

SESSION 2 Q&A

Chair: Nicolas Gouletquer

Partnerships and Business Development Manager, Sustainability Program, CSIRO Agriculture & Food

Q. (female): Thank you very much. I would like to celebrate the inspiring presentations this morning, and I want to raise this theme for comment from the panel. We are in a transition. We've talked about inequality. We've talked about the way in which we do partnerships. We've talked about culture and its importance, the clarity in our language, the friendship and warmth we offer as we co-create. But we haven't talked about how much time and effort and cost it takes. I noticed in the last presentation it took between 2016 and 2018 to broker those relationships. I'm not sure how much the dancing cost, but I'm sure it had a cost. I think the second presentation talked about the back and forth, to understand whether the feedback was working and how the feedback could refine the approach. The first presentation talked about the respect for the science behind this. I'm keen to hear what is the proportion of time and investment in creating these types of approaches, not only for the initiation of projects, but to really understand how to scale and how to embed that learning?

Chair: Thank you very much. And also noting that sometimes the notion of time itself differs markedly from one country to another.

A. Uday Nidumolu: Time invested in partnerships. Yes. To me, that seems the most critical part of partnership, and especially in this space. If you are doing molecular lab work, that is a different story.

If you're wanting to translate your science to society, I would invest *any* amount of time just to make the partnerships stronger, because everything else will flow, because the objective is that this must be useful. For example, in this scaling project, I spent two years trying to convince ACIAR to fund me to do this, and now the fruits of that labour have paid off seriously well. You saw that song and dance: it was a one-week effort for us, but it had 200 shows.

We underestimate the investments in partnerships because it's like people: you have lifelong friends because you invested in them, right? This is exactly the same. I have had some of these partners for the last 20 years, so that makes it work efficiently. We have come to the point in the relationship where you can even disagree! In partnerships that's important. I don't think we should put a dollar figure on the partnership time. It cost money, of course, but if you are doing a \$4 million project, and spend \$15,000 on partnership, the partnership cost is nothing. That's my personal view.

A. Wahida Maghraby: Thank you very much. It's a very awesome question: how much time, effort and cost is required? I've been working in this area for more than 25 years. In my experience, I always treat the partner as my friend. I am always working from the heart, and I always find the most passionate people in building this partnership. And at the end of the day, you know, for us, Indonesia is a developing country, and thus developing networks is important for us. What we have to understand is: What is the most important outcome that we want from Indonesia's point of view? What is the mutual benefit for both countries (which in this case means Indonesia and the donors), and how this can make beneficial impact and improvement?

I know that measuring impact at the beginning is the hardest part, but you need to share and understand the narrative that we would like to generate from the partnership and common interest. As the first speaker in this session mentioned, you treat your partners as your friends. That has been the key for me. I have learned a lot from my colleagues about how to work with the younger researchers. It's opening my eyes and widening my ideas. It is important to involve the young generation (millennials and Gen Z). We can create room for collaboration and learning experiences across generations. At the end of the day, it is important for both partners to create collaboration opportunities, to develop a common interest and understanding, with open-minded attitudes, to increase the benefits and outcomes from the partnership.

Q. Neil Andrew, former Chair of the Crawford Fund: I am going to bring a very parochial and, I hope, practical approach to partnerships. I happen to have a property in the Riverland of South Australia. It has always been fruit-fly free. My question is to our Torres Strait islands and Papua New Guinea friends. My fruit-fly free property currently faces the reality of fruit fly in South Australia. Right now we are focusing on how to eliminate fruit fly in the Riverland of South Australia. I was fascinated by your practical approach in your region. In South Australia, there is a real effort to eliminate fruit fly by introducing sterile male fruit flies. The reason I raise that here is that the sterile males are effectively distributed by air, and it struck me that in the isolation that you face in those villages, in PNG particularly, and in the Torres Strait, there could be a lot of value in distributing sterile males simply by air. Don't ask me for a solution. You could ask Wendy Umberger and ACIAR about creating a transformative partnership, because that's what this question is supposed to be about.

A. Anastasia Kawi: I think the technique you mention, the sterile insect technique, is not really applicable in Papua New Guinea, within the small space of the Torres Strait and the Treaty Villages. Maybe in the future we can work on something. The Treaty Villages are subsistence farming, gardening. So, for them, something like bait spraying and blocking is more suitable at this stage.

Chair: Thank you everyone for your contributions to this session.