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**INTRODUCTION**

The Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) Program on Forests, Trees, and Agroforestry: Livelihoods, Landscapes, and Governance (CRP-FTA) responds to the urgent need for a strong and sustained research focus on forest management and governance, given the crucial role of forests in confronting some of the most important challenges of our time: climate change, poverty, and food insecurity. Impact-driven and innovative, FTA seeks to enhance the management and use of forests, agroforestry, and tree genetic resources across the landscape.

CRP-FTA is comprised of the following five flagship projects:

- **Flagship Project 1 (FP1)**, which concerns smallholder production systems and markets, has a focus on research that helps to boost the productivity and sustainability of forestry and agroforestry, to increase people’s incomes in forested areas, and to improve policies and institutions that affect land rights for the rural poor.

- **Flagship Project 2 (FP2)**, which concerns management and conservation of forest and tree resources, deals with threats to important tree species. Key areas include conserving high-value tree species, improving silviculture practices, and developing constructive ways to resolve conflicts over resource rights.

- **Flagship Project 3 (FP3)**, which concerns landscape management of forested areas for environmental services, biodiversity conservation and livelihoods, explores the drivers and consequences of forest transition and incorporates the restoration of deforested and degraded lands for environmental goods and services.

- **Flagship Project 4 (FP4)**, which concerns climate change adaptation and mitigation, encompasses research on how forests, trees, and agroforestry can mitigate climate change and how they can help people adapt to climate change.

- **Flagship Project 5 (FP5)**, which concerns the impacts of trade and investment on forests and people, seeks to understand the effects of forest-related trade and investment and generate knowledge that will help mitigate the negative impacts and enhance the positive ones.

The four CGIAR research partners of CRP-FTA include Bioversity International, the International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT), the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), and the World Agroforestry Center (ICRAF). The CRP-FTA is also comprised of outreach partners, defined as any entity providing services to populations who may not otherwise have access to those services. Such outreach partners include but are not limited to development organizations, government ministries, intergovernmental organizations, community-based organizations, and private businesses.

As CRP-FTA approaches Phase II of its implementation, it is critical to assess and document the knowledge needs of the outreach partners on the ground in order to align research priorities to fill them and facilitate their work. Accordingly, a knowledge needs assessment of the outreach partners of the CRP-FTA has been undertaken toward this end, the documentation and analysis of which are included herein. However, in order to understand the dynamics of the outreach partners with which the CRP-FTA engages including the limitations of knowledge provision and strengths upon which to build, an analysis of each outreach partner’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) was also carried out.

**METHODS**

**Selection of Participants and Inclusivity**

While comprehensive and inclusive participation is ideal, only lists of FP4 and FP5 partners were able to be obtained in time for this assessment from CIAT, CIFOR, and ICRAF, and a list of FP1 partners was only made available by ICRAF. Following two weeks of background research to distill the CRP-FTA outreach partners from the research partners, as well as to determine the nature of the relationships of the outreach partners with the CRP-FTA research centers, a list
of the relevant outreach partners was compiled for each flagship project and contacted at least twice for an interview if unresponsive at first contact. A snowball technique was utilized where appropriate to identify informed and suitable focal persons within each outreach organization with whom to speak. A list of such persons, as well as their organizational, geographical, and project affiliations can be found in Appendix A.

Medium of Data Collection

The knowledge needs assessment of the outreach partners within the CRP-FTA was carried out over a period of two months via interviews primarily utilizing the telecommunications application Skype, though telephone was used where quality internet connection was unavailable, and in person interviews were conducted with local outreach partners. Participants were asked a series of ten standardized questions with the primary objectives of carrying out a SWOT analysis of each outreach partner in evaluation of their internal strengths and weaknesses, as well as their external opportunities and threats, determining their perspectives on their organization’s knowledge needs, and ascertaining a ranking such knowledge needs in order of the priority in which they would like to see them addressed. An outline of the knowledge needs assessment questions can be located in Appendix B.

Following this process, a total of 28 people representing 27 different outreach organizations were interviewed for the knowledge needs assessment.

SAMPLE CHARACTERIZATION

Geographic Representation

The outreach partners were interviewed from 18 different countries on 5 continents. However, this number masks the true reach of the outreach partners interviewed since 6 of the partners interviewed are considered to be global in nature and not confined to one particular country, region, or continent. With regard to the true reach of the partners interviewed, 9 operate in Africa, 3 operate in Asia, 8 operate in South America, and 7 are considered to have global reach.

For simplicity, Figure 1 below depicting the geographic spread of the outreach partners interviewed for the knowledge needs assessment includes the country in which each outreach partner was interviewed rather than the full geographical spread of each partner’s operations.

Figure 1: Geographic Representation of the Outreach Partners
Organizational Representation

With regard to the organizational representation of partners interviewed for the assessment, the sample was eclectic mix of organizational types but dominated by non-governmental organizations (NGOs). There were 15 NGOs, 4 private businesses, 4 global alliances or partnerships, 2 government entities, 1 intergovernmental organization (IGO), and 1 research and policy institution engaged in outreach. Figure 2 below summarizes the organizational composition of the outreach partners interviewed.

Figure 2: Organizational Representation of the Outreach Partners

Partnerships Representation

Concerning the CRP-FTA research centers with which the outreach partners interviewed are currently engaged or have been engaged with in the past, CIFOR dominated in representation with 20 of the organizations collaborating exclusively with CIFOR in some capacity and 4 others collaborating with CIFOR in conjunction with another CRP-FTA research partner. Figure 3 below depicts the numerical breakdown of the associations and collaborations of the outreach partners with each of the CRP-FTA research centers represented in this assessment.

Figure 3: Research Partnerships Representation of the Outreach Partners

Linguistic Representation

Outreach partners included in the needs assessment were those partners capable of speaking English or French for the interview. Therefore, partners contacted who were unable to communicate in one of the two aforementioned languages were not included in this assessment.

Project and Programmatic Representation

With respect to the extent to which each flagship project is represented in the needs assessment, while FP1, FP4, and FP5 partners were contacted, it is only FP4 and FP5 partners who responded to requests to participate in the needs assessment. Therefore, the breakdown of outreach partners by flagship project is 15 FP4 partners, 11 FP5 partners, and one partner who is involved with the CRP-FTA but not with a specific flagship project.

Likely as a reflection of the majority of outreach partners included in this assessment being involved in FP4, over half (52%) of the outreach partners interviewed stated that they were engaged with the United Nations Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+) Programme in some capacity.
STRENGTHS OF OUTREACH PARTNERS

In order to strategically address the needs of the CRP-FTA outreach partners, it is critical to take inventory of and understand their internal strengths such that they can be built upon and leveraged. Consideration of the extant enabling conditions and infrastructure within each outreach organization allows recognition of the existing foundation on which to construct sustainable solutions to meet their needs.

While each outreach partner operates within a unique context, several recurrent strengths were mentioned more often than others. The most frequently cited internal strengths include strong partnerships and networks, inclusivity and participatory processes, responsiveness, attention to indigenous people and local communities, outreach and fieldwork, and connection with the policy process. Figure 4 provides a summary of the main strengths of the outreach partners.

Partnerships and Networks

Approximately 59% of participants cited strong partnerships and networks as one of their main strengths. However, elaborations upon why the participants considered this a strength reveal different dimensions and advantages of such partnerships and networks. In other words, while each participant who cited partnerships and networks referenced it as beneficial strategically, the different strategic aspects highlighted differed. For instance, some organizations emphasized the importance of particular types of partnerships such as those with civil society for purposes of advocacy and community mobilization while others emphasized the importance of partnerships generally for more abstract and process-oriented reasons such as diversifying perspectives for strategy development. Still others stressed the importance for pragmatic reasons such as information gathering on the ground for informed decision-making, filling of skills gaps and specializations, and extending the reach and impact of their organizations.

However the CRP-FTA chooses to harness and leverage this strength and its nuanced applications in furthering its objectives, the high degree of integration and linkages identified by a majority of the outreach partners imply that addressing the needs, whether they be knowledge needs or otherwise, of these outreach partners will go beyond the partners’ boundaries and likely be compounded and magnified through the ripple effect. In other words, the return on investment for facilitating the work of the outreach partners through research or otherwise will likely go beyond the scope of these specific outreach partners due to their self-cited high degree of connectivity to other actors working on their issues.

Inclusivity and Participatory Processes

Related to partnerships and networks in efforts to establish connectivity is the inclusivity cited by 26% of participants as a main strength. The incorporation of multiple stakeholders including traditionally marginalized populations into activities and operations was identified as important for establishing holistic and interdisciplinary approaches. However, while some participants emphasized inclusion of all actors on grounds of rights, others gave a less value-driven justification for inclusion, framing it as an important strategic decision given the status or advantages of certain groups in influencing policy, for example.

As with strong partnerships and networks, the inclusivity highlighted by a large number of the outreach partners suggests a level of connectivity conducive to extending the reach of the CRP-FTA benefits to traditionally marginalized populations and maximizing impacts.

Responsiveness

With regard to internal dynamics and strengths, about 22% of participants identified responsiveness as one of their primary assets. This includes not only the ability to react and adapt to circumstances but also specifically to react with speed and timeliness, though this second condition was not emphasized by all participants citing this strength. While some organizations accounted for their agility by virtue of their small size, others cited streamlined internal policies and processes or non-restrictive funding as contributing factors. However, it should be noted that some of the outreach partners who recognized their small size as a strength due to responsiveness simultaneously recognized it as a weakness in terms of human resources and efficacy.

In terms of how the CRP-FTA might gain from such internal dynamics, the responsiveness of a large number of outreach partners could prove advantageous in accelerating or actualizing
outreach quickly in the face of new or improved information.

**Attention to Indigenous People and Local Communities**

About 19% of outreach partners identified attention given to indigenous people or local communities as a principal strength. Several of the outreach partners proudly stressed a commitment to staying with and serving local communities to ensure the continuity and sustainability of their work even after or between project cycles. While this strength could technically be considered a subset of the aforementioned strength of inclusivity and participatory processes, it is worth mentioning separately since the outreach partners made an effort to distinctly distinguish these particular populations.

The CRP-FTA might interpret this as an indication of a particular population subset that its outreach partners prioritize and deem important such that it can tailor research to them or leverage such connections in advancing its objectives.

**Outreach and Fieldwork**

While the outreach partners are by their very nature engaged in outreach, it is only 19% of participants who cited such outreach or fieldwork as a major strength. Strong community facilitators, extension activities, and community capacity building were among the factors mentioned that contribute to successful and strong outreach and fieldwork.

In terms fulfilling the CRP-FTA objectives, strong outreach and fieldwork could be leveraged for data collection to further its research agenda or be taken as an indicator of community clout and presence that can also be leveraged for multiple purposes.

**Connection with the Policy Process**

Approximately 19% of participants specified a connection with the policy process as one of their strengths. The manner in which the outreach partners identified playing a role in the policy process can be classified as through information-gathering and through convening power. With regard to the information-gathering, some of the organizations indicated the importance of action-verified information and field insights feeding into policy processes for more informed-decision making. With respect to convening power, several organizations cited their ability to connect relevant stakeholders with decision-makers at various levels of government.

The presence of the connection with the policy process as one of the most frequently cited strengths is of particular significance for the CRP-FTA program in that leveraging outreach partners with connections to the policy process has the potential to increase the reach and impact of research, as well as codify, systematize, and legitimize research findings by embedding them within policy.
WEAKNESSES OF OUTREACH PARTNERS

The weaknesses of the outreach partners are those internal limitations that challenge their efficacy in fulfilling their objectives. Such weaknesses are important to consider in that they paint a more realistic picture of the extent to which knowledge or information can ameliorate the challenges that the outreach partners face in fulfilling their respective missions.

The weaknesses identified by the outreach partners were largely disparate and unique to each organization’s particular context. However, common weaknesses that surfaced more frequently than others included a lack of human resources, data gaps, low monitoring and evaluation (M&E) capacity, and unknown impacts of the outreach partners’ organizations or interventions including environmental, economic, and social impacts. Figure 6 provides a summary of the main weaknesses identified by the outreach partners.

Lack of Human Resources

30% of participants ascribed lack of human resources as one of their challenges that they face. Many of these outreach partners highlighted the small number of staff in comparison to the magnitude of the problems with which they deal. As a result of such understaffing, most of the outreach partners stressed the importance of establishing and working through partnerships to compensate for the lack of human resources or complement existing ones.

The human resource deficiencies were not confined to any particular organizational type but were cited across a wide array of organizational types including NGOs, government entities, a research and policy institute, and an IGO. Thus, lack of human resources is problem plaguing the CRP-FTA outreach partners in various spheres of operation.

This finding of a lack of human resources amongst almost one third of the participants underlines the importance and sensitivities to partnerships, including those with the CRP-FTA research partners, in the work of the CRP-FTA outreach partners.

Data Gaps & Low M&E Capacity

Two problems that go hand-in-hand are data gaps and low M&E capacity, both of which were cited by 19% of participants as major challenges.

With respect to data gaps, in some instances, the problem identified was outdated data while in other instances, nonexistent data was indicated. The problem was usually identified in tandem with other organizational weaknesses in explanation of the issue. For instance, difficulties establishing partnerships, inabilities to secure long-term funding, and low institutional capacity due to the aforementioned lack of human resources were all implicated in accounting for data gaps by the outreach partners.

With reference to low M&E capacity, participants cited the costs of M&E, documentation and measurement of impacts, data collection, and data verification by experts as impediments to effective M&E.

Of interesting note are the geographical associations of the outreach partners who mentioned data gaps and low M&E capacity as challenges. Data handicaps infamously afflict the African continent, and the geographical associations of the respondents citing this issue is reflective of this reality, as is depicted by Figure 5. Of the outreach partners who
mentioned data gaps as a main challenge, 80% of them are in Africa or made the comment with specific reference to their work in Africa. Similarly, a majority (60%) of outreach partners who mentioned M&E as a main challenge are located in Africa, while the other 40% are located in South America.

Given that monitoring, evaluating, and assessing the CRP-FTA’s impacts is one of the four cross-cutting themes of the program, outreach partners globally should continue receiving assistance in this realm, but particular attention should be paid to support outreach partners operating in Africa.

**Unknown Impacts**

Closely related with challenges of data gaps and low M&E capacity are challenges of unknown impacts of projects and/or interventions referenced by 19% of the outreach partners. While 40% of these outreach partners referenced unknown impacts of projects and interventions generally as an impediment, 60% went further to specify unknown environmental, economic, and social impacts of their activities as challenges. In other words, 11% of the total outreach partners interviewed designated environmental, economic, and social impacts as specific areas of impact that are unknown and as challenges that they are confronting.

Similar to the aforementioned data gaps and low M&E capacity challenges, the weakness of unknown impacts of projects and interventions emphasizes the continued need to support the commitment to monitoring, evaluating, and assessing the CRP-FTA’s impacts across all of its partners.

**THREATS TO OUTREACH PARTNERS**

While it is instructive to analyze the internal strengths and weaknesses of the CRP-FTA outreach partners, it is also important to acknowledge that they do not operate in a vacuum but rather in a complex world and in which they must confront and navigate through external threats to their efficacy.

The particular threats the CRP-FTA outreach partners encounter in their work include poor financing, governance challenges, and the research-to-policy and policy-to-action gaps.

**Poor Financing**

The most prevalently cited threat in discussions with the outreach partners was poor funding. Approximately 26% of outreach partners identified lack of sustainable financing as a threat, though the justifications varied greatly. Poor financing includes not only a lack of or uncertainty of funding opportunities but also unsustainable short-term financing trends and difficulties securing financing. According to the outreach partners, some of the problems ushered in by such poor financing are an inability to properly carry out the work they would like to do or develop strong projects, expand operations, incentivize good behaviors like robust data collection, support themselves or members appropriately, prioritize domestic needs and be less beholden to donor preferences or agendas, and more.

The financing problem was not unique to any one organizational type but was rather widely cited across NGOs, government entities, private businesses, and global alliances.

Given that the associated issues of poor financing have the potential to severely cripple the
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**Figure 6: Weaknesses of Outreach Partners**
efficacy and operations of the CRP-FTA outreach partners and may be arguably already doing so based on their responses, the CRP-FTA research centers may consider stepping in with what they do best—knowledge production and dissemination. Development of a mechanism by which the CRP-FTA outreach partners may become more aware of funding opportunities was suggested by one of the participants. Since over one fourth of outreach partners cited poor financing as impeding their activities in some fashion, it may be advisable for the CRP-FTA to explore development of a tool or platform aggregating or disseminating information on different financing opportunities to improve versatility in a domain currently constraining its outreach partners.

The Research-Policy-Action Gap

Approximately 26% of the outreach partners discussed a gap either between research and policy, or between policy and action on the ground. The partners called attention to the weak linkages between these three spheres, as represented in Figure 7, as challenges and expressed a great need for their fortification.

Accounting for the gap between research and policy, some of the partners identified poor communication as a central problem. In particular, translating research findings into a language that is comprehensible and accessible to policymakers and decision-makers, especially for the articulation of national policy agendas, was pinpointed as a core issue. Additionally, some of the partners accounted for the divide between research and policy with a lack of advocacy. There was a perception that while research centers such as those in the CRP-FTA excel at giving recommendations, the recommendations are not actively promoted to governments or decision-makers.

With respect to the gap between policy and action on the ground, some participants perceived weaknesses in creating incentives for change. Others, however, indicated that the problem stems further back in the research phase with a perceived weakness in linking or tailoring research with practical situations on the ground. It was even expressed that additional research may not be the most appropriate way to ameliorate some of the challenges being faced, but rather that improved application of already extant research be undertaken.

Fortifying the linkages along the research-policy-action chain is in the interest of furthering the CRP-FTA goals, and therefore its research centers should examine methods by which this can be pursued. While engaging in advocacy directly risks entry into a political realm that may compromise the perceived neutrality and independence of the CRP-FTA research centers, the program might consider partnering with additional organizations reputed with strong advocacy skills and in line ideologically with the CRP-FTA priorities, or strengthening already existent relationships with such characteristics. Moreover, in addressing concerns about poor linkages between research and practical situations on the ground, the CRP-FTA might consider more context-driven research with regionally or sub-regionally tailored recommendations to facilitate the application of its knowledge base on the ground.

Governance Challenges

Roughly 15% of participants described some form of governance challenges as threatening their activities. The governance challenges described can be grouped as either bad governance or challenging legal climates.

Figure 7: The Research-Policy-Action Gap
With regard to bad governance, some participants noted that a lack of strong governance including poor law enforcement undermines the normalization of certain processes such as forest certification, or the prevention of illegal activities such as logging, that make their work difficult.

With respect to challenging legal climates, participants noted the complexities of their particular legal systems in which they operate contributing to difficulties navigating their work. Complexities identified included the fluidity of constantly updated laws in Brazil, which makes staying informed on the existence of laws as well as understanding their impacts difficult. Also referenced were issues harmonizing parallel legal structures such as with the formal and traditional regimes in Mozambique.

Of interesting note is that 75% of the outreach partners noting governance challenges as a threat to their activities operate in Africa.

**OPPORTUNITIES: KNOWLEDGE NEEDS OF OUTREACH PARTNERS**

The knowledge needs of the CRP-FTA outreach partners represent opportunities awaiting fulfillment by the CRP-FTA research centers. While the knowledge needs are wide in scope and deep in detail, certain topics emerged with more frequency than others throughout the interview process. What follows is a synthesis and analysis of the most widely cited knowledge needs, including the prioritization with which the outreach partners would like to see them addressed. However, while the most frequently cited needs and associated trends should be given special regard, the less commonly cited needs should not be discounted.

**Markets**

One of the most widely expressed needs from the outreach partners was that for research relating to markets. Almost half (48%) of all participants conveyed a need for market research of some kind, though the type of market research varied based on the context as is summarized in Figure 8.

One of the more prevalently cited needs was market research specifically as it relates to supply chains and value chains. Roughly 31% of the participants who expressed a need for markets research specified supply chains or value chains research as either their first or second priority out of all of their needs. Half of these participants communicated a need for more research specifically surrounding cacao or cocoa, timber forest products, and oil palm. One participant also expressed a need for research elucidating the supply chains of bamboo, rubber, Brazil nuts, and shea butter.

Equally as prevalent as a market research need were requests for information regarding forest markets and the forestry sector cited by 31% of the participants who expressed a need for markets research. Half of these participants made direct mention of such forest markets and how they relate to combating deforestation or protecting forest resources. Topics of interest mentioned included forestry sector financing and cost-effective methods of reducing deforestation, markets’ ability to fund forest activities including those that safeguard biodiversity, the relative importance of various investments in the forestry sector, and understanding the pressure of commodities like beef cattle and soy on deforestation in the Amazon.

Following supply chains and value chains as well as forest markets, the next most prevalently cited markets research need was related to climate financing frameworks, specifically as it relates to carbon credits markets and their impacts. About 23% of the participants who expressed a need for...
markets research made direct mention of such climate financing frameworks.

Other markets research topics mentioned singularly included payment for ecosystem services and its contribution to conservation of ecosystems in Rwanda, as well as how those ecosystems can mutually contribute to the communities enabling the conservation.

The high demand for research relating to markets should be taken as a cue that the outreach partners are interested not only in research as it relates to the biophysical environment but also the social and environmental systems in which they reside.

**Land Use & the Landscape Approach**

Over one fourth (26%) of the outreach partners interviewed identified land use research as one of their knowledge needs. Of these partners identifying land use research as a priority, 71% requested more research regarding the landscape approach in their unique contexts.

In a world where interests like agriculture, mining, and various other land uses compete for space, the landscape approach strives to equip people with the tools and concepts to effectively allocate and manage land in the name of balancing environmental, economic, and social goals. While some of the outreach partners specifically mentioned the landscape approach by name, others referenced principles consistent with the landscape approach. Partners requested information that is tailored to countries and regions such that they may apply the landscape approach to their unique contexts. Since most of the outreach partners citing this need operate on a global or continental scale, providing a list of specific places in which the CRP-FTA should prioritize its landscape approach research is difficult. However, 60% of the outreach partners requesting assistance with the landscape approach operate in Brazil, which should be noted in considering locales for research or support. The topics that the uniquely Brazilian organizations requesting landscape approach research requested included what models of governance might be utilized as well as effective ways of integrating livestock, agriculture, and forest systems.

With regard to the other 29% of outreach partners who requested research on land use but not relating to the landscape approach, the issues with which they cited needing assistance included land use planning that is climate-smart and ecologically-based in Colombia and the Congo Basin, which represent developing nations expected to be hit particularly hard by the effects of climate change.

Such land use research as a knowledge need was ranked as either the first or second priority by 86% the outreach partners citing land use research as a need, which may be taken as an indicator of the perceived exigency and importance of the topic amongst the outreach partners.

**Climate Change**

Another of the most commonly identified topics for research by 37% of the outreach partners was climate change, though this statistic is perhaps unsurprising given that over half of the participants interviewed were FP4 partners. What is likely of more interest to the CRP-FTA program are the subtopics of the climate change issue which the outreach partners found of import. A synthesis of the core research topic needs follows and is summarized in Figure 9, but of interesting note is also the population subsets that were highlighted in the discussions surrounding climate change knowledge needs. In particular, a need for research addressing and supporting smallholder farmers or indigenous populations was referenced by 40% of the outreach partners requesting climate change knowledge.

**Adaptation**

One of the most frequently discussed topics that emerged from conversations with the outreach partners was climate change adaptation, which was mentioned explicitly by 30% of the partners expressing climate change research as a need. Within this topic, it was requested that a “lessons learned” synthesis be produced such that best practices can be applied in multiple settings. Moreover, in settings like Rwanda where research and data is generally scarce, a comprehensive quantitative assessment of the environmental and social impacts of climate change including factors that can help contribute to the nation’s adaptation and resilience were requested. Lastly, with
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1 Sayer et al., “Ten Principles for a Landscape Approach to Reconciling Agriculture, Conservation, and Other Competing Land Uses."
reference to the aforementioned research-policy-action gap, assistance in composing policy briefs on issues of climate change adaptation was solicited.

Climate change adaptation knowledge needs were also indirectly mentioned by 20% of participants, who would like research investigating means by which smallholders can be resilient in the face of climate change in particularly vulnerable places in Africa like Tanzania and Rwanda. Incorporated into this need is understanding the tensions and dynamics between pastoralists and smallholder farmers as climatic variations cause pastoralists to migrate into traditionally agricultural lands, instigating conflict.

**Mitigation**

Another 30% of outreach partners citing climate change research as a need explicitly expressed development of climate change mitigation strategies as a necessity. Low emissions development strategies adapted more sub-nationally and locally, such as to the state and province levels, were among the requests.

Additionally, while not explicitly stated, 30% of outreach partners requesting assistance with climate change knowledge implicitly expressed needs for research surrounding climate change mitigation. For example, exploring bioenergy as it relates to biomass and incorporation of smallholders in Africa, as well as more information on climate-smart agriculture and land use in Colombia were among topics discussed. Furthermore, knowledge facilitating the connection and coordination of subnational REDD+ initiatives with a national REDD+ strategy in Brazil for a coherent strategy against deforestation and climate change was requested.

**Financing Schemes and Frameworks**

Next most frequently identified as a need was research surrounding climate financing schemes and frameworks amongst 20% of the outreach partners requesting climate change knowledge. Similar to climate change adaptation strategies, it was suggested that a “lessons learned” synthesis of various financing schemes globally would be beneficial as well as integral for funding the expansion of program activities like workshops or consulting activities.

**Climate Information Services**

Also indicated not so much as a knowledge need but rather as a knowledge tool was improved climate information services for connecting climate information to relevant end users. As a mechanism toward this end, the outreach partners at the Stockholm Environment Institute

![Figure 9: Climate Change Knowledge Needs](image-url)
Institute (SEI) suggested collaboration through the CRP-FTA’s utilization of its WeADAPT² online platform, whereby practitioners, policymakers, and researchers can access high-quality information related to climate change as well as network with each other.

The CRP-FTA research centers might consider collaboration through this online platform as a means to aggregate and disseminate information quickly to relevant actors, as well as to maximize the reach of its research and foster partnerships. In favor of such a tool would likely be the 11% of total outreach partners interviewed who stated that staying updated and current with the latest global, regional, or national trends and information is difficult and might appreciate such a medium of exchange.

**Impact Evaluations**

**Environmental Impact Evaluations**

Almost 30% of the outreach partners requested knowledge on the environmental impacts of various activities. While not all partners specified the type of environmental impact evaluations that they would like to see, 20% of these partners requested information regarding how their projects are affecting biodiversity, and these included projects of the REDD+ program and The Nature Conservancy in Brazil. Another 20% of these partners expressed that they would like more knowledge on their environmental impacts specifically in terms of carbon emissions, which included understanding carbon emissions from tree cutting in Rwanda and carbon accounting of projects of the Nature Conservancy in Brazil. Still another 20% explained a need for knowledge surrounding forests and forestry impacts, which included understanding the impacts and possible changes in forest exploitation under Côte d’Ivoire’s new Forest Code, as well as the environmental impact of forestry projects in Mozambique. The last specified topic upon which knowledge was requested by an outreach partner was the holistic impacts of infrastructure development on the environment in South America, particularly in Brazil, Bolivia, Ecuador, Colombia, and Peru.

**Social Impact Evaluations**

Though less frequently requested than knowledge surrounding environmental impacts of various activities, social impact research was requested by 19% of the outreach partners. As its top priority in Rwanda, the Association Rwandaise des Ecologiste’s (ARECO) cited understanding the distribution of the benefits of its interventions with emphasis upon gender dynamics. Also as its top priority, the Forest Stewardship Council of the Congo Basin requested research exploring the true political and social impacts of its forest certification efforts in improving governance. The remainder of the partners mentioned social impact evaluation as part of a more holistic impact evaluation of their activities that they would like to see.

**Economic Impact Evaluations**

Even less commonly cited than both environmental impact and social impact knowledge needs but still significantly present were the economic impact knowledge needs identified by approximately 11% of participants as an area with which they would like more knowledge and assistance. While it was usually mentioned more broadly in the sense that economic impacts should be a part of the a more holistic impact evaluation process of their activities, more specific topics included the economic impacts of agro-industry versus traditional family agriculture in Cameroon such that development activities can be better planned, as well as understanding the funding impacts of REDD+ in the countries in which the five international NGOs of the Climate, Community, and Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA) initiative operate.

**Context-Driven Research**

In high demand by almost one third of the outreach partners (30%) is more context-driven and tailored research. Such outreach partners expressed a major need for research that is adapted to their local contexts and in consideration of their unique situations. Especially with REDD+, it was observed that international norms tend to focus on the national level to the neglect of attention at more regional and sub-regional levels when it comes to research. For example, in Tanzania, connecting and adapting national REDD+ strategies to the local

---

² For more information, please see the following webpage: https://www.weadapt.org/
level was identified as challenging. And acquiring data or information at subnational levels, including information on things like REDD+ financing at the jurisdictional, programmatic, and project levels in places like Peru, Brazil, and Africa generally was described as critical but nearly impossible.

However, while most of these outreach partners expressed needs of tailoring research to some form of subnational level, there were others who would appreciate such information even being tailored at the national level. Especially with the upcoming 21st annual session of the Conference of the Parties (COP-21) in Paris, the implications of such negotiations on the national processes in places like Nepal are poorly understood and concomitant research was thusly requested.

While context-driven research is not an easily definable topic that can be incorporated into Phase II of the CRP-FTA per se, it is a type of research that was widely requested amongst commentary that the research currently generated by CRP-FTA research centers is generic in nature and its application often ambiguous or difficult to implement. Therefore, in its next phase, the CRP-FTA might consider more regionally or sub-regionally-focused research incorporating the specific environmental, social, political, and economic factors thereof and/or be more explicit about outlining methods and recommendations for the application of its research findings. Actualization of recommendations emerging from research findings is key to achieving the CRP-FTA objectives, and commentary by the outreach partners suggests that clearer road maps in order to achieve such actualization is in high demand.

**Modeling**

While 26% of outreach partners agree that modeling is an integral part or their knowledge needs, the details of those modeling needs are disparate and will be discussed forthwith. The types of modeling listed as a first priority by some but not all of these partners include community organization, the landscape approach, sustainable agriculture and forestry, and climate finance.

**Community Organization**

Concerning modeling of community organization, 43% of partners requesting modeling assistance cited this domain as a need and represent organizations across three continents. In particular, Mozambique’s Centro Terra Viva called attention to the reality that there 360,000 hectares of land occupied by local communities within the country. Given this magnitude of occupation, modeling addressing how best to incorporate such populations into project activities aimed at responsible natural resources management is vital. Such modeling might incorporate how to best integrate such local communities into natural resources management projects and avoid marginalizing them, effectively establish partnerships toward this end, organize such communities within institutional frameworks, and empower local communities to have a meaningful voice in dialogues and negotiations concerning them and their land.

Moreover, the WWF in Colombia appealed for assistance in governance and community engagement models with local and indigenous people owning natural forest such that economic arrangements can be developed in a sustainable manner around forestry and agroforestry.

Lastly, Fauna and Flora International (FFI) in Indonesia expressed a need for knowledge regarding peat modeling and community forest management of such areas where there are many forests. Proper modeling incorporating appropriate local populations was identified as critical for effective peat forest management and for evaluating its impacts.

**Landscape Approach**

43% of the outreach partners expressing needs in modeling did so in reference to developing landscape approach models within their work settings. For instance, the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), a global non-profit organization dedicated to the promotion of responsible forest management worldwide through certification and labelling of forest projects, would like knowledge on how forest certification can be compatible or integrated with the landscape approach such that economic, social, and environmental systems are all considered. Moreover, Nexus Socioambiental, a private consulting company in Brazil, requires knowledge on pragmatic landscape approach management in the field with suggested models of implementation and governance such that it can provide guidance more effectively. Lastly, the Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI) Africa Center, an independent research and policy institute, requires more information on incorporating models of ecosystem services within larger holistic models such as the landscape approach.
Assisting all of these organizations with knowledge on landscape approach models is a wise investment in that FSC is a global organization with a wide reach and SEI Africa Center spans a continent, while Nexus Socioambiental is a consultancy and thus prime tool for disseminating information. The impact of the knowledge generation on the landscape approach can therefore have far-reaching effects.

**Sustainable Agriculture and Forestry**

With regard to sustainable agriculture and forestry models, the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) in Colombia acknowledged a gap in knowledge about local species since it admittedly imports all of its forestry models from elsewhere. While supportive of sustainable agriculture development, adapting those models to the Colombian context is imperative and a place where research may be able to step in with design. It was emphasized that development of such models to the Colombian context should not just include species-specific information but more holistically consider and incorporate viable economic models within them for sustainable forest production that are socially inclusive and sensitive to Colombia’s post-conflict situation. A suggested mechanism by which to achieve these goals and explore more knowledge is community-based agroforestry.

**Climate Finance**

With respect to climate finance models, Derecho Ambiente Y Recursos Naturales (DAR) identified development of climate finance models as paramount for improving governance and institutionality in the Amazon rainforests within the Amazon Basin in which it works in Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru. Moreover, it was indicated that development of such models would also improve DAR’s ability to improve its human resources and training capacities. Thus, the benefits of research aimed at development of such models would be twofold toward improving management of the Amazon rainforests while also improving internal capacities to further that interest.

**Governance**

While certainly not overwhelming in proportion, 11% of the CRP-FTA outreach partners expressed an interest in more governance-related research. Such requests included analyses of both the internal governance of the CGIAR partner organizations as well as external governance in the countries of operation.

With regard to internal governance knowledge needs, knowledge about how to strengthen the institutions with which the CGIAR works was requested in the form of best practices or lessons learned research. Because the CGIAR including its CRP-FTA research partners have experience working with outreach partners running the gamut of organizational types and locations, it was suggested that sharing observations and experiences about what institutional governance, structures, and styles appear to work best with, for example, small organizations versus large organizations, would be particularly valuable and instructive to strengthening the organizations with which the CRP-FTA works and ipso facto strengthening their outreach efforts.

In consideration of governance external to the outreach partner organizations, more information about governance was requested by South American partners for the Amazon. This includes more information about governance within the Amazon Basin in conjunction with information about its ecological values, which were identified as integral for the proper planning, development, and ultimately sustainability of the efforts of the WWF in Colombia. Similarly, Nexus Socioambiental of Brazil requires knowledge on what possible models of governance are compatible with the landscape approach management with which it is trying to engage.

**Agroforestry Systems**

While only mentioned by roughly 11% of participants, agroforestry systems are a venue of interest for the outreach partners, especially for cocoa and oil palm. Two-thirds of the research partners requesting assistance in this arena operate in Brazil, while the last third operates in Cameroon. In Cameroon, the system of interest is that of oil palm and specifically how to utilize agroforestry systems with oil palms in order to increase profitability and reduce dependence upon chemical fertilizers. In Brazil, however, the commodity of interest is cocoa with the objectives of utilizing agroforestry systems to improve the incomes of smallholders while benefitting biodiversity and watersheds, which includes scaling up cocoa production toward this end in an economically viable way and understanding rural production. Of interest also in Brazil are other forest species and models besides that of cocoa that could ameliorate.
smallholder income alongside environmental benefits of biodiversity and watershed safeguarding. Moreover, not just the type and purpose of the agroforestry system knowledge was specified, but requests were also made based on location. In particular, more research facilitating the understanding and design of agroforestry systems in extremely remote areas such as those of the deep Amazon were mentioned.

Each of the 11% of outreach partners citing agroforestry system research as a knowledge need ranked it as their first priority, which may be taken as an indicator of the perceived urgency and importance of such research in their work.

**Recommendations**

Following careful qualitative analysis of the interviews undertaken with the CRP-FTA outreach partners, including consideration of their strengths, weaknesses, threats, and knowledge needs as opportunities waiting to be fulfilled, the following set of recommendations can be distilled for Phase II of the CRP-FTA:

**Recommendations Based on Outreach Partner Strengths**

1. Given that partnerships and networks were identified as a clear strength by 59% of outreach partners, moving forward, CRP-FTA should not shy away from mobilizing its outreach partners as resources in furthering its objectives and should continue to foster its relationships with its outreach partners in order to grow its network through theirs.

2. The inclusivity highlighted by a large number of the outreach partners suggests a level of connectivity conducive to extending the reach of the CRP-FTA benefits to traditionally marginalized populations and maximizing impacts. Special attention should therefore be paid to fostering relationships with outreach partners who emphasize inclusivity.

3. Given that responsiveness was cited as a strength by a large number of outreach partners, the CRP-FTA should harness its outreach partnerships in situations where quickly accelerating the dissemination or actualization of research findings is paramount.

4. Since indigenous peoples, local communities, and smallholder farmers were repeatedly identified as population subsets prioritized by outreach partners, the CRP-FTA should consider tailoring its research to addressing these populations such that research and outreach priorities are aligned and knowledge supply can meet knowledge demand more effectively.
5. The strong outreach and fieldwork cited as a strength by many outreach partners should be leveraged for data collection to further its research agenda or be taken as an indicator of community clout and presence that can also be leveraged.

6. The presence of the connection with the policy process as one of the most frequently cited strengths is of particular significance for the CRP-FTA program in that leveraging outreach partners with connections to the policy process has the potential to increase the reach and impact of research, as well as codify, systematize, and legitimize research findings by embedding them within policy. Ironically, about one fourth of outreach partners also cite the research-policy-action gap as one of their main threats. Therefore, given that the CRP-FTA is at the nexus of organizations citing connection to the policy process as both a strength and a threat, it might consider acting as a liaison connecting those with weak connections to the policy process to those with strong ones. In other words, the CRP-FTA research centers should strengthen its outreach partners by connecting them not just to research but to each other.

**Recommendations Based on Outreach Partner Weaknesses**

1. The finding of a lack of human resources amongst almost one third of the participants underlines the importance and sensitivities to partnerships, including those with the CRP-FTA research partners, in the work of the CRP-FTA outreach partners. While it is beyond the mandate and realistic expectation of the CRP-FTA to take responsibility for filling such capacity gaps, it can help mitigate the negative effects of such human resource gaps by maintaining and even reinforcing its efforts in capacity development such that quality improvements can help offset quantity shortages in its outreach partners.

2. Given that the weaknesses of data gaps and M&E were weaknesses cited predominantly amongst partners operating in Africa, special attention should be paid in support of partners in this geographic area.

3. Unknown impacts of projects and interventions emphasize the continued need to support the commitment to monitoring, evaluating, and assessing CRP-FTA’s impacts across all of its partners, which should be holistic in nature and include environmental, social, and economic impacts as requested by the outreach partners.

**Recommendations Based on Outreach Partner Threats**

1. Because over one fourth of outreach partners cited poor financing as impeding their activities in one fashion or another, it may be advisable for the CRP-FTA to explore development of a tool or platform aggregating or disseminating information on different financing opportunities to improve versatility in a domain currently constraining its outreach partners.

2. Fortifying the linkages along the research-policy-action chain is in the interest of furthering CRP-FTA goals, and therefore its research centers should examine methods in which this can be pursued. While engaging in advocacy directly risks entry into a political realm that may compromise the perceived neutrality and independence of the CRP-FTA research centers, the program might consider partnering with additional organizations reputed with strong advocacy skills and in line ideologically with CRP-FTA priorities, or strengthening already existent relationships with such characteristics.

3. In addressing concerns about poor linkages between research and practical situations on the ground, CRP-FTA might consider more context-driven research with regionally or sub-regionally tailored recommendations to facilitate the
application of its knowledge base on the ground.

4. While CRP-FTA cannot miraculously end the governance challenges that many of the outreach organizations are facing in their respective countries, it might consider providing research upon and documentation of governance dynamics to help its outreach partners more effectively navigate them in their work.

Recommendations Based on Outreach Partner Opportunities as Knowledge Needs

1. Since almost half of the outreach partners conveyed a need for some kind of market research, CRP-FTA should acknowledge that outreach partners are interested not only in research as it relates to the biophysical environment but also the social and environmental systems in which they reside. Following this acknowledgement, it should prioritize its market research in three main areas: supply chains/value chains, forest markets/forestry sector, and climate financing.

2. Given high interest for knowledge surrounding land use with particular attention to the landscape approach, the next phase of research should address this demand through contextually-driven and geographically specific research on application of the landscape approach as well as the tradeoffs of various land uses.

3. The four primary arenas in which the CRP-FTA should focus its climate change research are adaptation, mitigation, financing schemes and frameworks, and climate information systems. The two population subsets to which it should pay particular attention are smallholder farmers and indigenous populations.

4. The CRP-FTA research centers should consider adopting SEI's online WeADAPT platform as a means to aggregate and disseminate climate change information quickly to relevant actors, as well as to maximize the reach of its research and foster partnerships.

5. Development of agroforestry systems around cocoa and oil palm, as well as other species capable of ameliorating smallholder income should be pursued in Colombia and Brazil.

6. The CRP-FTA should continue to honor its commitment to monitor, evaluate, and assess the impact of the program's work with an eye toward more holistic metrics inclusive of environmental, social, and economic impact indicators.

7. The CRP-FTA should explore research around modeling in 5 core areas: community organization, the landscape approach, sustainable agriculture and forestry, climate finance, and governance.

8. In Phase II, CRP-FTA should undertake more regionally or sub-regionally-focused research incorporating the specific environmental, social, political, and economic factors thereof and/or be more explicit about outlining methods and recommendations for the application of its research findings.
CAVEATS

In considering the recommendations and information contained in this needs assessment, the reader should bear in mind that the strengths, weaknesses, threats, and opportunities as knowledge needs of the sample characterized herein are not necessarily representative of the CRP-FTA outreach partners as a whole. As aforementioned, outreach partners connected to CIFOR were overrepresented in this particular sample, and only partners from two of the five flagship projects were evaluated. Therefore, while useful as a snapshot of the CRP-FTA’s outreach partners and indicator of the current partnership climate, any person or organization seeking to utilize the information contained within this needs assessment for decision-making purposes should be mindful of its biases and limitations.

CONCLUSION

As the CRP-FTA approaches Phase II of its implementation, taking inventory of the nature of its relationships including those of its outreach partners is key. Identifying strengths upon which to build, weaknesses to ameliorate, threats to acknowledge, and opportunities to seize are all part of supporting and fortifying the outreach partners with which the CRP-FTA works and therefore strengthening the partnerships with which it engages. While each partner is unique in its history, context, and needs, several overlying trends and dynamics can be observed, though addressing the needs of the majority or plurality should not come at the expense of neglecting the minority. As the details of Phase II of the CRP-FTA continue to evolve, the SWOT analysis and knowledge needs assessment of the program’s outreach partners contained herein should play a guiding role in shaping one of the world’s most important programs furthering the future of global forests, trees, and agroforestry, and the livelihoods, landscapes, and governance which they uplift.
# Appendix A

## Table of Outreach Partners and Affiliations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title of Person Interviewed</th>
<th>Outreach Partner’s Country/Countries of Operation (Location where interview was conducted in parentheses)</th>
<th>Outreach Partner’s Continental Location</th>
<th>Name of Outreach Partner Organization</th>
<th>Organization Type</th>
<th>FTA Flagship Partner Type</th>
<th>FTA Research Collaboration Partner(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joanna Durbin</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Global (Washington, D.C., U.S.)</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Climate, Community &amp; Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA)</td>
<td>Partnership of International NGOs</td>
<td>FP4</td>
<td>CIFOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darmawan Liswanto</td>
<td>Country Program Director for FFI-Indonesia</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Fauna and Flora International Indonesia (FFI-Indonesia)</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>FP4</td>
<td>CIFOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naya S. Paudel</td>
<td>Environmental Governance Specialist</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Forest Action</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>FP4</td>
<td>CIFOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathieu Auger-Schwartzenberg</td>
<td>FSC Sub-Regional Coordinator for Congo Basin</td>
<td>Congo Basin</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Forest Stewardship Council (FSC Congo Basin)</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>FP5</td>
<td>CIFOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jan Cherlet</td>
<td>Knowledge Management Expert</td>
<td>Global (Rome, Italy)</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>International Land Coalition</td>
<td>Global Alliance (of civil society and farmers organizations, United Nation’s agencies, NGOs and research institutes)</td>
<td>FP5</td>
<td>ICRAF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel Ngom</td>
<td>Smallholders Coordinator based in Yaoundé</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development of Cameroon (MINADER)</td>
<td>Government entity</td>
<td>FP5</td>
<td>CIFOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandra Rueda</td>
<td>Founder</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>South America</td>
<td>NES Naturaleza</td>
<td>Private business (consultancy)</td>
<td>FP5</td>
<td>CIFOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Menton</td>
<td>SEED's Director of Policy and Practice, Co-Founder</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Solutions &amp; Evidence for Environment &amp; Development (SEED)</td>
<td>Private business (consultancy)</td>
<td>FP4</td>
<td>CIFOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nike Doggart</td>
<td>Senior Technical Advisor</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Tanzania Forest Conservation Group (TFCG)</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>FP4</td>
<td>CIFOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodrigo Freire</td>
<td>Forest and Climate Coordinator; Coordinator of the São Félix do Xingu Initiative, Sustainable Cocoa Coordinator</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>South America</td>
<td>The Nature Conservancy Brazil</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>FP4</td>
<td>CIFOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camila Camaert</td>
<td>Specialist in Agribusiness Sector Policy; Commodities Policy Specialist</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>South America</td>
<td>World Wildlife Fund Colombia</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>FP5</td>
<td>CIFOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaap van der Waarde</td>
<td>Senior Adviser of Landscapes &amp; Species at WWF, Netherlands</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>World Wildlife Fund Netherlands</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>FP5</td>
<td>ICRAF, CIAT, CIFOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Gabriel Labbate</td>
<td>Team Leader/Regional Coordinator for UNEP Regional Coordinator for Latin America and the Caribbean for UN REDD</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>South America</td>
<td>United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) working with UN REDD</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Agency (IGO)</td>
<td>FP4</td>
<td>CIAT, ICRAF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annah Agasha</td>
<td>Smallholder Support Manager, FSC International</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Forest Stewardship Council (International)</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>FP5</td>
<td>CIFOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacey Noel and Oliver Johnson</td>
<td>Stacey Noel (Centre Director for SEI Africa) And Oliver Johnson (Deputy Director and Sustainable Energy Programme Leader, SEI Africa Centre)</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI) Africa Center</td>
<td>Research/Policy Institute</td>
<td>FP-</td>
<td>ICRAF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title/Position</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Organization Details</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel Drigo</td>
<td>Researcher and Auditor</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>South America</td>
<td>Nexus Socioambient (consultancy)</td>
<td>FP5</td>
<td>CIFOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfi Syakila</td>
<td>Communication and Knowledge Management Officer</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>ASEAN Social Forestry Network (ASFN)</td>
<td>FP4</td>
<td>ICRAF, CIFOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dancilla Mukakamari</td>
<td>National Coordinator, Association Rwandaise des Ecologistes</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Association Rwandaise des Ecologistes’s (ARECOS)</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>FP4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgilio Viana</td>
<td>CEO/Director General</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>South America</td>
<td>Fundação Amazonas Sustentável (FAS): Amazonas Sustainable Foundation</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>FP4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cesar Gamboa</td>
<td>CEO/Executive Director</td>
<td>Peru, Brazil, Bolivia, Ecuador, Colombia (Peru)</td>
<td>South America</td>
<td>Derecho Ambiente Y Recursos Naturales (DAR)</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>FP4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thais Hiramoto</td>
<td>Project Coordinator at Biofílica</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>South America</td>
<td>Biofílica</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>FP4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Téodyl Nkuentchua</td>
<td>Programmes Coordinator</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Centre pour l'Environnement et le Développement (CED)</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>FP4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia Chinwala Peterson</td>
<td>Director of Training &amp; Knowledge Networks</td>
<td>Global (Colorado, U.S.)</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Governors' Climate and Forests Task Force (GCF)</td>
<td>FP4</td>
<td>CIFOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Piatto</td>
<td>Coordinator of Climate and Agriculture Initiative</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>South America</td>
<td>The Institute of Agricultural and Forest Management and Certification (Instituto de Manejo e Certificação Florestal e Agroecologia) IMAFLORA</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>FP5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FP stands for Framework Programme.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position and Title</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alda Salomao</td>
<td>General Director and Senior Legal Advisor</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Centro Terra Viva (CTV)</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>FP5</td>
<td>CIFOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makala Jasper</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Mpingo Conservation and Development Initiative (MCDI)</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>FP4</td>
<td>CIFOR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B
Knowledge Needs Assessment Interview Outline

Introduction:

Hello! My name is Amanda with the World Agroforestry Center (ICRAF), and we are conducting an assessment of how we can provide relevant knowledge to our outreach partners to better meet their needs. Thank you very much for agreeing to speak to me about this. The goal of this interview is simply to find out your perspective of [Insert outreach partner]’s knowledge needs so that we may be able to help fulfill them.

Tour of the Interview (Aligning Expectations):

To give you a roadmap of this interview, first I am going to ask you a few questions about yourself and your role in [Insert outreach partner]. Afterwards, I will ask a few more detailed questions in order to understand the relationship between you and [Insert research center(s)] with which [Insert outreach partner] collaborates.

Then we will talk a little more about [Insert outreach partner]. For example, we will discuss strengths, as well as limiting factors specifically with regard to knowledge that challenge its effectiveness in achieving its stated mission or taking advantage of opportunities. Lastly, I will ask you to help me rank important knowledge needs in order of the priority in which you would like to see them addressed by [Insert research center(s)] with which you collaborate. You will then have the opportunity to give any remarks or comments, or ask further questions before concluding the interview.

Was I clear about the purpose of the interview? If not, you can ask me questions so that the purpose of the interview is clear.

*I would also like to ask your permission to record this Skype call just for transcribing purposes. May I record this call?

Context (Understanding the Roles and Responsibilities of the Interviewee):

Q1: How long have you been working with [Insert outreach partner]?

Q2: What is your title in [Insert outreach partner], and what is your main role? [Or confirm title if known.]

Q3: Can you briefly walk me through what your typical work day might look like?

Q4: I understand that your organization has been working with [Insert research center]. What has been the main purpose of this collaboration? What main role do you see [Insert research center] performing in this collaboration?

Identifying Strengths:

Q5: What is the main role of [Insert outreach partner]?

Q6: In your view, what does [Insert outreach partner] do particularly well that gives it an advantage over other organizations working on similar issues?
Identifying Challenges (Weaknesses/Threats) and Opportunities:

Q7: In performing its role, what are some of [Insert outreach partner]’s key challenges in fulfilling its mission/mandate? And could improved information/knowledge help you mitigate some of these challenges, or take advantage of certain opportunities?

Q8: If yes, what kinds of information/knowledge would be most useful to you? In other words, where are the knowledge gaps?

Q9: You listed [Insert #] of areas where you think [Insert research center] can assist with knowledge or knowledge-related products. [Read out the areas the person stated.] Please help me prioritize the top 5 areas in which you perceive critical knowledge gaps, in order of the priority in which you would like to see them addressed.

Q10: Organizations like [Insert research center] typically produce scientific papers for publishing in journals. Do you have any thoughts on how knowledge or these knowledge products can be specifically tailored to support your work? What would those be?

Q11: Do you have any other remarks or comments that you would like to share?

Conclusion:

Thank you for taking the time to speak with me today. Conversations like these are critical for ensuring that research meets development needs.

“Would you be willing to be contacted again in the future if there is need for further information? I can promise you this would be very brief and only to answer follow-up questions regarding this interview should they arise. If yes, how would you prefer to be contacted (e-mail, telephone, Skype)?
APPENDIX C: Word Cloud of Transcribed Interviews

The following images represent a Word Cloud depicting the frequency of certain words within the transcribed interviews. Words that were utilized more often appear larger, while words that were utilized less often appear smaller.