Frederic	Geoffroy	France	EDULINK
Jean-Marc	Bardet	France	EDULINK
Mamadou Kaba	Traore	France	EDULINK
Patrick	Droniou	France	EDULINK
Sonia	Miranda	France	EDULINK
Jimmy	Godfrey	Germany	EDULINK
Katrin	Wenz	Germany	EDULINK
Susanne	Dreschl-Bogale	Germany	EDULINK
David	Anipa	Ghana	EDULINK
Emmanuel Wendsongre	Ramde	Ghana	EDULINK
Apostolos	Malamakis	Greece	EDULINK
Avraam	Karagiannidis	Greece	EDULINK
Daniela	Antonacci	Italy	EDULINK
Eugenia	Rinaldi	Italy	EDULINK
Gianni	Vaggi	Italy	EDULINK
Jorge Ramon	Centurion	Italy	EDULINK
Luigi	Moccia	Italy	EDULINK
Marco	Galeotti	Italy	EDULINK
Marisa	De Rosa	Italy	EDULINK
Judith	Mendes	Jamaica	EDULINK
Raphael G.	Wahome	Kenya	EDULINK
Shali	Ngali	Kenya	EDULINK
Washington	Oloo	Kenya	EDULINK
Dina	Bak	Mozambique	EDULINK
Ana	Godinho	Portugal	EDULINK
Fernanda	Gomes	Portugal	EDULINK

<i>First name</i>	<i>Last name</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>Programme</i>
Joao	Rosa	Portugal	EDULINK
Maria	Martins	Portugal	EDULINK
Tony	Lavender	Portugal	EDULINK
Carlos	Rodriguez	Spain	EDULINK
Nizar	Ayadi	Spain	EDULINK
Anna	Bon	The Netherlands	EDULINK
Henk	van den Heuvel	The Netherlands	EDULINK
Peter	Weesie	The Netherlands	EDULINK
Andrew	Lawrence	Trinidad & Tobago	EDULINK
Paul	Kibwika	Uganda	EDULINK
Cathy	Svensson	United Kingdom	EDULINK
Hilary	Jones	United Kingdom	EDULINK
Liz	Trenchard	United Kingdom	EDULINK
Daniela	Schier	Austria	Other
Altagracia	Reyes	Belgium	Other
Anne	Fromont	Belgium	Other
Antoine	Defise	Belgium	Other
Antonio Leal	Cordeiro	Belgium	Other
Daniele	Mazzanti	Belgium	Other
Eustace	Wallace	Belgium	Other
Gerard	Denouden	Belgium	Other
Giorgio	Brandolino	Belgium	Other
James	Kembi Gitura	Belgium	Other
Jeannine	Fally	Belgium	Other
Luis Kinanga	Salakiaku	Belgium	Other
Moulim	Maiga	Belgium	Other
Paula	Bauwens	Belgium	Other
Rafael	Torres Campos	Belgium	Other
Renaat	Van Rompaey	Belgium	Other
Sambou	Stéphan Sylvain	Belgium	Other
Shirley	Skerritt-Andrew	Belgium	Other
Yassin Eisa Mohamed	Abdella	Belgium	Other
Christof	Merkle	Belgium	Other
Emmanuel Wendsongre	Lalsondé	Burkina Faso	Other
Maingari	Daouda	Cameroun	Other
Elisangela	Da Silva	Cap Vert	Other
Diogenes	Aybar Batista	Dominican Republic	Other
Ainhua	Echeverria	European Commission	Other
Giuseppe	Balducci	European Commission	Other
Yolande	Moubelou	Gabon	Other
Kawsu	Darri	Gambia	Other
Carina	Fazius	Germany	Other
Nina	Salden	Germany	Other
Charles	Oser-Mengal	Ghana	Other

<i>First name</i>	<i>Last name</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>Programme</i>
Georges Philippe	Duroseau	Haiti	Other
Richard	Mirabal Jean Claude	Haiti	Other
Smith	Glaude	Haiti	Other
Filippo	Sartor	Italy	Other
Mathilde	Diwa	Ivory Cost	Other
Mshenga	Mwacharo	Kenya	Other
Tandia	Mohamedou	Mauritania	Other
Laure	Dutaur	Mauritius	Other
Noel	Lee Cheong Lem	Mauritius	Other
Noamonunghenda	Haileka	Namibia	Other
Sylvester	Muchila	Namibia	Other
Adamou Didier	Tidjani	Niger	Other
Alberto	García Castaño	Spain	Other
Jesper	Wohlert	Spain	Other
Luis Manuel	Llerena Díaz	Spain	Other
Nyam tara	Mukome	Tanzania	Other
Curtis	Manchoon	Trinidad & Tobago	Other
Euphemia	Cazoe	Trinidad & Tobago	Other
Lucy	Kalewanu	Uganda	Other
Kolawole	Babalola	United Kingdom	Other
Siale	Bain-Vete	United Kingdom	Other
Martin	Tavenjika	Zimbabwe	Other
Konah	Muove		Other
Adrian	Trotman	Barbados	ACP S&T
Yannik	Hallet	Belgium	ACP S&T
Faridath Atchabi	Aboudou	Benin	ACP S&T
Orlando	Perez	Dominican Republic	ACP S&T
Benjamin	Buclet	France	ACP S&T
Florence	Pradel	France	ACP S&T
Martina	Gliber	France	ACP S&T
Thomas	Le Bourgeois	France	ACP S&T
Ina-Maria	Stiehler	Germany	ACP S&T
Matthias	Winker	Germany	ACP S&T
Nsesheye Susan	Msinjili	Germany	ACP S&T
Wolfram	Schmidt	Germany	ACP S&T
Alessandro	Peressotti	Italy	ACP S&T
Angela	Melodia	Italy	ACP S&T
Davide	Bellavite	Italy	ACP S&T
Giovanni	Guaraldi	Italy	ACP S&T
Lucia	Brusegan	Italy	ACP S&T
Maria Chiara	Paire	Italy	ACP S&T
Monica	Serrantoni	Italy	ACP S&T
Pierpaolo	Bergamini	Italy	ACP S&T
Sara	Canterino	Italy	ACP S&T

<i>First name</i>	<i>Last name</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>Programme</i>
Keshav	Kshirsagar	Papua New Guinea	ACP S&T
Ellah	Nyakunu	South Africa	ACP S&T
Mafaniso	Hara	South Africa	ACP S&T
Pieter	van der Bijl	South Africa	ACP S&T
Demie	Moore	The Netherlands	ACP S&T
Perry	Polar	Trinidad & Tobago	ACP S&T
Julius	Mwine	Uganda	ACP S&T
Moses	Osiru	Uganda	ACP S&T
Washington Odongo	Ochola	Uganda	ACP S&T
Dieter	Schwela	United Kingdom	ACP S&T
Elizabeth	McVeigh	United Kingdom	ACP S&T
Keith	Tomlins	United Kingdom	ACP S&T
Philip	Stevenson	United Kingdom	ACP S&T

3. Conference evaluation questionnaire

Evaluation Questionnaire

We kindly invite you to complete this questionnaire to assess the quality and the results of the Joint Stakeholders Conference. Please tick into the relevant (white) boxes or leave them blank if not applicable. You may also add comments or suggestions in the relevant spaces.

Please return the questionnaire by email before November 16th, 2011, to the EDULINK or the ACP-S&T PMUs mail addresses or to the conference mail address: Edulink-ST-2011@gopa-cartermill.com

CONFERENCE ORGANISATION & FORMAT	Tick into the relevant box:		
	Very good	Sufficient	Insufficient
Structure of conference (3 days, shared conference)			
General standards of speakers' presentations			
General standards of moderators			
Catering			

Additional comments or suggestions on the organization & format of the conference:

CONFERENCE CONTENT	Tick into the relevant box:		
	Very good	Sufficient	Insufficient
Conference agenda			
Presentations:			
- Day 1, EDULINK sessions			
- Day 2: Towards an effective institutional network			
- Day 2: Technical and financial reporting			
- Day 3, ACP-S&T sessions			
Panel discussions			

Additional comments or suggestions on the content of the conference:

CONFERENCE OBJECTIVES	Tick into the relevant box:		
	Very good	Sufficient	Insufficient
Overall achievement of the conference objectives			
Opportunity to share views with other projects			
Opportunity to learn from other projects			
Opportunity for meeting the PMU, ACP and EC officers and clarify contractual issues			
Opportunity for acquiring better knowledge on project management issues			
Opportunities for networking and contacts building			

Additional comments or suggestions on the objectives of the conference:

Name of person:	
Organization:	
Project:	

Thank you for your cooperation!

EDULINK - ACP S&T PMU
Rue de Trèves 45
1040 Brussels
info@acp-edulink.eu
info@acp-st.eu

4. Evaluation results

Conference evaluation results		
	<i>Questions</i>	<i>Total score</i>
1	Structure of conference (3 days, shared conference)	0.86
2	General standards of speakers' presentations	0.75
3	General standards of moderators	0.89
4	Catering	0.73
5	Conference agenda	0.94
6	Presentations, Day 1, EDULINK sessions	0.83
7	Presentations, Day 2: Towards an effective institutional network	0.76
8	Presentations, Day 2: Technical and financial reporting	0.74
9	Presentations, Day 3, ACP-S&T sessions	0.75
10	Panel discussions	0.80
11	Overall achievement of the conference objectives	0.73
12	Opportunity to share views with other projects	0.91
13	Opportunity to learn from other projects	0.86
14	Opportunity for meeting the PMU, ACP and EC officers and clarify contractual issues	0.85
15	Opportunity for acquiring better knowledge on project management issues	0.74
16	Opportunities for networking and contacts building	0.77

Rating system:

- *Very good* = 1,00

- *Sufficient* = 0,50

- *Insufficient* = 0,00

5. Comments and suggestions from the questionnaires

All comments in the questionnaires are reported here below.

Conference organisation & format

The meeting was well organized and it was useful for all of the projects to get together to share ideas in research, capacity building and networks.

I was able to make a link with another EU ACP S&T project in PNG and we are now exploring how the two projects can work together.

Overall and based on my limited attendance, I found the conference enlightening, in terms of contextualizing the project, networking with others and in terms of support available on technical and financial reporting for ongoing projects.

The time allowed was insufficient to bridge cultural barriers especially because participants stayed in different hotels and could not extend networking activities beyond meeting times. This might not have been the case if the programme was not so tight.

Some translations from French to English were not clear enough to enable following the debate.

Found caterers very enthusiastic/helpful, but some Western food to supplement Oriental-style cooking would have been appreciated. In addition to the wines and soft drinks, some beers would have been welcome.

The format of the conference was fine for me (although I only attended that last two days). I thought it worked well.

Particularly the mid-term meeting would be a perfect opportunity to present more projects from a technical point of view to foster better networking also between the different projects.

Many technical presentations were very interesting and it was surprising to see how many links between projects from apparently different fields could be closed. Also in terms of capacity building and impact, such a mid-term technical conference (day) could be beneficial, since the proceedings could be published.

An organized tour to some tourist sites. Participants could be asked to pay a contribution.

If allowable, an excursion on an afternoon to a museum or something like that could help thaw frozen characters and facilitate melting into one another for better networking.

Start the conference with a round table where each participant within 1 minute, presents him/herself, his/her project or his/her role in the programme.

Beforehand, invite participants to expose posters or present leaflets on projects

In order to facilitate the networking among Project Managers from different projects, it could be useful to organize bilateral or restricted meetings.

It was a very good Conference. Maybe the best of the last 3 conferences. Practical, efficient and with very open lines of communication.

You could imagine having some parallel group work sessions resulting in concrete recommendations or with concrete practical exercises.

I think the PMU failed in the organization of the sub-group meetings. It was supposed to be an occasion for meeting those people interested in the same thematic. Yet, there was not enough information about "projects" attempting the conference. People met just if they knew each other beforehand. Therefore, for the next meeting, I would suggest what follows:

- 1. To facilitate recognitions among the different project's Representatives, provide a list of conference participants reporting also the name of the project where the representative is Involved in and doing the same thing on the badge.*
- 2. To facilitate meetings among projects involved in different thematic: organizing different tables just indicating the main thematic dealt by projects.*

Bigger screens might be helpful in reading smaller details in slides

A little detail: if it is possible for next conferences to provide more plugs in order to use laptop to take notes.

Conference content

Now more than before the requirements and contractual commitments on reporting are clearer. The discussions were more focused and supportive than the one facilitated last year.

There was a seamless link between EDULINK and ACP S&T sessions

It was useful for me as a leader of a EUACP project to learn more about the EDULINK projects and common linkages. The discussions regarding the institutional networks were useful but these usually need external drivers to sustain them beyond the duration of these projects which everyone was well aware of. I thought it was very useful that ways of making the project networks and collaboration more sustainable was discussed.

Additional time should be given to other projects to share their experiences especially difficulties in implementation.

It would be helpful if participants could separate their financial queries etc. from their presentations. At times the presentations were dominated by issues linked with finances and reporting procedures, and the implementation of the project, aims, and objectives. The focus on capacity building and sustainability was frequently lost.

The PowerPoint presentations on reporting were good, but should have been more detailed. They did not differ much from those of 2010. Some in-depth training regarding reporting procedures would be appreciated.

Day 3 was sufficient in total but not very good. The presentations in the morning were very good and gave very good insight into some other projects. However, the afternoon presentations were not always perfect. The technical presentations related to the reporting were good and the hand-outs are very valuable. The mid-term review presentation was (sorry to say so) really confusing, as it was poorly structured and not yet well elaborated.

In this programme, most of the project leaders I spoke with or who presented in this and in previous conferences have serious problems with the lengthy procedures, eligibility issues and slow or late financial instalments. Of course we sometimes make errors ourselves, thus exacerbating this situation. This helped us to better understand EDULINK PMU's position, since you are in between the two opposed sides (donors and spenders) where the whole packet of rules is entrusted to you for correct implementation. Good luck for that!

It would be good if each project is given a little while to say something.

Maybe it was a lot of description of projects and not discussion concerning some aspects of Education

It would be interesting to discuss further how to exploit successful projects after the project end.

Some presentations could have been better oriented. Could be interesting to hear about more S&T projects (good and bad experience), but get more focused presentations.

A practical session for example on defining and implementing S&T policies could be interesting, or on your Project Management requirements, for some projects that could need it.

If possible, to get some case studies during the conferences to improve the understanding of beneficiaries.

The presentations were all very useful and interesting. Concerning the session on technical and financial reporting we have appreciated the power point presentation and the concrete suggestions. As pointed out by an intervention it would be very useful to have an example (maybe cleared by names and other details,) of a very good narrative and financial report.

Conference objectives

Great opportunity to learn from many fronts during the conference.

There should be a post conference follow-up interaction between projects facilitated by the PMU.

The opportunity to learn from other projects was welcomed. The chance to clarify contractual and financial issues was appreciated and I understand better the financial reporting system.

I would like to focus more on success stories at the next meeting so that the EU ACP can promote this to support ACP S&T policy, capacity and networks. For the EU ACP S&T projects these should focus on successes in networks and capacity building and how these can contribute to policy and the millennium goals. Also, the participants can combine their experiences to develop guides on how to establish and build networks in S&T and capacity building strategies.

Although I understand that time is limited and that the PMU carefully chose projects to be presented across subjects and geographical areas, I would suggest some form of formal projects presentation through a posters session or through opened meetings across main subjects (education, agriculture, ...). That would increase the likelihood of a greater exchange of views.

As I was unable to attend the conference for the full duration, I feel not in a position to comment overall on how some of the overall objectives were met. I did however find the experience supportive and informative. Thank you.

An excellent opportunity for networking. The issues regarding project management are well-known, but I would have appreciated more positive solutions/inputs for the various projects.

The networking opportunities were perhaps quite limited, except for the lunch break, although I did network with a useful number of people.

It was good to share experiences with other projects in bilateral communication. However, there was not enough time to meet all representatives of projects or PMU or EC for a chat or discussion between the sessions. During the sessions, it seemed many interesting topics were raised but not really completed in the discussions or they had to be stopped due to the agenda.

It might be a good idea to implement a kind of workshop for 1-2 hours where different projects (maybe sorted according to their topics) gather together in smaller groups (max. 5-10 projects) and discuss with people from the PMU or EC as moderators/discussion partners. Moderators could force the discussion towards synergistic effects and better exchange between the projects.

The objectives are fine, but in line with the remarks above, they all are directed at the project participants. Might it be considered that future conferences explicitly include an objective aimed at the improvement of the EDULINK programme, rules and regulations itself? This questionnaire makes a good start!

Good luck with the further implementation of the EDULINK programme and hope to see you at the next conference!

Regional conferences to include partners would help on networking.

The EDULINK personnel and the Commission were very helpful and cooperatives.

It would have been nice to hear more details about future calls and policy planning. Need to better understand the objectives of external analysis and evaluations. This was not very clear, but the consequence on future policy making seems important...

Include a synthesis paper / PowerPoint presentation of the Conference conclusions.

I think that all the presentations were very useful and I will definitely contact some of the partners I met during the conference in relation to activities included in our S&T project and also to develop new collaborations and activities. I think also that some of the issues raised during the final debate were very interesting and it was very helpful to share views and have a debate concerning the objectives of the programme and some general issues. In particular I think that debate concerning the link between capacity building, research and how is it really possible to take actions concerning capacity building, was really interesting.

6. Project monitoring table

Project monitoring table (according to project description and log frame)					
<i>Project No. XX#XX - Year of reporting: Year XXX</i>					
<i>N.</i>	<i>Planned (title of the activity)</i>	<i>Executed in the reporting period (description)</i>	<i>Output in the period/ OVI</i>	<i>Comments on achievements and deviations</i>	<i>Annex ref. n.</i>
A	Project organization				
A1				
A2				
A...				
B	Assessment of situation				
B1				
C	Curriculum Development				
C1				
C2				
C...				
D	Execution of Training				
D1				
D2				
D3				
D...				
E	Dissemination and promotion				
E1				
E2				
E...				
F	Project monitoring and evaluation				
F1				
F2				
F...				

7. Financial Report checklist

1	All 3 tables of Annex VI are included
2	Correct templates of Annex VI are followed
3	Table forecast budget is correct / Totals under 'real costs during the period' are the same as in the Interim financial report table.
4	Financial report - Budget section is the same as per contract or rider (cost descriptions and figures)
5	Column of contingencies is filled correctly. The total under column "use of contingencies" should be '0'
6	Contingencies have been previously authorized
7	Re-allocations appear under column F of the financial report template. The total under column 'allowed reallocation' should be '0'.
8	Reallocations have been justified through a note to the contracting authority.
9	Reallocations do not exceed the 15% threshold (Art. 9.2)
10	All costs are foreseen in the budget and eligible (applicable to the project)
11	The financial report covers all the expenses of the project, including those co-financed by other parties
12	All reported costs are actually incurred, identifiable and verifiable (supporting documents) costs, except at 10. Administrative costs
13	Additional costs (new budget lines) are justified
14	Expenditures are presented in the currency they were incurred
15	Exchange rates are correct
16	Formulas of subtotals by column and by row are correct
17	Column total costs in Euro is correct (sum of costs in individual currencies)

18	column (i) costs previous periods is correct (the same as previous year' approved report)
19	column (h)+(i) cumulated costs is correct
20	Individual costs follow the formula: # units X unit rates
21	# Units are in line with budget, work plan and narrative report
22	Unit costs and per diem rates are in line with budget
23	Procurement above Euro 5000 is reported in narrative report section 2.2
24	Costs under main budget heading 4 'Local office' cover only premises especially used for the Action
25	Administrative costs applied is the correct %
26	For revised versions: previous PMU / ACP remarks have been taken into account
27	The financial report includes the bank interest produced by the prefinancing advanced by the Contracting Authority
28	Detailed list of expenses covering the reporting period is attached, when due
29	Costs in the detailed list of expenses are classified following the budget and the totals by budget line are the same as in the financial report
30	All supporting documents (e.g. invoices) are available in your institution's files
31	The financial report is signed on all pages by an authorised person from your institution and sent to the Contracting Authority
32	The Expenditure verification report is enclosed when due
33	The submitted financial report is the same as the audited financial report (with eligible costs)

8. List of bilateral meetings

EDULINK meetings

Raphael G. Wahome: PREPARE-PhD - Promoting Excellence in Ph.D. Research Programmes in East Africa, Nairobi (12#24)

Washington Odongo Ochola, Wellington Ekaya, Adipala Ekwamu: RUFORUM, Uganda (12#33, 118#05, 118#09)

Carlos Rodriguez Primo: IU IEPALA-R.B.-UCM, ISET and UAN produce excellent teacher trainers for Mozambique and Angola, Madrid (12#35)

Marco Galeotti: LIVE - Linking Institutions for Veterinary Education, Udine (118#06)

Paul Kibwika: ARIS - Strengthening Agricultural and Rural Innovation Systems, Makerere University, Uganda (118#13)

Sonia Miranda, Réseau de Masters et de Doctorats de statistiques appliquées en Afrique francophone subsaharienne, Paris (118#18)

Papa Ciré Dime: Appui à la Thèse Doctorale en économie - Version 2008 (CIEREA), Burkina Faso (118#20)

Jorge Ramon Centurion, TDNet, Pavia (118#21)

Maria Cristina Macovei: NETRIS - Network of Regional Integration Studies College of Europe, Belgique (118#22)

Susanne.Dreschl-Bogale: HENNA, Giessen (118#25).

Joao Rosa : Teacher Quality in Lusophone Countries, Lisboa (118#28)

Ana Godinho: A NAME for Health, Porto (118#29)

Mark Thomas, Judith Mendes: CREATive, University of the West Indies, Barbados (118#30)

David Rampersad: Capacity Building for the Financial Sustainability of ACP HEIs, University of the West Indies, Trinidad & Tobago (118#33)

ACP S&T meetings

Washington Odongo Ochola, Wellington Ekaya, Adipala Ekwamu: RUFORUM, Uganda (FED/2009/217070, 217072, 217080)

Angela Melodia, ACRA, Italy (FED/2009/217079)

Alessandro Peressotti, University of Udine, Italy (FED/2009/221814)

Ella Nyakunu, University of Pretoria, South Africa (FED/2009/218786)

Wolfram Schmidt and Susan Msinjili, BAM, Germany (FED/2009/217053)

Orlando Perez, EMPRENDE, Dominican Republic (FED/2009/217071)

Pieter van der Bijl, SARIMA, South Africa (FED/2009/218782)

Dieter Schwela, University of York, UK (FED/2009/217068)

Keshav Kshirsagar, NARI, Papua New Guinea (FED/2009/218779, 218780, 218781)

Maria Piare, Università di Torino, Italy (FED/2009/217077)

Florence Pradel, Fondation Merieux, France (AFS/2009/219014)

Giovanni Guaraldi, Università degli Studi di Modena e Reggio Emilia, Italy (FED/2009/217058)

Faridath Aboudou, LARES, Benin (FED/2009/217055)

Perry Polar, UWI, Trinidad & Tobago (FED/2009/217062)

Keith Tomlins, University of Greenwich, UK (FED/2009/217073)

Adrian Trotman, CIMH, Barbados (FED/2009/217069)

Matthias Winker and Ina-Maria Stiehler, University of Dresden, Germany (FED/2009/217060)

Mafaniso Hara, University of the Western Cape, South Africa (AFS/2009/219017)

Vernon Barret, University of Trinidad & Tobago, Trinidad & Tobago (AFS/2009/219020)

Demie Moore, WUR, the Netherlands (FED/2009/218789)