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For a long time, African agriculture has failed to rise and assume its rightful position in terms of economic, social and political relevance on the continent, notwithstanding the astounding characteristics of the continent’s agricultural potential. According to Leke et al. (2010), nearly 60% of the world’s arable, uncultivated land is in Africa, and yet the continent is a major net importer of food. It is estimated that one in four people living in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) suffers from undernourishment. Agriculture is the major employer in most Sub-Saharan African countries, with at least half of the national labour force across most of the countries. With few exceptions, the performance of agriculture in African countries remains unsatisfactory and the sector has not experienced anywhere near the results obtained under the Green Revolution in Asia.

A cursory look at the reasons for this depressed agricultural performance will point at many factors, however, against the background of all the supporting policy pronouncements, it is difficult to explain the lack of progress without focusing on the role of actors within Africa’s agricultural sector. Across the continent, agriculture sector actors seem to have abdicated the role of interpreting the continental policy pronouncements to devise national frameworks that would take agriculture to the next level. It is FANRPAN’s view that the absence of a common platform enabling state and non-state actors to collaborate in a co-creative process of deciphering continental and regional food and agricultural policies, thus creating practical frameworks for implementation at local and national level have resulted in the slow to no progress that characterises agriculture on the continent. There is also a need to acknowledge the skewed state of capacity between state and non-state actors regarding their respective abilities to interface with the various policy processes, thereby leaving the government departments to go it alone.

It is against this background that FANRPAN believes in investing a concerted effort to build the capacity of ordinary state and non-state actors in the field of policy. This will lead to the establishment of a vibrant community of practice capable of spearheading the transformation of African agriculture through meaningful engagement along the policy cycle.

As you embark on this training programme, I implore you to set clear targets focused on positively transforming the agricultural sector at the level that you operate, one policy at a time. An enabling policy environment will facilitate growth of the agriculture sector. This Policy Training Manual is a vital tool towards the creation of the cadre of knowledgeable policy practitioners and stakeholders that will lead the development and implementation of evidence-based food, agriculture and natural resource policies at local, national and continental levels.

I wish you an exciting journey as you take your first steps towards becoming a policy champion!

Tobias Takavarasha
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INTRODUCTION

Agriculture is a key sector in most African countries and accounts for half of Africa’s gross domestic product (GDP). With rapid population growth in Africa in the past two decades, per capita food grain production has been declining resulting in food scarcity coupled with imbalanced diets. A large part of the population has become malnourished. Agriculture in Africa is affected by risks such as climate change, increased market risk, and tightening resource constraints. With the removal of constraints to agricultural development, it is anticipated that Africa’s agricultural output will increase from the current US$ 280 billion per year to as much as US$ 880 billion by the year 2030 (AfDB, 2015). According to a World Bank report: “Growing Africa: Unlocking the Potential of Agribusiness”, Africa’s farmers and agribusinesses could create a trillion-dollar food market by 2030 if they can expand their access to more capital, electricity, better technology and irrigated land to grow high-value nutritious foods (World Bank, 2013).

Africa has the largest population of young people in the world, with 226 million people aged 15 to 24 (UNEP, 2015). Each year, young people graduate from school seeking to enter the continent’s workforce, often with no success. The continent is facing a double employment crisis—a lack of jobs for youth, and an increasing number of young people in need of work. However, as the largest sector of employment in Africa, agriculture promises opportunities for job growth and economic prosperity. African youth are realising that white-collar jobs are elusive and are increasingly turning to agriculture to earn a living.

Although there are opportunities in agriculture and agribusiness, African youth often do not have the necessary skills or access to resources to enable them to successfully to earn a living from the agricultural sector, either through employment or starting their own businesses. It is widely expected that for youth to be actively engaged in agriculture, agriculture needs to be profitable and attractive. With climate change and increased climate variability, African farmers need to adopt climate-smart technologies that will improve yields, create more drought-resilient crops and livestock, resulting in higher incomes and improved food security. With increased technological advancement in the agriculture sector, Africa needs to identify how to create employment for the youth by bringing them into the formal agribusiness economy, with access to domestic and foreign markets.

There is growing agreement on the importance of bringing input from youth to policy making processes. It is clear that young people should be part of the solution as they are facing the challenges that policies seek to address. Many youth groups say: “Nothing for us, without us” – a slogan used by several interest groups seeking to be consulted on decisions that affect them.

It is against this background that the Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Analysis Network (FANRPAN), with support from the Mastercard Foundation, has designed and developed a training programme to build and enhance the knowledge and hands-on skills for effective participation by youth in agriculture policy development processes resulting in the beneficial transformation of the sector.

About this Policy Training Manual

This Policy Training Manual focuses on policy processes around the Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources (FANR) sector in Africa. This is because agriculture is central to Africa’s development. With rapid population growth in Africa in the past two decades, per capita food grain production has been declining resulting in food scarcity coupled with imbalanced diets. A large part of the population has become malnourished. Agriculture in Africa is affected by risks such as climate change, increased market risks, and tightening resource constraints. With the removal of constraints to agricultural development, it is anticipated that Africa’s agricultural output will increase from the current US$ 280 billion per year to as much as US$ 880 billion by the year 2030 (AfDB, 2015). According to a World Bank report: “Growing Africa: Unlocking the Potential of Agribusiness”, Africa’s farmers and agribusinesses could create a trillion-dollar food market by 2030 if they can expand their access to more capital, electricity, better technology and irrigated land to grow high-value nutritious foods (World Bank, 2013).

With climate change and increased climate variability, African farmers need to adopt climate-smart technologies that will provide higher yields, more drought-resilient crops and livestock, including higher incomes and improved food security. With increased technological advancement in the agriculture sector, Africa needs to identify how to create employment for the youth by bringing them into the formal agribusiness economy linked to domestic and foreign markets.
# How to Use This Training Manual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why this training manual?</th>
<th>This training manual is designed to be flexible and provide the user with options. It is not an academic textbook, a technical guide or an instruction manual. It is full of useful materials, tools and exercises. Different aspects will be relevant to different policy advocacy projects and programmes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Different learning methods</td>
<td>This training manual consists of the following: Pre-Assessment Module 1: How Policies Are Made Module 2: How to Become a Policy Advocate Module 3: Enhancing Understanding of Agriculture Policy Processes: A Case Study Approach Post Assessments Each module in this training manual is self-contained, so users can select whichever modules are most appropriate to their needs. However, it would be wise to cover Module 1 before tackling Module 2 and Module 3. Each module could take anything from four to eight hours with appropriate breaks, depending on the detail required. The manual can be used:  • as a five-day intensive training workshop, with the aim of achieving a basic advocacy strategy at the end.  • as a two- or three-day intensive training workshop, covering less detail and requiring more follow-up afterwards.  • over a period of time, in shorter training sessions at key intervals, with time in between to apply the learning and report back on progress.  • in study group learning sessions, once a week or month, studying one section at a time.  • by individuals who want to understand the basics of policy development and advocacy for their own benefit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is it for?</td>
<td>This manual is designed for the current and next generation of agripreneurs, farmers, researchers, scientists and extension workers. It is relevant to them if they are considering an advocacy initiative, looking to integrate advocacy into a wider development project or programme, or intending to become more systematic, strategic and effective in their existing advocacy engagements.  • People who are new to advocacy, or who have only limited advocacy experience, will benefit from the manual’s back-to-basics approach.  • People who have some experience or interest in advocacy will want to use the toolkit to refresh their skills and confidence.  • Organisations and networks with a responsibility for building capacity for advocacy will find a wealth of resources in the toolkit to help them strengthen and empower others.  • Anyone who is a facilitator, trainer, adviser, knowledge manager, strategist or planner for advocacy in their organisation or network will be able to use the toolkit to run workshops and other learning sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiding symbols</td>
<td>Each section includes a range of opportunities for you to go through key principles, relevant examples, reflect on the material you have worked through, complete activities and apply knowledge gained, and answer group discussion questions to further explore the concept. As you read through the module, you will find different visual features that are designed to help you navigate the document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before you begin</td>
<td>Before you begin with any of the modules in this manual, we have created a Pre-Assessment exercise, that will help you to determine what you know about the subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When you have finished</td>
<td>The Post-Assessment is to be done once you have gone through the Policy Training Manual. Compare your answers to those in the Pre-Assessment to identify where knowledge has been gained and where improvements can be made.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rate your knowledge on the topics on a scale of 1 to 5 by circling the corresponding number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can you define policy and give examples of policies that you have encountered?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How confident are you in your ability to explain how policies are made?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you describe the policy context, policy processes and policy change management?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How confident are you in your ability to identify policy issues?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How confident are you in your ability to identify the policy stakeholders?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you define policy advocacy?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How confident are you in your ability to explain the difference between policy advocacy and lobbying?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you describe and give examples of policy advocacy engagement platforms and tools?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How confident are you in your ability to define advocacy goals and objectives and develop advocacy messages?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you identify advocacy campaign messengers and policy champions?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you describe what a policy dialogue is?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How comfortable are you in your ability to know which platform to use to get your message across?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADF</td>
<td>Agricultural Development Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AfDB</td>
<td>African Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARNS</td>
<td>African Regional Nutrition Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>African Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUC</td>
<td>African Union Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAADP</td>
<td>Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFS</td>
<td>Committee on World Food Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFTA</td>
<td>Continental Free Trade Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMESA</td>
<td>Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP21</td>
<td>21st Conference of Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRLR</td>
<td>Commission on Restitution of Land Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAC</td>
<td>Eastern African Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECCAS</td>
<td>Economic Community of Central African States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FANRPAN</td>
<td>Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Analysis Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISP</td>
<td>Farm Input Subsidy Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAASTD</td>
<td>International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICARRD</td>
<td>International Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>Land Claims Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDGs</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAFSIPs</td>
<td>National Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>National Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCOP</td>
<td>National Council of Provinces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDCs</td>
<td>Nationally Determined Contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPAD</td>
<td>New Partnership for Africa’s Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRSA/AC</td>
<td>Projet Régional de Sécurité Alimentaire de l’Afrique Centrale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAIP</td>
<td>Regional Agricultural Investment Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>Agricultural Policy Investment Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>Regional Agricultural Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECs</td>
<td>Regional Economic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISDP</td>
<td>Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SADC</td>
<td>Southern Africa Development Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUN</td>
<td>Scaling Up Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFTA</td>
<td>Tripartite Free Trade Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGGT</td>
<td>The Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGRtF</td>
<td>The Voluntary Guidelines to Support the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRA</td>
<td>Water Resource Authority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ABOUT THIS MODULE

In this module you will be taken through the policy making process cycle. You will also gain a better understanding of applying tools for policy analysis. This module provides a broadly accepted definition of policy and underscores actors’ unique positions and experiences in policy processes. This module will help you understand how to organise evidence for policy action and most importantly, how you can support actors in contributing to policy development processes.

Key module objectives are to assist the users to:

• Gain a basic understanding and analytical skills associated with the food and natural resources (FANR) policy issues and policy analysis.
• Improve knowledge on how agriculture policies are designed and implemented at local, national, and regional levels.
• Analyse the dynamic processes that influence policy-making decisions.
• Develop skills to design and analyse policy proposals using different policy models.
• Identify critical characteristics of the civil society organisational context that are likely to influence policy design, implementation, and evaluation processes.
• Identify policy problems within the agriculture sectors and use learned analytical skills to identify solutions to those problems.
• Critically analyse regional and global themes and dynamics influencing agriculture policy at the national level.
• Develop networking across the civil society, public sector and private sector divide for influencing policy decision making.

Module Outline

Guiding Symbols

Each section includes a range of opportunities for you to go through key concepts, reflect on the material you have gone through, apply the knowledge gained through various activities and, for group discussion purposes, and further explore the concepts by answering questions.

As you read through the module, you will find different visual features that are designed to help you navigate the document.

This module has eight sections:

1. Section 1: Introduction, introducing the training objectives and training schedule, as well as giving instructions on how to use this training manual to get the most out of it.
2. Section 2: Understanding the Policy Context, focusing on policy terminologies/definitions, types of policies, and key stakeholders in the agricultural policy arena; the varied and complex nature of ‘policy’ and policy processes; and how policy analysis can help one to understand what drives and influences these processes and the resulting consequences.
3. Section 3: Agenda Setting. Identifying problems that require government attention, deciding which issues deserve the most attention and defining the nature of the problem.
4. Section 4: Policy Formulation. Setting objectives, identifying the cost and estimating the effect of solutions, choosing from a list of solutions and selecting policy instruments.
5. Section 5: Policy Implementation. Establishing or partnering with an organisation to take responsibility for implementation, ensuring that the organisation has the resources (such as staffing, money and legal authority) to do so, and making sure that policy decisions are carried out as planned.
6. Section 6: Policy Review. Assessing the extent to which the policy was successful, or the policy decision was the correct one; if it was implemented correctly and, if so, if it had the desired effect.
7. Section 7: Putting it all Together
8. Section 8: Annexes

We sincerely hope this module is a useful resource to support you in the process of planning your evidence-based policy advocacy campaigns and achieving policy influence.
2.1. Introduction

The section covers topics of evaluating and prioritising interests, as well as determining stakeholders’ power based on their relative levels of importance and influence. The concept of policy will be unpacked and explained. You will also be taken through some examples to help you better grasp the concepts that are presented.

You will learn about different types of public policies, global, regional and national policy frameworks. You will also learn about different types of policy stakeholders and you will be introduced to the policy cycle. Specifically, after going through this section, you will understand:

1. The difference between policy and politics
2. The policy characteristics and elements
3. The difference between state and non-state actors
4. Where youth fit within the policy context.

2.2. Defining Policy

The word ‘policy’ is not a tightly defined concept, but a highly flexible one used in different ways on different occasions. Policies exist at different levels. For example, as individuals we have policies, based on values and interests that guide how we act in specific circumstances. Other levels include family policies, organisational policies and government policies. Policies differs from rules or law. While law can compel or prohibit behaviours (e.g. a law requiring the payment of taxes on income), policy merely guides actions in a way that is most likely to achieve a desired outcome.

Policy is like the proverbial elephant: you only know it when you stand back and look at the entire animal.

The blind men and the elephant
Politics can be defined as the science or art of governing or government, especially governing a political entity like a nation. Politics refers to authority and refers to public life. Politics generally revolves around government and its activities. Politics is a term that refers to the organisational process. Politics refers to the theory and practice of governance.

It is useful to identify policy characteristics when analysing policy content or when thinking prospectively about the content of a policy, as they can provide the main signposts for what the policy is about, what is intended, how likely it is to succeed, or what major stumbling blocks may arise in implementing the policy. Policy characteristics usually include:

- the gains and losses of the policy to a system, to implementers, to beneficiaries etc. (Who carries the losses or benefits from the gains? How big are the gains or losses? How visible or immediate are the losses or the gains?);
- the administrative or technical and financial resources needed to implement the policy; the level of skill required, and the availability of the resources.
- the level of complexity of the policy and the feasibility of implementation (i.e. how difficult is the policy to implement?);
- the participation needed (i.e. to what extent does the policy depend on other people to succeed?); and
- past policies and their influence on current problems and current policies

Policy and politics... what’s the difference?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Politics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A policy can be defined as an overall plan that embraces the general goals.</td>
<td>Politics can be defined as the science or art of governing or government, especially governing a political entity like a nation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy can be termed as a ‘principle.’</td>
<td>Politics refers to authority and refers to public life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A policy can also be termed as a commitment or statement of intent. It is because of the policy that people, an organisation, or a party is held accountable.</td>
<td>Politics generally revolves around government and its activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy is a set of rules or principles that guide decisions.</td>
<td>Politics is a term that refers to the organisational process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A policy can also be said to be a course or action that is proposed by a government, an individual, a business, or any party.</td>
<td>Politics refers to the theory and practice of governance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy characteristics

It is useful to identify policy characteristics when analysing policy content or when thinking prospectively about the content of a policy, as they can provide the main signposts for what the policy is about, what is intended, how likely it is to succeed, or what major stumbling blocks may arise in implementing the policy. Policy characteristics usually include:

- the gains and losses of the policy to a system, to implementers, to beneficiaries etc. (Who carries the losses or benefits from the gains? How big are the gains or losses? How visible or immediate are the losses or the gains?);
- the administrative or technical and financial resources needed to implement the policy; the level of skill required, and the availability of the resources.
- the level of complexity of the policy and the feasibility of implementation (i.e. how difficult is the policy to implement?);
- the participation needed (i.e. to what extent does the policy depend on other people to succeed?); and
- past policies and their influence on current problems and current policies

Policy elements

Policy is a multi-dimensional term with a range of aspects. These include:

- Policy creates a framework for action (within your organisation)
- Policy is a decision
- Policy is grounded in legitimate authority
- Policy is a written product
- Policy creation is an ongoing process

Policies exist at different levels. For example, as individuals we have policies based on values and interests that guide how we act in specific circumstances. Other levels include family policies, organisational policies and government policies. However, only government policies are covered for the purpose of this module.

EXAMPLE

**Government Policies**
- Presidential executive orders, statutory instruments (acts of parliament), parliamentary rules or orders, Labour relations laws and national agricultural development policies (programmes).

**Policies in Private Sector Organisations**
- Human resources policies and procedures, Corporate privacy policies, Gender and diversity policies.

**Group Policies**
- Group adopted or agreed terms and conditions e.g. constitution of cooperatives, Community grazing policy, Livestock dipping policy, Group sales and marketing policy.

**Individual Policies**
- Religious or traditional beliefs, personal preferences and biases – “My religion does not allow me to eat pork”; “Cooking is not a job for a man.”
Formal public policy, as developed by governments, is intended to influence the many actors working within a sector or system and the procedures and processes built into it, in ways that guide them to work together to achieve common goals and purposes. In general, public policies seek to generate ‘public value’; that is, they seek to produce things of value to the public at large in any country and to build public institutions, such as hospitals and clinics, that operate in ways that the public judges as fair and accountable.

Formally, public policies often take the form of written documents. These can be documents which are actually called policies, but can also be regulations, guidelines or legislation. However, policies can also be in the form of more informal written documents such as memos or circulars communicating central-level decisions to those working at district/local level in communities; or posters outlining rules and procedures and displayed in government offices.

Public policy may also take the form of formal public statements such as ministerial budget statements in parliament which lay out plans of action for ministries in the years ahead. Even informal public statements by those with authority can be understood by the general public or other agriculture sector actors, even if incorrectly, as statements of policy. When a Minister of Agriculture announces a decision and, perhaps, even gives timelines for its implementation, then this becomes the policy statement – and the formal policy document must catch up with the public announcement. Understanding the political and economic context and the institutional constraints is critical to the successful design and uptake of policies and reform processes.

The following are major types of public policies:

I. **Regulatory policies** are those concerned with regulation and control of activities or behaviours. They impose restrictions or limitations on the behaviour of individuals and groups.

II. **Constituent policy** issues are those which are concerned with the setting-up or re-organisation of institutions. Each of these policy issues forms a different power arena. Constituent policies create executive power entities, or deal with laws.

**Example:**

**Kenya National Seed Policy**

The National Seed Policy is the Ministry’s outline of the intervention measures to be implemented in the seed sub sector in order to achieve the stated objective of availing adequate high-quality seed and planting material for the country’s farming and forestry needs. This is intended to be achieved through the implementation of measures geared towards exploiting the potential of improved varieties and technologies for increased agricultural and forestry productivity; building capacity and infrastructure development within the seed industry to handle research and development, quality control, technology transfer, and other emerging technologies; establishing an effective regulation, coordination and management of all activities within the sub sector; and creating an enabling environment, through policy and legal reforms for effective participation of both the public and private sector.

**Example:**

**South Africa Commission on Restitution of Land Rights**

The mandate for restitution emanates from section 25 (7) of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996 (Act No108 of 1996). Restitution (of land rights) is one of the four pillars of Government’s Land Reform Programme, the others being redistribution; tenure reform; and development. Restitution of land rights is implemented under the Restitution of Land Rights Act, 1994 (Act 22 of 1994). This Act establishes the Commission on Restitution of Land Rights (CRLR) and the Land Claims Court (LCC). The functions of the CRLR are to solicit and investigate claims for land restitution and to prepare them for settlement. The LCC adjudicates disputes emanating from the restitution process.
III. **Distributive policies** involve allocation of services or benefits to particular segments of the population - individuals, groups, corporations, and communities. Some distributive policies may provide benefits to one or a few beneficiaries. Governments also use distributive policy to encourage certain activities.

IV. **Redistributive policies** involve deliberate efforts by the government to shift the allocation of wealth, income, property, or rights among broad classes or groups of the population. Redistributive policies are difficult to enact because they involve the reallocation of money, rights, or power.

---

**Malawi Farm Input Subsidy Programme (FISP)**

*Achieving food self-sufficiency on a national basis is a high priority for the government of Malawi. The goal of the Farm Input Subsidy Program (FISP) is to enhance food self-sufficiency by increasing smallholder farmers’ access to and use of improved agricultural inputs, thereby boosting the incomes of resource-poor farmers. FISP is administered through vouchers or coupons that enable eligible households to purchase fertilizer, hybrid seed, and pesticides at reduced prices. The programme targets smallholder farmers who own land.*

---

**Ghana National Land Policy**

*The National Land Policy of Ghana aims at the judicious use of the nation’s land and natural resources in support of the different socio-economic activities undertaken, in accordance with sustainable resource management principles and to maintain viable ecosystems. The policy guidelines include the facilitation of equitable access to land, security of tenure and protection of land rights, ensuring the sustainable use of land and enhancing land capability, and conservation. Promotion of research into all aspects of land ownership, tenure and the operations of the land market and land development process.*

---

**2.4. Policy Frameworks**

Policy frameworks are public commitments and global instruments that are meant to guide policy development. Global frameworks standardise the way we do policy business across countries. For the last 15 years, the global community closely monitored trends toward achieving the targets set under the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), before adopting the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and there is no doubt that many sub-Saharan African countries have made some progress.

However, in comparison to other regions, sub-Saharan Africa faces a significant challenge in achieving food security and nutrition policies within the framework of the SDGs. The most recent estimates of food insecurity reveal that approximately 218 million people were undernourished in sub-Saharan Africa; it means that about one out of four persons in the region did not have adequate dietary energy supply. Estimates also show that, on average, one out of four individuals above 15 years of age in the region experienced severe food insecurity in 2014–15 based on self-reported individual experiences.

Several overarching frameworks provide key principles and strategies for the achievement of food and nutrition security. The following frameworks are particularly important due to their connection to developing policies related to food security and nutrition:

**Global Food Security Related Policy Frameworks**

- The Five Rome Principles for Sustainable Global Food Security
- The Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VGGT)
- UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development
- The Paris Agreement and other COP21 Decisions

**Others Global Food Security Related Policy Frameworks**

- The International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development (IAASTD)
- The final Declaration of the International Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (ICARRD)

**Continental Food Security Related Policy Frameworks**

- The AU Agenda 2063 for long-term development
- African Regional Nutrition Strategy
- The ‘Feed Africa’ strategy of the African Development Bank (AfDB)

**Regional and Sub-Regional Food Security Related Policy Frameworks**

- Tripartite Free Trade Area Agreement
- Policies on agricultural investment plans in middle Africa
- Policies for food security and nutrition in southern Africa

Brief descriptions of each framework are provided in Annex 1.
2.5. Who is a Policy Stakeholder?

You are a stakeholder when you:

- have an interest or concern in something, especially a business or a type of organisation or system in which most members or participants are seen as having an interest in its success.
- intend to be affected or are already affected by a government’s or any organisation’s actions, objectives and policies.
- have something to gain or lose through the outcomes of a planning process or project. In many circles these are called interest groups and they can have a powerful bearing on the outcomes of political processes.

Stakeholders in policy processes usually fall into two categories, state and non-state actors.

State Actors - government officials and the bureaucrats

These are the people who can devise, pass, and enforce laws and regulations that may either fulfill the goals of your effort or directly cancel them out.

- Federal and state or provincial representatives, ministers, permanent secretaries etc. who introduce and pass laws and generally control public budgets at the federal and state or provincial levels.
- Governors, mayors, city/town councillors, selectmen, etc. The executives that carry out laws, administer budgets, and generally run the show can contribute greatly to the success – or failure – of an effort.
- State/federal agencies. Government agencies often devise and issue regulations and reporting requirements and can sometimes make or break an effort by how they choose to implement these measures.

Non-State Actors – Those who are affected and can influence and those with an interest in the outcome of an effort

Some individuals and groups may not be affected by or involved in an effort but may nonetheless care enough about it that they are willing to work to influence its outcome.

- The business community will usually recognise its interest in any effort that will earn it or cost it money or impose regulations on it.
- Advocates may be active on either or both sides of the issue.
- Organisations and individuals who have an interest in the issue may organise to support or to defeat it.
- People with academic or research interests related to a targeted issue or population; their work may have convinced them of the need for an intervention or initiative, or they may simply be sympathetic to the goals of the effort and understand them better than most.
- Funders and potential funders are obvious key stakeholders, in that, in many cases, without their support the effort won’t be possible.
- Community at large. When widespread community support is needed, the entire community may be the key stakeholder.
- The media. Independent media sources, which should provide balanced coverage of issues, have an obligation to inform their audience.
- Community leaders – prominent persons that others listen to might be respected because of their position of leadership or they may be longtime residents who have earned the community’s trust.

Stakeholder Analysis is a way of determining who among stakeholders can have the most positive or negative influence on an effort, who is likely to be most affected by the effort, and how you should work with stakeholders with different levels of interest and influence.

- Step One. Identify your stakeholders. This involves identifying stakeholders and discussing why they are critical for meeting policy outcomes. It is important to focus primarily on the person and his or her role, not just an organisational group or a positional title. This is because individuals will most likely have different levels of power or importance within an organisation and will likely have different relationships (or none at all) with various team members.
- Step Two. Prioritise your stakeholders. This requires you to prioritise your list of stakeholders in terms of how critical they are in helping deliver on the policy according to their level of interest (low or high) and their degree of power or influence (weak/low or strong) on the issue. This will help prioritise communication and engagement activities with the people most likely to affect or be affected by the policy.
- Step Three. Understanding and managing your stakeholders involves considering such items as the likely attitudes of the various stakeholders to the policy, their attitude and any risks associated with their involvement in the policy development process. It then asks you to consider what changes may be required in how you engage with them to minimise any risks and/or to increase their appreciation of, and commitment to, the project.
- Step Four. Evaluation and revision should be undertaken regularly throughout the life of the policy. It is most beneficial when a stakeholder analysis is regularly updated to identify whether there are potential new stakeholders, changes in current stakeholder importance or influence, or if perceptions of the project have changed. Throughout these steps it is important keep a record using the stakeholder analysis table available in Annex 1.
The policy development process has been called ‘messy’ because it is both complex and complicated.

- The process is ‘complex’ because it is humanly not possible to know everything about the multitude of internal and external actors and factors that do not always act or behave in predictable or identifiable ways.

- The policy process is ‘complicated’ because there are many actors, factors and mechanisms with many inter-relations and interactions among them that need to be considered, ranked for importance, and monitored.

The policy process never starts out from a ‘blank slate’; it is never the case that government or another agency simply comes to a ‘new’ situation where there is no current influence of policies. Instead, there are always pre-existing policies at work in a situation.

In the agriculture sector, these pre-existing conditions influence and shape the practices of actors in the sector, including their resistance to new policies. So as new policies are introduced, they interact with the existing policies in ways that are hard to predict, and as a result, there are often unexpected consequences. Furthermore, as new policies are being implemented, a range of other forces may undermine their relevance or their impact on practices, again leading to new pressures for policy change.

The Policy Cycle provides a simplified way of visualising the
policy development process and assists in targeting the most effective way of influencing this process. It divides the policy process into a series of stages, from a notional starting point at which policy makers begin to think about a policy problem to a notional end point at which a policy has been implemented and policy makers think about how successful it has been before deciding what to do next.

The cycle is useful in many ways. It is simple and understandable. It can be applied to all political systems. The emphasis on cycles highlights fluid policy making.

The graphic above depicts the general order of stages in which policy development and implementation occurs. In reality, the aspects of the cycle overlap or are not exclusive of one another. It is important to note that the policy cycle is a continuous process rather than a single event.

The four key stages of the cycle: Agenda Setting, Policy Formulation, Policy Implementation and Policy Review are discussed in detail in Section 3, 4, 5 and 6.

---

**REFLECT**

Reflect on the following questions

1. Are there policies that I know that are not part of the four types of policies that have been presented?
2. What is the difference between policy and politics?
3. Given what I now know about policies, what then is my role?
4. Can you think of youth policy champions in your constituency? What is unique about them? What makes them influential?

---

**ACTIVITY**

Take 15 minutes to answer the following questions using examples from an environment that is familiar to you. This can be your school, work place and/or your community.

1. In your own language, explain what ‘policy’ is.

2. Considering your own environment, give examples of distributive, regulatory, constituent and redistributive policies.

3. In your country, what are the on-going policy initiatives that feed into the continental and global
   a. climate change frameworks and
   b. nutrition frameworks?

---
Section 2 ended by introducing the policy cycle. In this section, you will explore agenda setting and discover factors that shape and influence agriculture policy agendas. Agenda setting will be defined, its functions and processes will be presented, and examples of agenda setting will be provided.

You will learn about the three elements that constitute agenda setting, namely problem identification, problem prioritisation and research. You will also learn about evidence-based policy making and the different types of evidence. By the end of this module, you will be able to demonstrate understanding of how to develop policy options and strategies.

3.1. Introduction

Specifically, after going through this section, you will understand:
1. The key aspects to consider when identifying problems
2. Several factors that may be considered in prioritising problems
3. The process of identifying policy options
4. The role of research in policy development, specifically:
   • what evidence based policy making is,
   • different types of evidence,
   • why evidence-informed policy is desirable.

3.2. What is Agenda Setting?

The first step in the problem-solving and decision-making process is to identify and define the problem. A problem can be regarded as a difference between the actual situation and the desired situation.

The first stage in policy making refers to the identification of a societal problem requiring the state to intervene. There are many societal problems, but only a small number will be given official attention by legislators and executives. Those that are chosen by the decision-makers constitute the policy agenda. The factors determining whether an issue reaches the agenda may be cultural, political, social, economic, or ideological, which can be grouped into three:

1. Problem-driven agenda – this is when citizen groups gain broad public support and get an issue onto the formal agenda.
2. Policy-driven agenda – this is when initiatives of governments need to be placed on the public agenda for successful implementation.
3. Politically-driven agenda – this is when influential groups with access to decision-makers present policy proposals, which are broadly supported by particular interest groups but only marginally by the public.

The result of the convergence of the three streams is the opening of a policy window, which allows advocates of a certain issue to put it on the policy agenda.

For the purpose of this manual, agenda setting should be understood to consist of problem identification, problem prioritisation and research.

3.3. Problem Identification

The process of problem identification provides the platform for investigating a broad range of interventions for addressing the policy challenge and generating policy options.

The process of problem identification involves the development of clear, straightforward problem statements that can be linked directly with the broad challenge.

When identifying problems, the following should be considered:

• not only ‘problems’ or ‘challenges’ should be considered, but also constraints on opportunities that are preventing the goals and objectives from being achieved.
• identification should be based on empirical observations, such as data and information obtained from surveys, demand modelling, interviews and studies from a wide range of sources.
• problem identification should result in problem statements that describe the nature of the problem facing the system and its components.
• Problem identification should not be confined to existing situations or issues. Emerging and potential future problems should also be considered.
• Problems can be different for the various planning levels.
• Problems should be seen as multi-dimensional. It is important to ‘cast the net wide’ when identifying problems. This means considering the full range of economic, social and environmental factors and canvassing a broad spectrum of potential problems.
Describe and document the problem

It is important to clearly describe and document what you consider the problem to be. This helps to ensure that agreement is reached as to the problem and provides a starting point for resolving the problem. Describing the problem also ensures that any confusion about the problem is identified and resolved.

A useful technique for describing the problem is to ask questions that can help you to actively think about the specific problem. Some questions you can ask are:

- Why do you think there is a problem?
- What is happening?
- When is it happening?
- Where is it happening?
- Who do you believe is involved?
- Why is it happening?

Note: When asking the question “Who do you believe is involved?” state facts and do not apportion blame.

Once you have worked through these questions, the answers should be used to document the problem as specifically and accurately as possible. This description can then be used as a starting point for the next step in the problem-solving and decision-making process: gather information relevant to the problem.

Example

Putting the Spotlight on Climate Change

Today, the world is seized by the looming threat of climate change and the trigger of this impending doom is a steady increase in temperatures now termed ‘global warming’. Yet three decades ago NASA scientist James Hansen testified to the United States Senate Energy Committee that the age of climate change had arrived, in his words: “The greenhouse effect has been detected and it is changing our climate now”.

The announcement shook the political establishment in 1988. George H. W. Bush, in the middle of a heated presidential campaign, vowed to use the "White House effect" to battle the "greenhouse effect." Four years later, with then-President Bush in attendance, the United States became a founding member of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change – which still guides global climate action today.

In effect, Jim Hansen’s chilling warning helped set the climate change agenda.


3.4. Problem Prioritisation

The process of problem prioritisation allocates significance to the identified problems. This determines which problems should be tackled first. Limited funding and competing needs and trade-offs mean that governments and society generally cannot afford to address all the problems identified. This means that setting priorities is an important element in identifying and assessing problems.

A sound evidence base is important in determining why a problem should be prioritised ahead of others. A comparison of quantitative and qualitative information gathered will help to identify the most urgent or most significant problem. However, it is important to appreciate that this may not be an entirely objective process as input from stakeholders will be largely subjective.

Several factors may be considered in prioritising problems, including:

- Current or forecast levels of demand
- The scale or extent of the problem, and hence the potential benefits of addressing the problem
- Government priorities and policies.

Problem prioritisation is an inherently political process in which political attention is attached to a subset of all possibly relevant policy problems. The involvement of particular actors (e.g. experts), the choice of institutional venues in which problems are debated and the strategic use of media coverage have been identified as tactical means to prioritise problems. While several stakeholders are involved in these activities, most of the variables affecting the prioritisation of policy problems lie outside the direct control of any single stakeholder.

The crucial step in the process of problem prioritisation is the move of an issue from its identification – frequently expressed by interested groups or affected stakeholders – up to formal policy agenda. The move encompasses several substages as follows:

1. While problem prioritisation in liberal democracies is said to be largely conducted in public, the actual agenda-setting is characterised by different patterns in terms of stakeholder composition and the role of the public. The outside-initiation pattern, where non-state actors force governments to place an issue on the systemic agenda by way of gaining public support, presents but one of different types of agenda-setting.

2. Equally significant are processes of policies without public input such as when interest groups have direct access to government agencies and are capable of putting topics on the agenda without major interference or even recognition of the public.
3. Another pattern is the mobilisation of support within the public by the government after the initial agenda-setting has been accomplished without a relevant role for non-state actors (e.g. introduction of a new currency).

4. State actors may initiate an issue where public support is already high.

The confluence of several interacting factors and variables determines whether a policy issue becomes prioritised on the policy agenda. These factors include both the material conditions of the policy environment (like the level of economic development), and the flow and cycle of ideas and ideologies, which are important in evaluating problems and connecting them with solutions (policy options).

How the different variables – actors, institutions, ideas, and material conditions – interact is highly contingent, depending on the specific situation. That also implies that agenda-setting is far from a rational selection of issues in terms of their relevance as a problem from the wider society.

Sometimes windows of opportunity open at a specific time for a specific policy. The policy window opens when three usually separate and independent streams – the policy stream (solutions), the politics stream (public sentiments, change in governments, and the like), and the problem stream (problem perception) – intersect.

---

**EXAMPLE**

### Stakeholder Approach to Problem Prioritisation

A development practitioner wishes to implement a livestock livelihoods development project in the Eastern Cape, and as part of the scan, feedback from the communities indicated that they have these problems:

- Land tenure – farmers have only 1-3 years for livestock farming – hence they cannot invest in dip tanks or fencing
- Environmental degradation – no reclamation, environment is degraded
- Access to markets – limited due to remote location
- Carcass classification – problematic due to lack of expertise

The development practitioner realises there is a need to prioritise which problems to attend to first. To do this there is need to have an in-depth understanding of each of the four problems identified.

After a thorough analysis of the problems with a view to understanding each as well as the relationships between them, the development practitioner makes the following observation. Instead of four, there are three main problems, which are:

- Land tenure – the problem of short tenure does not allow for farmers to make meaningful investments as well as look after the environment. Hence, environmental degradation is a result of farmers not having a sense of ownership.
- Carcass classification – problematic due to lack of expertise
- Access to markets – limited due to remote location

Of these three, the development practitioner and the community agree that the most critical issue is land tenure, because it affects the continuity of their farming practices.

---

### 3.5. What is the Role of Research in Policy Development?

**KEY CONCEPT**

Research begins when we want to know something. It is concerned with increasing our understanding and it provides us with the information and knowledge needed for problem solving and making decisions. It usually involves:

- assembling and analysing available data, preferably from multiple reliable sources;
- understanding the context of the problem, e.g. historical events, external driving forces, related issues;
- identifying and understanding stakeholder perspectives, e.g. through surveys or other methods of consultation;
- identifying values; these are often what lie at the heart of many major issues, and where solutions need to be directed.

**Evidence-based policy making**

Evidence-based policy has been defined as an approach that ‘helps people make well-informed decisions about policies, programmes and projects by putting the best available evidence from research at the heart of policy development and implementation. Evidence provides:

- Rationale for initial policy direction.
- Understanding of the nature and extent of the problem.
- Suggestions for possible solutions.
- Insight into likely impacts in the future.
- Motivation for adjustments to a policy or to the way it must be implemented.
**Different types of evidence**

- **Systematic reviews.** Consist of research evidence that has been systematically searched, critically appraised, and rigorously analysed according to explicit and transparent criteria.
- **Single studies,** pilot studies and case studies. Provide valuable and focused evidence for policies, programmes, and projects in specific contexts.
- **Experts’ opinion** is commonly used to support government policy and practice, either in the form of expert advisory groups or special advisers. There is need to ensure that the expertise being provided is up-to-date and well-grounded in the most recent research evidence.
- **Internet evidence.** The uncertain scientific and political basis of much of the information on the internet makes it difficult to determine whether it meets the required quality standards to be considered sound, valid, and reliable evidence.

**Why evidence-informed policy making is desirable**

- **Increases transparency,** as citizens have the right to know how and why governments have made decisions which will impact them.
- **Increases accountability** to the electorate for decisions which governments make by making information available.

### Examples of research serving the functions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Natural science</th>
<th>Social science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Ecological survey of an estuarine habitat</td>
<td>Baseline survey of small businesses in a province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>Field experiment in grassland community manipulating grazing pressure</td>
<td>Study comparing two communities with differing teenage pregnancy rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction</td>
<td>Study investigating the response of fish populations to increased nitrates in river water</td>
<td>Study investigating the effects of increased taxation on household savings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>Periodic surveys of soil quality adjacent to manufacturing plant</td>
<td>Survey of school attendance following introduction of free school meals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Identifying alternative policy options is, in most cases, an iterative process. The aim is to consider as many realistic alternatives as possible and then narrow them down to the most relevant ones for further analysis. Policy options should be closely linked to the drivers of the problems and the identified objectives: a clear logic should underpin the intervention under consideration.

The main tool for developing policy options is a situational analysis. With a good situational analysis and a definition of the objectives of the policy, it will be possible to define different options for solving the identified problems.

When identifying possible options to tackle the problem it is advisable to be as open-minded as possible and review a wide range of policy options and instruments to find the best way to achieve the objective. This includes considering a combination of some of the instruments in a package.

Complex issues may require action over a range of policy areas. In such cases it is important to identify existing policies which are implemented in other areas and identify the future relationships and interdependencies among such policies or legislation and assess them as a whole.

When considering different options, it would also be useful to identify future trends of the main elements affecting the policy instrument, such as demographic trends, economic, technological and other relevant trends. The associated risks and uncertainties relating to the assumptions should be also reviewed.

It is important that at this stage wide consultations take place. Consultations should be carried out with all other concerned ministries and state administration bodies and, if appropriate, with local government administration, relevant NGO’s, other interested parties and independent experts.

The purpose of such consultations is twofold:

- To identify additional options that could be considered as possible solutions.
- To gather as much information as possible in the area and “test” the assumptions and possible risks associated with the options.

The following steps are suggested to identify a realistic set of options:

- **Consider a wide variety of policy options** - think outside the box and avoid regulatory bias.
- **Screen your options** to focus the analysis on the viable options. See annex 3 for criteria for screening viability of policy options.
- **Check the suitability** of the retained policy options to make sure the impact analysis will properly inform policy decisions.
- **Outline the retained options** in greater depth to allow the identification of the impacts of alternative options.

### Resource property rights

The main property rights important for sustainable agriculture and rural development (SARD) are those relating to land and water (including inland and marine fishery resources).

Typically, most land is held in private or communal ownership, fisheries are in public or communal ownership, or are open access, and most water resources are in public ownership. Policy options in relation to these various types of property rights include:

- policies entailing reallocation of resource property rights between public, communal and private ownership;
- policies relating to the redistribution of privately owned resources among private individuals;
- policies that govern the utilisation of open access, state and common property resources; and
- policies to establish and enforce procedures to encourage the efficient and sustainable use of resources.
REFLECT

Reflect on the following questions
1. Who sets the agenda in your country?
2. What is the difference between problem identification and problem prioritisation?
3. Given what I now know about agenda-setting, what then is my role?

ACTIVITY

Take 15 minutes to answer the questions using examples from an environment that you are familiar with. This can be your school, work place and/or your community.

1. Define agenda setting and describe two types of policy agendas and their overall importance in the policy making process.

2. How does a problem become part of the ‘policy agenda’, and what factors are important in determining whether a problem becomes recognised as being on the policy agenda?
4.1. Introduction

Section 3 explored agenda setting and the different factors that shape and influence agriculture policy agendas. In this section we look at the next phase in policy formulation. We explore effective formulation vis-à-vis acceptable policy formulation.

You will learn about policy research translation, moving an issue onto the policy agenda through strategic advocacy engagement, policy drafting and legislation. You will also learn about evidence-based policy making and the different types of evidence. By the end of this module, you will be able to demonstrate understanding of opportunities and pitfalls for researchers to contribute to the design of evidence-based agricultural policies.

Specifically, after going through this section, you will understand:

1. How to translate research into policy by establishing links with policy makers, working with knowledge brokers and advocates
2. How to develop and implement a strategic advocacy campaign to get an agriculture issue onto the policy agenda
3. The process of drafting legal text of policy instruments and implementation plans.

4.2. What is Policy Formulation?

Policy formulation is the development of effective and acceptable courses of action for addressing what has been placed on the policy agenda.

- **Effective formulation** means that the policy proposed is regarded as a valid, efficient, and implementable solution to the issue at hand. If the policy is seen as ineffective or unworkable in practice, there is no legitimate reason to propose it. Policy analysts try to identify effective alternatives. This is the analytical phase of policy formulation.

- **Acceptable formulation** means that the proposed course of action is likely to be authorised by the legitimate decision makers, usually through majority-building in a bargaining process. That is, it must be politically feasible. If the policy is likely to be rejected by the decision-making body, it may be impractical to suggest it. This is the political phase of policy formulation.

As illustrated in the policy cycle in section 2, policy formulation entails considering policy options and strategies, policy research translation, advocacy and convening, policy drafting and legislation.

4.3. Policy Research Translation

Policy world realities are inherently political and shaped by many inputs, including public opinion. To have any impact, it is important to understand the policy context and the needs of the policy makers and practitioners responsible for the built environment. Research translation is the process whereby knowledge is passed anywhere along the translational pathway i.e. research findings are translated into practice, policy or further research.

The following are some tips of how research can be translated into policy:

- **Establish links with policy makers and practitioners** - Factors that affect policy makers’ use of evidence to inform policy include: (i) personal contact between researchers and policy makers; (ii) timely relevance of the research; and (iii) provision of research summaries containing policy recommendations. Attending policy briefings and built environment conferences is a first step in creating contact and building a network.

- **Work with knowledge brokers and advocates** - For research to have an impact, it needs to be communicated to the right people, in the right way, and at the right time. Knowledge-brokers (these could be people working in scientific, advocacy, or professional organisations) can ensure that research is informed by issues confronting policy makers and practitioners, and in turn can link policy makers and practitioners with evidence or with the researchers themselves to facilitate the dissemination of research findings. Advocacy groups can help to synthesise the evidence, participate in expert panels or advisory groups, and provide one-on-one briefings with policy makers.

- **Establish research agendas jointly with policy makers and practitioners** - Establishing joint research agendas requires researchers to see the world through the eyes of policy makers and practitioners. What are the crucial policy-relevant questions that they need answered, and how can researchers align their desire to advance scientific knowledge with these policy imperatives?
To move an agriculture issue onto the policy agenda and through the policy making process you will need to develop and implement a strategic advocacy campaign. Below is your quick guide to developing an effective advocacy campaign to achieve agriculture policy change. This topic will be covered in greater detail in Module 2.

Gather background information
Before you begin an advocacy campaign, do your research. You need to be certain that policy change is the best way to solve the problem. You’ll also need to know the latest science and evidence in support of your issue, the current laws and regulations, and what gaps may exist. Research any past advocacy efforts on the same issue, so you know what worked and what did not.

Set clear policy objectives
A successful campaign starts with clear objectives that are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound. Make sure your objectives are linked to policy change and existing evidence, and that they include the following: (i) a policy actor(s) or decision-maker(s), (ii) the action or decision you want them to take, and (iii) a timeline by which you want them to act or decide.

4.4. Advocacy and Convening

**Build strong partnerships**
Working in coalition or partnership with others is the best way to demonstrate support for your issue. Identify a core group of organisations that will work together to drive the campaign forward on a day-to-day basis. Next, identify a range of old and new supporters willing to speak out in favour of your objectives. To identify those supporters, look to civil society and professional or business groups from the agriculture, development, economic and scientific sectors.

**Know the political landscape**
Understanding the policy making process and which decision-makers and influencers to target is key to achieving your objectives. Once you understand the political landscape, strategise about when during the process you can successfully engage, intervene, and influence your targets. You will also need to know decision-makers’ positions on your policy change objectives and identify any opposition you will encounter.

**Help develop legislation or regulations**
Early in the process, you’ll want to prioritise drafting of the actual policy, using the strongest wording possible. As an advocate, the role that you will play during this phase is likely
to vary. Having a lawyer or policy expert as a resource can be very important. At a minimum, they can help you analyse the strengths and weaknesses of existing or emerging policies in accordance with evidence-based best practices.

**Determine what is non-negotiable**
Compromise is sometimes necessary in advocacy. However, it is important to know your limits. You won’t necessarily help your cause if you support the passage of weak policies. You and your core partners will need to determine together what is non-negotiable, ideally early in the advocacy process.

**Identify legislative sponsors and policy champions**
Strong sponsors willing to champion a policy throughout the process are valuable assets for any campaign. Seek out influential and respected policy makers on relevant committees or in key positions who you can trust to act as loyal partners and effective champions. Remember that it takes time to cultivate such champions. Meet with them regularly to understand their concerns and needs, agree on how best to work together, and share information. Always be available to act as a resource for your champion.

**Develop your key strategies**
Persuading decision-makers to act is essential for affecting changes in policy. There are many ways this can be done, but most successful campaigns employ some combination of the following three strategies: (i) direct interaction with decision-makers and influencers, (ii) using media and social media to influence decision-makers and the public, (iii) and grassroots mobilisation to engage a strong base of supporters and organisational allies to encourage change and counter opposition or indifference.

**Prepare to communicate effectively**
Effective communication underpins every successful advocacy campaign. First, define your different audiences and work to understand their information needs, interests, concerns, and the best communication channels to reach them. Using this information, you can then design targeted, persuasive messages and identify the most compelling messengers and spokespersons. It is important to monitor media and social media engagement on your issue, so you know what is being said about your campaign and can respond quickly.

**Formulate your campaign action plan**
The campaign action plan is your roadmap for the campaign, leading from objectives to strategies and then to messages. Carefully consider all the elements of your plan in collaboration with your core group of partners. In addition to key activities, the action plan should also outline the necessary resources, responsible persons, and timeline. Remember that your plan is a living document that should be reviewed regularly and updated as the political landscape changes.

**Run your campaign**
With a detailed plan in place, it’s time to implement. Keep in mind that a successful campaign requires strategic planning alongside strategic implementation. The campaign process is dynamic and ever changing, and every campaign will require you to respond to unanticipated events, disagreements within your network, changing decision-makers and new opposition. Don’t be afraid to be flexible, revisit your plan and update it as needed.

**Monitor and evaluate progress**
Monitoring and evaluating implementation of your advocacy plan will be one of the most critical activities of your campaign but is often overlooked. Reviewing your progress at regular points will not only help to hold you and your partners accountable for planned actions but will also reveal whether your actions are accomplishing your goals. If your campaign is not making progress, you’ll need to reassess and adjust your plan.

**Celebrate success and remain engaged**
Successful advocacy campaigns take time. Even if you don’t secure your policy change right away, you will have made progress in educating decision-makers, the media, and the public on your issue. Celebrate milestones both big and small, and make sure you thank supporters for their ongoing commitment. Once you have achieved your policy change, ensuring successful implementation is the next objective. A campaign doesn’t end with the change in law or policy change.
After the analysis of the options and their impacts, and after the consultations, the relevant government ministry then must finalise the policy proposal and recommend policy instruments that will best fit the policy objectives. The ministry then prepares the draft legal text of the policy instrument(s) (primary and/or secondary legislation) and implementation plans including fiscal impact assessment of the policy instrument.

The ministry will have to select the assessment criteria against which it will analyse the policy options and recommend the option and policy instrument in order to achieve the desired outcomes.

Some assessment criteria could include:

- Consistency with government priorities
- How the option addresses the problem and the intended outcome
- The economic costs/benefits
- The environmental costs/benefits
- Impact on the budget
- Complexity of implementation

When reviewing the policy instruments the following aspects are considered:

- How well the draft policy instrument meets the objective
- Can the draft instrument be effectively applied in the existing administrative structure?
- Clarity of the draft instrument to ensure better implementation,
- Are there any conflicting interdependencies with existing legislation?

After this thorough analysis, the ministry drafts implementation plans including:

- a specification of the new legislation or changes in the existing one that will be needed to carry out the policy instrument;
- the body or bodies directly responsible for implementation;
- human resources needed for implementation and their capacities;
- needs for training to ensure efficient implementation; and
- estimation of funds needed for implementation.

There are number of questions that can help ministries check whether all relevant aspects of the proposed policy instruments have been reviewed:

- Have assessment criteria been selected against which the ministry will make the assessment and propose the recommended option? Have they been clearly presented in the proposal?
- Have issues regarding the effective implementation of the draft proposal been reviewed?
- Is the draft instrument (legislation) clear and unambiguous?
- Are there conflicts or interdependencies with existing legislation?
- Have important issues related to the implementation been reviewed?

4.5. Policy drafting and legislation

Once a policy has been properly debated the Department and Ministry look at the issues and options and draw up a final policy which is published as a White Paper. The White Paper is a statement of intent and a detailed policy plan which often forms the basis of legislation. It is debated and adopted by Parliament and approved by Cabinet, or similar state authorities, depending on the country.

In its early stages before a new law has been tabled in Parliament it is called a draft Bill. Once it has been tabled in Parliament it is called a Bill.

Before the draft Bill is tabled in parliament the following takes place:

- The draft Bill goes to the relevant Cabinet committee for approval.
- Once Cabinet has given its approval it may be released for public comment.
- Once comment has been received, the department and ministry will make any changes they think are necessary because of public input.
- The draft Bill goes to Cabinet to ensure that it has kept to agreed aims and principles and does not contradict any other policies.
- The draft Bill is sent to the State legal advisors for legal approval.
- The draft Bill is then tabled by the Minister in Parliament.

Once a Bill has been tabled, it will be given a number and then released as a Bill, for example, B6 of 2018 and go through the process of becoming a law.

This process is specific to the South African system, while sharing many commonalities with other sub-Saharan African countries.
Reflect on the following questions
1. In what ways are policy makers currently engaging with young people in policy formulation?
2. How could policy makers engage with young people more effectively?
3. Given what I now know about policy formulation, how can I become involved?

ACTIVITY
1. Think of a policy that you are familiar with from your own environment and write down the key components:
   - Background
   - Purpose statement
   - Applicability/scope statement
   - Effective date
   - Responsibilities section

2. Is the policy still applicable today?

   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
5.1. Introduction

Section 4 explored policy formulation. In this section, we look at the different factors that influence policy implementation. The concept of policy implementation will be defined and its functions and processes will be presented. You will also be taken through some examples to help you better grasp the concepts that are presented.

You will learn about policy implementation and the provision of technical assistance. You will also learn about policy monitoring. Specifically after going through this section you will understand:

1. How policy implementation plans are developed
2. The needed level of stakeholder engagement in policy implementation
3. Why effective implementation requires planning and the mobilisation of enough resources.
4. The importance of monitoring policy development and how to do it.

Sound policies are of little value if they are not implemented effectively. Without implementation, policies, no matter how endorsed or by whom, are nothing more than ideas or wishful thinking (e.g. CAADP’s 10% budget allocation to agriculture; the Abuja declaration on Fertilizer, June 2006).

Understanding the process of implementation through which policies are put into practice, is the key to understanding the difficulties and outcomes of public policy making.

Policy implementation includes the actions and mechanisms whereby policies are brought into practice – turning what is written in the legislation or policy document into a reality. At this stage the content of the policy, and its impact on those affected, may be modified substantially, or even negated. In analysing this stage in the policy-making process, one needs to examine how, when, and where particular policies have been implemented.

The most common meaning of implementation is to carry out, to accomplish, to fulfil, produce or to complete. This meaning could easily be equated with service delivery. For the purposes of a working definition for this training module, policy implementation is regarded as the accomplishment of policy objectives through the planning and programming of operations and projects so that agreed upon outcomes and desired impacts are achieved.

As illustrated in the policy cycle in section 2, policy implementation entails policy implementation, technical assistance and policy monitoring.

5.2. What is Policy Implementation?

Sound policies are of little value if they are not implemented effectively. Without implementation, policies, no matter how endorsed or by whom, are nothing more than ideas or wishful thinking (e.g. CAADP’s 10% budget allocation to agriculture; the Abuja declaration on Fertilizer, June 2006).

Understanding the process of implementation through which policies are put into practice, is the key to understanding the difficulties and outcomes of public policy making.

Policy implementation includes the actions and mechanisms whereby policies are brought into practice – turning what is written in the legislation or policy document into a reality. At this stage the content of the policy, and its impact on those affected, may be modified substantially, or even negated. In analysing this stage in the policy-making process, one needs to examine how, when, and where particular policies have been implemented.

The most common meaning of implementation is to carry out, to accomplish, to fulfil, produce or to complete. This meaning could easily be equated with service delivery. For the purposes of a working definition for this training module, policy implementation is regarded as the accomplishment of policy objectives through the planning and programming of operations and projects so that agreed upon outcomes and desired impacts are achieved.

As illustrated in the policy cycle in section 2, policy implementation entails policy implementation, technical assistance and policy monitoring.

5.3. Policy Implementation and Technical Assistance

Developing policy implementation plans

Good implementation plans are scalable and flexible. They reflect the degree of urgency, innovation, complexity and/or sensitivity associated with the particular policy measure and provide sufficient detail to support and inform successful implementation.

At the least, implementation plans should present a clear alignment between policy objectives and implementation; make clear the assumptions that have been made in policy development; spell out critical intermediate and final results; and identify areas of uncertainty, and how and when they will be clarified. An implementation plan should reflect adequate consideration of key risks to implementation, throughout the entire implementation process – not just at the beginning. This is particularly important where policy or programme implementation involves untested service delivery models or new technology, or where significant behaviour change is expected. Plans should provide a map of how an initiative will be implemented.

The map should deal with matters such as:

• timeframes, including the different phases for implementation
• roles and responsibilities of all those involved in implementation
• resources (including funding and human resources)
• risk management, including how any potential barriers to implementation will be dealt with
• monitoring and reporting requirements.

Experience indicates that special attention needs to be given to:

• the choice of appropriate legislative instruments and the time needed for drafting
• any requirements for subsequent micro-policy development, as this can significantly affect the implementation of the relevant systems, training or other requirements
• the role of third parties in delivery.
Stakeholder involvement in policy implementation

Successful policy processes require democratic public participation; where policy makers and the public continually engage in dialogue, examine the consequences for fundamental values, as well as sharing burdens and benefits. In the national sphere, different stakeholders should be involved to reduce political pressures on the government.

Stakeholder participation in policy implementation is influenced by a range of factors, including the context, the policy content and stakeholders’ needs and resources, level of knowledge of the policy, and their relative power and influence.

The involvement of stakeholders in implementation can be challenging because it often requires joint actions in response to new partnerships that did not exist previously. In some cases, stakeholder groups and organisations that may be unrelated, or are not always committed to the same outcomes, must reach agreement to support implementation.

Stakeholders may also enter the fray in ways not planned by the policy. As policy implementation unfolds, additional stakeholders may find themselves being affected by the changes and may also seek to insert themselves into the process. The successful engagement of different groups within society, civil society and the private sector is crucial to implementation, because each sector contributes unique perspectives, skills and resources.

For example, civil society groups are well suited to assist in adapting policy strategies to reach underserved communities, such as the poor, marginalised groups, and rural populations. They can also play a role in monitoring implementation and advocating specific strategies to improve implementation, serving as watchdogs to ensure that funding is allocated, and appropriate activities are carried out. The private sector’s involvement can catalyse improved quality of care and efficient logistics systems, as well as complement public sector services.

Planning for implementation and resource mobilisation

Effective implementation requires planning and the mobilisation of enough resources. The difficult decisions that may have been avoided when policies were drafted must be resolved as plans and guidelines are developed. Strong strategic action plans, work plans, budgets, and operational directives are often the missing links between policy formulation and actual implementation.

Implementation is a challenging process, even when written guidelines on goals, strategies, roles and responsibilities, and a monitoring framework are provided. It is even more challenging in the absence of written guidance and clear action plans.

In the implementation process, political, financial, managerial and technical resources are needed. Therefore, throughout the implementation process it is important to guard against those opposing the policy change and blocking access to these required resources. The process confirms the fact that sometimes the policy outcome is very different from what the planners conceived due to the process of change and conflict occurring in the implementation stage.

Once strategies are determined, implementation organisations need to estimate and mobilise the financial, human, and material resources required to implement the policy effectively. Because new policies often involve new strategies, organisations may be required to modify or even abandon old practices and undertake new activities. In many cases, this requires implementers to be trained in the content of the policies and required skills.

EXAMPLE

Capacity building for implementation

If a policy calls for expanding the pool of agro-dealers who can supply improved fertilizers and seeds, then current SMEs will need appropriate training if the policy is to achieve its goal.
Monitoring policy development and implementation is an integral component of the policy cycle. Policy monitoring is a process by which stakeholders follow and assess policies to ensure they are developed, endorsed, enacted, and implemented as intended.

Policy monitoring involves:
- appraising the policy environment,
- gauging the level and quality of stakeholder engagement,
- documenting the progress of policy development and the legislative endorsement of policy,
- putting policies into practice through financing and implementation planning, and
- evaluating outcomes of implementation.

Monitoring policy interventions can help stakeholders identify barriers and facilitators for effective policy implementation. Policy monitoring can and should be conducted by all stakeholder groups and requires expertise in different areas, such as advocacy, accountability systems, monitoring and evaluation, and data analysis.

Policy monitoring requires stakeholders to understand how policies move through the process from development to implementation and the potential barriers to progress. Specifically, effective policy monitoring requires an awareness and understanding of the policy environment; analytical skills, such as being able to identify, develop, and apply assessment tools and analyse findings; and the ability to mobilise communities to participate in the policy process, lead strong well-coordinated advocacy efforts, and engage with a range of government departments and units.

High capacity for monitoring policy development, adoption, and implementation includes being able to:
- Effectively and systematically collect, analyse, communicate, and use data related to the process and outcomes of policy development and implementation
- Use data (including financial data and data about service delivery and agriculture outcomes) to improve policy development and implementation
- Build strong relationships among sectors and among individuals and organisations to adequately monitor the full policy process.

In the ideal scenario, the following would exist:
- Opportunities and mechanisms that engage multiple sectors and organisations in policy dialogue
- Systemic monitoring and evaluation of the impacts of policy formulation and implementation for positive or negative effects
- A robust legal and regulatory framework that allows for a strong M&E system but also protects individuals’ rights (i.e. laws on the confidentiality of individuals’ personal details and livelihood status; data sharing among institutions)
- National working groups/committees focused on policy monitoring, which meet regularly and have clear working objectives
- A national research agenda, which includes specific research priorities and stakeholders with interest in using the data collected.
Reflecting on the policy implementation process, what are the outcomes for different stakeholders, e.g. government, researchers and citizens?

A new policy on livestock has been developed and you are tasked with its implementations in your ward. Indicate your actions against each of the requirements for policy implementation below:

1. Developing policy implementation plans

2. Stakeholder involvement in policy implementation

3. Planning for implementation and resource mobilisation

4. Monitoring policy implementation
6.1. Introduction

Section 4 explored policy formulation. In this section we now look at policy review and learning, two indispensable elements of the policy cycle. The concept of policy review will be defined and its functions and processes will be presented. You will also be taken through some examples to help you better grasp the concepts that are presented.

You will learn about policy learning and other topics related to policy learning. You will also study policy accountability. Specifically, after going through this section, you will understand:

1. Why it is important to undertake policy implementation evaluation and review
2. The potential challenges and opportunities in policy implementation evaluation
3. How to hold government accountable for agriculture policies and spending.

Policy monitoring and evaluation (M&E) are indispensable elements of the policy cycle and are the prerequisites of well-elaborated and implementable public policies. Policy M&E enables and facilitates improvement of public policies throughout their natural cycle, to reflect the situation on the ground and respond to noted challenges and opportunities.

M&E is crucial in elaborating sound public policies that lead to the desired results, where results refer to outcomes and impacts, drawing on experiences gained from the successes and failures of what already is being or has been implemented in the same policy area. M&E is applied to public policies for reasons of effectiveness (‘ensure we do more good than harm’), efficiency (‘use scarce public resources to maximum effect’), service orientation and public value (‘meeting citizens’ needs/expectations’), accountability (‘transparency of what is done and why’), democracy (‘enhance the democratic process’), and trust (‘help ensure/restore trust in government and public services’).

M&E of the results of public policies is a necessary precondition in assuring adequate government responsibility and accountability in the allocation and spending of public funds. Therefore, building a horizontal policy M&E framework will strengthen governance principles, improve responsiveness of policies and generate public trust.

As illustrated in the policy cycle in section 2, policy review entails learning, policy evaluation and policy accountability.

6.2. What is Policy Review?

Policy monitoring and evaluation (M&E) are indispensable elements of the policy cycle and are the prerequisites of well-elaborated and implementable public policies. Policy M&E enables and facilitates improvement of public policies throughout their natural cycle, to reflect the situation on the ground and respond to noted challenges and opportunities.

The knowledge mobilised for learning processes can be grouped into the following types:

- Know how: the ability to do something;
- Know what: knowledge about facts;
- Know why: knowledge about principles and laws; and
- Know who: knowledge about who knows what.

Furthermore, learning can be considered to occur through the following modes:

- Experience (learning by doing and learning by using);
- Observation of others (learning by using);
- Systematic study (learning by studying or learning by learning); and
- Interaction (learning by interacting).

What other topics relate to policy learning?

The following topics are closely related to policy learning:

- Strategy and policy coherence. The availability of policy-relevant knowledge bases along with the capacity to exploit them lie at the core of strategy-making in innovation.
- Measurement and evaluation. Measurement and evaluation of innovation policies is a necessary component of policy-making and implementation.
Policy evaluation examines the inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, impact/s and context surrounding policy implementation. It can also provide important information about stakeholder perceptions and awareness, as well as barriers to and facilitators of implementation.

Policy evaluation can have multiple aims or purposes, including:

- Understanding how a policy was implemented.
- Identifying critical differences between planned and actual implementation.
- Identifying barriers to and facilitators of implementation.
- Documenting and comparing different intensities or variations of policy.
- Collecting information to support interpretation of future evaluations of policy impact.
- Documenting the relationships between logic model components and external influences.
- Improving the implementation process.
- Informing future policy development. Policy implementation evaluation may focus on a number of different areas, including:
  - Components of the logic model, such as inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and impact/s.
  - Stakeholder attitudes, knowledge, and awareness.
  - Facilitators of and barriers to implementation.

Process data, both quantitative and qualitative, are useful in evaluating policy, as each can provide detailed information about how a policy was implemented or provide insight as to why certain things happened during implementation. Data for policy evaluation is usually intentionally descriptive and uses a variety of measures and types of data to complete a thorough picture of the implementation.

Policy evaluation often relies on non-experimental descriptive or exploratory designs such as case studies and cross-sectional designs. The focus of the design is on accurately describing the implementation process rather than on ‘proving’ any specific hypothesis or demonstrating relations between variables. The evaluation design may also include exploration of differences in implementation in different contexts or for different variations of the policy. Identifying the core components of implementation can be challenging, but this step is vital when developing the evaluation questions and measures. Components may be identified by describing the policy, conducting a policy content evaluation, or both.

### Key Concept

**6.4. Why Undertake Policy Implementation Evaluation and Review?**

Policy evaluation examines the inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, impact/s and context surrounding policy implementation. It can also provide important information about stakeholder perceptions and awareness, as well as barriers to and facilitators of implementation.

### Potential Policy Implementation Evaluation Challenges and Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapid pace of policy</td>
<td>• Strive to develop the evaluation plan before implementation if possible; identify potential indicators up front to plan for their collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges of finding an equivalent comparison group</td>
<td>• Identify variables within the implementing community (such as level or degree of implementation) that may allow for examination of how individual variables influence implementation and impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Lack of clear responsibility for evaluation     | • Create a clearly written evaluation plan with specific roles and responsibilities.  
  • Identify and partner with the stakeholder who has the responsibility for monitoring the implementation. |
6.5. Policy Accountability

Accountability exists when there is a relationship where government, and the implementation of policy by public offices, are subject to the oversight of state organs, direction or request that they provide information or justification for their actions. Accountability ensures that actions and decisions taken by policy makers and public officials are subject to scrutiny to guarantee that government policies meet their stated objectives and respond to public value, thereby contributing to better governance. In this case, the indicator of policy accountability is the realisation of the objectives of public policy, of course, through the mechanism of state organs.

Parliaments are key actors in the chain of accountability. They are, along with the judiciary, the key institution of horizontal accountability, not only in their own right but also as the institution to which many autonomous accountability institutions report. They are the vehicle through which policy accountability is exercised. Along with civil society organisations and the mass media, they are also important institutions in vertical accountability.

Newer concepts of accountability have emerged: social accountability and diagonal accountability. The former, defined as ‘society driven horizontal accountability’ seeks to provide direct answerability from government to citizens; parliaments and elected representatives are important vehicles through which citizens and civic groups can also extract enforcement.

Diagonal accountability operates in a domain between the vertical and horizontal dimensions. It refers to the phenomenon of direct citizen engagement with horizontal accountability institutions when provoking better oversight of state actions.

How do you hold government accountable?

You can play a crucial role in holding governments accountable for agriculture policies and spending. Here are some simple steps on how you can hold government accountable:

- **STEP 1 - Engage in the policy development process** to ensure agriculture policies and national plans are evidence-based and reflect the priorities and needs of civil society—especially disadvantaged, vulnerable, and marginalised populations. Attend meetings. Volunteer to serve on committees and working groups, such as national task forces on agriculture planning. If you feel appropriate policies and plans are not in place, call on the appropriate government agency to act.

- **STEP 2 - Track commitments and financial allocations.** Keep a record of the promises that policy makers make (in speeches, in national plans, via policies) and what resources and funds they have allocated to agriculture activities. Advocate that the government provide clear information about its plans and programmes, as well as information on how resources are being allocated. Request the relevant documents, including implementation timelines and budget documents. Track commitments and share the information you collect with your networks. Investigate what resources are needed for the government to be able to deliver on its policies and promises. You can do this by investigating whether the necessary items are in place. How much money is required and is it available? What other resources are needed?

- **STEP 3 Track financial expenditures.** While it can sometimes be difficult to track money and resources, you can play an essential role in holding donors and governments accountable by examining how funds are being spent. Document what monies have been allocated to agriculture activities and what resources are needed to make government commitments a reality. Follow up by monitoring financial expenditures to ensure that funds are being spent as they were promised. Seek out assistance from experts (e.g. from an international NGO that is skilled in agriculture financing and budgeting) or work through established networks and coalitions to help establish a collective system to monitor finances.
Use the evidence you collect as a basis for advocacy. The goal of policy monitoring and financial tracking should be to generate evidence as a basis for advocacy. You have an important role to play as government watchdogs, holding government accountable for the responsible programme planning and management of resources. If funds are not spent as planned, remind policy makers of the commitments they have made and apply pressure to government officials to manage the funds properly. In some instances, it will be necessary to approach policy makers and/or government officials in a sensitive way to avoid alienating them or escalating the situation. In non-democratic or authoritarian countries, policy advocates must never act in a way that could compromise their personal safety. In other instances, the best strategy may be to take the information public. Work with partners and allies – including donors and respected NGOs that have experience in this area – to develop the most appropriate strategies, based on the circumstances. Finally, remember to be proactive as well as reactive in your advocacy. Engage in the budget process to ensure that agriculture budgets address key issues from the start (i.e. by advocating that government include a separate budget line for the provision of subsidised seed and fertiliser).

REFLECT

1. Why is there a need for policy evaluation?
2. In your country which organisations conduct the policy evaluation?
3. What do you need to do to hold your government accountable for some of its agricultural policies?

ACTIVITY

Select a policy that has been implemented in your context and do the following:

1. List the intended outcomes of this policy

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

2. List the unintended outcomes of this policy

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

3. In your view, has this policy been effective? Explain your answer.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

4. In your view, what needs to be done to ensure that the policy is effective?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
PUTTING IT ALL TOGETHER – CALL TO ACTION

In this module, you have been exposed to an understanding of the policy development context, the stakeholder involvement in the policy development process and the various policy development processes.

With a clearer understanding of policies context and their general characteristics, various types of policies were unpacked. Furthermore, existing policy frameworks were presented.

For actual stakeholder involvement in policy process, the term ‘stakeholder’ was defined. This definition included stakeholder rights, rewards, responsibility, interest and influence.

Regarding policy development processes, the challenges of policy development were discussed. In addition, the policy development cycle was presented. This entails agenda-setting, policy formulation, policy implementation and policy review.

All of these are designed to effectively promote your engagement and/or participation in policy processes.

At this point, you can reflect on policies in agriculture and their specific impact on the youth:

• With the knowledge that you have acquired, how would you ensure that agriculture policies accommodate the concerns of the youth?

• In your own environment and language, would you be able to share your knowledge of policy processes with other stakeholders?

What’s next after Module One?

In Module Two we go into more detail on how to become a policy advocate, enabling you to build on the foundation that you have laid in Module 1. Module 2 focuses on the policy advocacy cycle, which further unpacks the processes of:

• identifying policy issues;
• policy research and analysis;
• planning for policy advocacy;
• taking action; and
• monitoring, reviewing, evaluation and learning.
MODULE 1: HOW ARE POLICIES MADE?

ANNEXES

MODULE 1
Module 1: How are Policies Made?

Promoting Youth Engagement in Agriculture Policy Processes

Annex 1: Detailed Description of International and Regional Policy Frameworks

a. The Voluntary Guidelines To Support The Progressive Realization Of The Right To Adequate Food In The Context Of National Food Security (VGRtF)

The VGRtF provide an overall framework for achieving food security and nutrition objectives. It calls for the right to adequate food to be the main objective of food security policies, programmes, strategies and legislation; that human rights principles (participation, accountability, non-discrimination, transparency, human dignity, empowerment and rule of law) should guide activities designed to improve food security, and that policies, programmes, strategies and legislation need to enhance the empowerment of rights-holders and the accountability of duty-bearers, thus reinforcing the notions of rights and obligations as opposed to charity and benevolence.

b. The Five Rome Principles for Sustainable Global Food Security

The Five Rome Principles for Sustainable Global Food Security, adopted in November 2009 by the World Summit on Food Security in Rome, provide a powerful strategic underpinning for coordinated action by all stakeholders at global, regional and country level, while embracing a twin-track approach in fighting hunger:

- Principle 1: Invest in country-owned plans, aimed at channelling resources to well-designed and results-based programmes and partnerships.

- Principle 2: Foster strategic coordination at national, regional and global level to improve governance, promote better allocation of resources, avoid duplication of efforts and identify response gaps.

- Principle 3: Strive for a comprehensive twin-track approach to food security that consists of: 1) direct action to immediately tackle hunger for the most vulnerable; and 2) medium and long-term sustainable agricultural, food security, nutrition and rural development programmes to eliminate the root causes of hunger and poverty, including the progressive realisation of the right to adequate food.

- Principle 4: Ensure a strong role for the multilateral system by sustained improvements in efficiency, responsiveness, coordination and effectiveness of multilateral institutions.

- Principle 5: Ensure sustained and substantial commitment by all partners to investment in agriculture and food security and nutrition, with the provision of necessary resources in a timely and reliable fashion, aimed at multi-year plans and programmes.

c. The Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VGGT)

The VGGT were endorsed by CFS 38th Special Session in May 2012. They provide a reference and guide to improve the governance of tenure of land, fisheries and forests towards achieving food security for all and to support the progressive realisation of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security.

d. UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

The UN Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development sets out 17 SDGs and 169 targets which build on the MDGs. The SDGs “seek to realise the human rights of all and to achieve gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls. They are integrated and indivisible and balance the three dimensions of sustainable development: the economic, social and environmental”. The pledge for the SDGs is that no-one will be left behind.

For more information on the SDGs visit: https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015/transformingourworld

e. The Paris Agreement and other COP21 Decisions

Parties to the UNFCCC reached a landmark and universally binding agreement on climate on 12 December 2015 in Paris, with the ultimate goal of limiting global temperature increase to below 2°Celsius. Other key elements of the Paris Agreement adopted at the 21st Conference of the Parties (also known as COP21) that inform FANRPAN’s global policy context include establishing binding commitments by all parties to make nationally determined contributions (NDCs) to climate change initiatives; submitting NDCs every five years, with the clear expectation that they will represent a progression beyond previous ones; and extending mechanisms to address ‘loss and damage’ resulting from climate change. One of the major opportunities that exist for Africa is the effective disbursement of funds that exist to finance climate change mitigation and resilience for the developing world. As the World Bank highlights, to get impact at scale, organisations must help to shape policy and national investment plans and to work with the private sector.

For more information on the Paris Agreement visit: https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/the-paris-agreement
f. Other policy frameworks
A number of other documents, instruments, guidelines and programmes provide principles and strategies that may be relevant to the achievement of food security. These include:

- The International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development (IAAASTD)
- The final Declaration of the International Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (ICARRD)

Regional and Sub-Regional Food Security Policy Frameworks

Continental

a. The AU Agenda 2063 for long-term development
The AU Agenda 2063 sets the continent’s development vision over the next 50 years towards a prosperous Africa based on inclusive growth and sustainable development, among other things. For agriculture and food security, this paved the way for the elaboration of the first ten-year implementation plan, covering 2015–2025, which culminated in the adoption of the Malabo Declaration on “Accelerated Agricultural Growth and Transformation for Shared Prosperity and Improved Livelihoods” in June 2014 in Malabo, Equatorial Guinea. Under this Declaration, African Heads of State and Governments pledged to end hunger by the year 2025 by at least doubling current agricultural productivity levels, reducing postharvest losses and waste by at least half the current level, and reducing stunting to 10 percent and underweight to 5 percent. They have also committed themselves to mutual accountability through institutionalising a biennial monitoring, review and reporting of progress.

In June 2015, the AU adopted the Declaration on Women Empowerment and Development towards the 2063 Agenda. The Declaration prioritises the financial inclusion of women in agribusiness and enhancing women’s rights to productive assets. The AU’s campaign to abolish the hand-held hoe launched in the same year is targeted to reduce women’s farm labour burden by widening their access to modern technologies and agro-processing. While progress is at varying levels, engagements at regional, sub-regional and national levels have taken place towards domesticateing and operationalising the Malabo Commitments using the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) results framework. Emphasis is rightly placed on the importance of country ownership and leadership in realising the goals, and that of partnerships to support the efforts in a coordinated and harmonised manner. An important aspect of these commitments is its consistency with the SDGs, which makes it easier for tracking progress and reporting using common and agreed-upon indicators.

For more information on the AU’s Agenda 2063 visit https://au.int/en/agenda2063

b. African Regional Nutrition Strategy
On 13 July 2015, the African Union Commission (AUC) launched the African Regional Nutrition Strategy (ARNS) for 2016–2025, a continental roadmap to enhance and promote nutrition. The strategy incorporates emerging nutrition concerns and sets clear targets that include the attainment of 40 percent reduction in stunting, 50 percent reduction of anaemia in WRA and 5 percent reduction in wasting among children under 5 years of age by 2025. Using the “Africa Day for Food and Nutrition Security,” celebrated every 30 October, as an important platform, the AUC appointed an African Nutrition Champion for a two-year term, to lead continental nutrition advocacy activities.

For more information on the African Regional Nutrition Strategy (ARNS) visit https://au.int/sites/default/files/pages/32895-file-arns_english.pdf

c. The ‘Feed Africa’ strategy of the African Development Bank (AfDB)
An important recent development is the adoption in 2016 by the AfDB of the ‘Feed Africa’ strategy to enhance a competitive and inclusive agribusiness sector that creates wealth, improves lives and protects the environment. The strategy, which is one of the high five priorities of the AfDB, aims to end hunger and rural poverty in Africa in the next decade by focusing on transformation, scaling up agriculture as a business through value addition (led by the private sector and enabled by the public sector) and using innovative financing mechanisms. The strategy would involve increased productivity; value addition; investment in infrastructure; creating an enabling agribusiness environment; catalysing capital flows; and ensuring inclusivity, sustainability and effective nutrition – all in a coordinated manner. It aims to drive transformation through 15 priority commodity value chains in given agro-ecological zones specifically to achieve self-sufficiency in key commodities such as rice, wheat, fish, palm oil, horticulture and cassava; move up the value chain in key export-oriented commodities like cocoa, coffee, cotton and cashew; create a food-secure Sahel in sorghum, millet and livestock; and realise the potential of the Guinea Savannah in maize, soybean and livestock. The AfDB pledged to invest US$24 billion over the next ten years and leverage additional investments through other instruments to catalyse investments at scale from the private sector and with co-financing from traditional donors and new players.

d. Tripartite Free Trade Area Agreement

The Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), Eastern African Community (EAC) and Southern Africa Development Community (SADC) signed a Tripartite Free Trade Area (TFTA) agreement in June 2015 with the objective of benefitting from liberalised intraregional trade and boosting the flow of goods and services. The trade area consists of 26 member countries of the three economic blocs that account for a combined GDP of about $1.3 trillion and a population of 565 million. The three RECs agreed to merge into a common market and eliminate tariff lines and trade barriers. The agreement was supposed to come into effect on 1 January 2016. However, it is still pending ratification by national parliaments as technical negotiations are still ongoing. Furthermore, building on the Tripartite model, the AU is expected to conclude negotiations of an Africa-wide Continental Free Trade Area (CFTA) in the near future, which is believed to foster trade liberalisation across the RECs. The conclusion of this landmark trade agreement will facilitate the formation of customs unions and catalyse the goal of tripling the intra-African trade in agricultural goods and services set by the 2014 Malabo Declaration.


e. Policies on agricultural investment plans in Middle Africa

Political instability and other forms of violence and civil unrest have exacted a toll on the agricultural fortunes of countries in the middle Africa sub-region over for two decades. To help alleviate hunger, ensure access of all to safe, nutritious and sufficient food, each country in the sub-region has prepared National Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plans (NAFSIPs) under the coordination of the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS) and the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) within the CAADP framework. The focus has been on investing adequately in the agriculture sector and increasing agricultural production, taking into account the commitment of civil society and reform of the sector. The NAFSIPs also determine the concrete actions required to ensure nutrition security through good agricultural practices.

In this context, NEPAD has launched an initiative to enhance national capacities to resolve nutrition concerns through the NAFSIPs. The 10 member countries are in the process of mobilising financial resources to implement the NAFSIPs with better intra-sectoral and intersectoral coordination. In addition, the ECCAS member countries have prepared and validated a Regional Agricultural Investment Plan (RAIP), the Common Agricultural Policy (Politique Agricole Commune), and the Regional Food Security Project for Central Africa (Projet Régional de Sécurité Alimentaire de l’Afrique Centrale) (PRSA/C).

The RAIP is complementary to the NAFSIPs in the sense that priority regional investments are meant to apply the subsidiarity principle in order to support four critical objectives for the agricultural sector in Central Africa: (i) enhancing agriculture productivity in key value chains (such as cotton, cassava, banana and meat production) with a view to increasing income for rural households and reducing major regional food production deficits; (ii) better natural resource management focusing on sustainability; (iii) promotion of a favourable agricultural policy framework and private business environment for job creation; and (iv) enhancing the overall food balance and nutritional status in middle Africa. Eleven priority regional investment programmes have been outlined in this respect.

f. Policies for food security and nutrition in Southern Africa

The SADC developed a Regional Agricultural Policy (RAP) and the SADC Regional CAADP Compact in 2014 to address the challenges of low productivity, undernourishment and climate change with the overall objective to promote sustainable agricultural growth and socio-economic development. One of the main objectives of the SADC RAP is to ameliorate private and public sector investment in the agricultural value-chains. The SADC Regional Agricultural Policy Investment Plan (RAPIP) was developed in 2015 and is estimated to cost US$565 million for 5 years (2017–2021). Five programmes are identified: (i) increase agricultural production, productivity and competitiveness; (ii) increase access to markets and trade of agriculture products; (iii) increase investments in and access to finance for agriculture; (iv) reduce social and economic vulnerability in the region; and (v) improve food and nutrition security for the subregion.

As part of the food and nutrition security strategy endorsed in August 2014, SADC is developing a results framework that includes implementation, monitoring and evaluation and reporting systems. A series of instruments for implementation were also identified, including the establishment of an Agricultural Development Fund (ADF). In practice, the quality of agricultural financing and investment exerts a significant impact on the success of national agricultural policies. For example, the removal of subsidies for production inputs in 2013 by the Government of Zambia has caused important income loss for smallholder farmers.

A major development for SADC in 2015 was the revision of the Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan (RISDP) for the period 2015–2020, which was approved by the SADC Council in April 2015. The revised RISDP aims to realign the region’s development plans with emerging global dynamics while refocusing on a few critical and realistic interventions. The priority areas retained include: (i) regional infrastructure and services development for regional integration; (ii) food security and joint management of transboundary natural resources; and (iii) social and human development. While efforts have been made to mainstream gender in policies, the revised blueprint recognises that there is still much to be done to see these policies translated into action.

For more information on the SADC Regional Agricultural Policy visit SADC_RAP_Policy_Document_(Final)_for_Publication_12_Sep_2014.pdf
Annex 2: An Abridged Stakeholder Analysis

Table 1. An abridged stakeholder analysis table (with example)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Why are they important?</th>
<th>Rank (where in the matrix?)</th>
<th>Current attitude</th>
<th>What we would like them to do?</th>
<th>Key Messages</th>
<th>How (Tactics)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Influential at a political level Farmer opinion leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Does not understand our project</td>
<td>Advocate for our project to other farmers</td>
<td>There are benefits for him to work with us</td>
<td>Invite to a project field day</td>
<td>12th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex 3: Key Criteria for Screening the Viability of Your Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal feasibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Options should respect the principle of consultation. They should also respect any obligation arising from relevant international agreements (e.g. Climate Change Paris Agreement, SDGs etc) and ensure respect of fundamental rights.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical feasibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technological and technical constraints may not allow for the implementation, monitoring and/or enforcement of theoretical options.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous policy choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coherence with other government policy objectives. Certain options may be ruled out early due to poor coherence with other general government policy objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness and efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It may be possible to show that some options would incontrovertibly achieve a worse cost-benefit balance than some alternatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportionality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some options may clearly restrict the scope for national decision-making over and above what is needed to achieve the objectives satisfactorily.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political feasibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Options that would clearly fail to garner the necessary political support for legislative adoption and/or implementation could also be discarded.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When it can be shown that two options are not likely to differ materially in terms of their significant impacts or their distribution, only one should be retained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Annex 4: Elements of Effective Policy

The checklist below contains the elements of an effective policy. The scope of each section will depend on the nature of the policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENTS OF EFFECTIVE POLICY</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td>Findings are brief statements of fact and/or statistics relevant to issues being addressed and that support the need for the policy. Think about:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Are the findings evidence-based?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Do the findings support the purpose of the policy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Do the findings anticipate challenges?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>The purpose is a statement that explains the goal(s) of the policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definitions</strong></td>
<td>The definitions are detailed explanations of the key terms in the policy. Think about:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Are all the key terms defined?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Are any unnecessary terms defined?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Are the definitions written broadly enough to encompass new or emerging concepts or products without being overly elaborate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main policy provisions</strong></td>
<td>The main policy provisions state the prohibitions and/or requirements of the policy and identify the parties to whom the provisions apply. Think about:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Are all the requirements and prohibitions reasonable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Do the provisions address the purpose?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Are the provisions consistent with other policies and laws?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Are the provisions clearly stated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is it clear to whom the policy applies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exceptions or exemptions</strong></td>
<td>This section contains any exemptions or exceptions to the prohibitions or requirements that are necessary to achieve the purpose of the policy. Think about:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Are the exceptions or exemptions limited and written as narrowly as possible?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enforcement</strong></td>
<td>The enforcement section identifies the parties responsible for enforcement, outlines the enforcement procedures, any penalties or fines that may be imposed, and any appeal process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation</strong></td>
<td>The implementation section states the effective date for the policy and the steps to disseminate and publicise the policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>The evaluation section outlines the timeline and process to assess the effectiveness of the policy, including how it meets the goals, as well as providing a framework for policy revision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Building on the foundation laid in Module 1, this module will give you a better understanding of policy advocacy. You will also learn about applying tools for advocacy as well as designing strategic advocacy activities. This module provides a broadly accepted definition of advocacy and underscores actors’ unique positions and experiences in policy advocacy. The module provides detailed steps, guidance, and tools for developing and implementing an advocacy strategy. This module will help you understand how to organise evidence for policy action and most importantly, how you can support actors in contributing to policy development processes.

Key module objectives are to assist the users to:

• Explore advocacy concepts, styles and approaches and learn how to develop an advocacy strategy
• Reflect on the different stakeholder interests and needs regarding advocacy work
• Review the core skills required for effective advocacy
• Provide a practical introduction to some key tools and methods used in influencing policy and advocacy including:
  - Issue identification, analysis and selection of strategic issues
  - Power-mapping and stakeholder analysis
  - Building and maintaining alliances and/or
  - Identifying audiences and key messages and/or
  - Setting objectives and monitoring and evaluating advocacy and/or
  - Understanding the policy context.

After working through this module, you will be able to:

1. Define policy-focused advocacy:
   • Identify the most effective way to use research and field data for policy prioritisation and policy advocacy.
   • Recognise the basic steps needed to create an advocacy strategy and the role of evidence in the process.

2. Know and apply tools for advocacy:
   • Identify the components of a policy advocacy strategy.
   • Develop a specific advocacy goal that is relevant to your work.
   • Identify key decision makers and influencers that can make your advocacy goal a reality.

3. Design strategic advocacy activities and targeted messaging to reach and influence decision makers:
   • Draft policy advocacy strategy and work plans to share and implement with colleagues.
   • Effectively advocate across multiple agencies and organisations for a position on an agriculture issue.

Module Outline

Guiding Symbols

Each section includes a range of opportunities for you to go through key concepts, reflect on the material you have gone through, apply the knowledge gained through various activities and, for group discussion purposes, and further explore the concepts by answering questions.

As you read through the module, you will find different visual features that are designed to help you navigate the document.

The module has nine sections:

1. Section 1: About this Module
2. Section 2: Introducing Policy Advocacy, provides a brief introduction to advocacy, looks at the differences between advocacy and lobbying, how to identify policy issues and how to develop advocacy goals and objectives.
3. Section 3: Advocacy Cycle Stage 1: Issue Identification, focuses on how to identify target audiences as well as mapping influence. The section also looks at how to deal with sources of opposition in advocacy.
4. Section 4: Advocacy Cycle Stage 2: Research and Analysis, reviews and defines effective advocacy messages and provides guidelines in developing primary and secondary advocacy messages specifically for different types of audiences.
5. Section 5: Advocacy Cycle Stage 3: Planning for Advocacy, gives an overview of the planning process, the necessity to plan and Advocacy Indicators.
7. Section 7: Monitoring, Reviewing, Evaluation and Learning, reviews the steps in planning an advocacy campaign and guides participants in developing implementation and monitoring and evaluation plans for their advocacy campaigns.
8. Section 8: Putting it all together - Call to Action, covers the nature and role of policy analysis, interactions among social institutions, markets, and government, how to conduct effective policy analysis, how to manage the policy development process, and how to produce sound, persuasive policy reports.
9. Annexes
2.1. Introduction

This section explores the concept of policy advocacy and related concepts. It further describes how to: identify the issue, analyse policy dynamics, identify policy dynamics, set goals and objectives, identify target audiences and influence, develop policy advocacy messages, build a coalition and develop and implement action plans.

The purpose of this section of the training manual is to:
1. Develop a shared understanding of what policy advocacy means in the context of food, agriculture and natural resources policy development;
2. Understand the policy advocacy cycle;
3. Reflect on why and understand how to engage in policy advocacy and help create a conducive policy environment.

2.2. What is Policy Advocacy?

Policy advocacy is the deliberate planned process undertaken to provide evidence and policy options that influence decision- and policy makers on matters of importance to a particular group or to society in general. Policy advocacy takes place at many levels, including local, national, regional and global levels.

Policy advocacy rides on evidence generated from policy analysis. It is therefore important to have a broad understanding of the policy environment and have a plan before embarking on policy advocacy initiatives.

Advocacy is often confused with lobbying. It is critical to know the difference and the boundary between advocacy and lobbying because many donors and development partners are subject to a regulatory environment that does not permit lobbying as a charitable activity.

Advocacy vs Lobbying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advocacy</th>
<th>Lobbying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educating and creating awareness.</td>
<td>Influencing, opposing or supporting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making non-partisan analysis, study, or research available to inform policy.</td>
<td>Drafting, negotiating or providing comments on the terms of a bill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring the progress of legislation that will impact programmatic objectives.</td>
<td>Emailing an op-ed with legislative recommendations directly to a government official.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadly disseminating non-partisan reports providing fair analysis of the impact of varying proposed interventions.</td>
<td>Urging policy makers to increase funding for a specific programme that has a line item in the legislative budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing technical assistance or advice to a legislative body or committee in response to a documented, formal request.</td>
<td>Encouraging support of appropriations that are subject to legislative approval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advocacy is mostly focused on influencing legislators and legislation to oppose or support specific actions through legislative change. At the grassroots level, lobbying is carried out to influence specific legislation by encouraging the public (‘call to action’) to contact legislators about legislation in a specific arena.

The main aim of lobbying is to persuade or influence the actions of government. Lobbying also aims to persuade policy makers or private corporations to ensure changes are made to existing policies.

Advocacy can take place at all levels of decision-making: international, regional, national, provincial, district and community. In most cases, it is needed at all levels because decisions made at one level affect people at another level. Decisions at top levels affect those at lower levels, while actions at lower levels can determine policies at higher levels.
2.3. What Informs an Advocacy Agenda?

The first step in any advocacy work is to define the issue. This is followed by problem and issue analysis. An advocacy issue is the problem or situation that an organisation seeks to solve, rectify, or change through a certain policy action. That means problems that can be addressed by the actions of institutions and individuals representing particular institutions.

A variety of policy actors identify issues for action using techniques ranging from the spontaneous generation of ideas, to the cautious and deliberate study of issues, and identifying root causes. Research data can bring suspected or even unknown issues into focus and can provide a comparison among issues. In defining the advocacy/policy issue, one must understand the context of the issue.

- How do existing policies affect the issue?
- What are the policy gaps, if any?
- What aspects of policy (formulation, implementation, or interpretation) should be changed?
- Who are the targets, supporters, and opposers?
- What actions have been performed by key decision makers on the issue?
- What are the root causes of the problem?

Advocacy goal and objectives

The goal of advocacy is a desired outcome or change in the policy environment. The pursuit of that desired outcome is generally long-term. The organisation should envision how the policy environment will be changed because of their advocacy efforts.

Advocacy objectives are the smaller steps you must take to reach your overall goal. The steps should be clear and focused and should include: the change you want to see, who (e.g. person, institution, office) will make the change, and when it will be achieved. They should be limited in number (no more than three).

Objectives for an advocacy intervention should be SMART: specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and time-bound. They should clearly state what will change, who will make that change, by how much, and by when. Generally, the timeframe for an advocacy objective will be one to three years. There are multiple approaches and ways to explain how to write SMART objectives.

Annex 1 provides more details on how to write SMART objectives.

EXAMPLE

Sentence structures for objectives:
By [when], [who] will do [what] resulting in [measure].
By [when], [measure - includes who and what].
[Measure – includes who and what] by [when].

EXAMPLE

Global Climate Change Negotiations

Climate change is an issue that impacts poor communities at the local level. However, negotiations about climate change take place at the international level. Decisions resulting from those negotiations determine government policies at the national level. Implementation of those policies takes place at the provincial and district level. So, for this issue, advocacy can be undertaken at every level to ensure that the impacts of climate change are addressed. It is important to recognise the interconnections between the levels, even if a community or organisation only undertakes advocacy at one of the levels.
2.4. Who are the Stakeholders in Policy Advocacy?

**KEY CONCEPT**

Stakeholders can be individuals, groups, organisations, institutions, departments or ministries that have interests in an initiative. They are called stakeholders because they have a ‘stake’ in the project or programme, usually meaning that they have something to gain or lose through it. In the context of advocacy, stakeholders are affected by, interested in or able to influence the identified advocacy issue. They include the constituents who may be directly and ultimately affected, either positively or negatively, by the advocacy process, as well as those who are simply intermediaries.

All stakeholders must be identified in the development of an advocacy initiative. Their interests must be assessed, even if they are excluded from decision-making processes. Consideration must be given to the ways in which their interests affect the viability of our advocacy plans and appropriate relationships must be established.

- **Allies** are people, groups, organisations or institutions that can help us achieve our advocacy aims and objectives. They support our cause and they agree with what we are advocating.
- **Opponents** are individuals, groups, organisations or institutions that are opposed to what we want to achieve. They oppose our position and do not agree with what we are advocating.
- **Neutral** are individuals, groups, organisations or institutions that are neutral to our advocacy; they have no expressed interest in the issue, or they may not know about it. We need to persuade these people to become allies rather than opponents.

A stakeholder analysis along with identification of target audience and influencers, can help point towards potential strategic partners in advocacy work. This goes further than analysing who is your ally or opponent. You have to check how committed your allies are in joining you in political action: are they willing to spend time, money, energy and share information about it. We need to persuade these people to become allies rather than opponents. We need to persuade these people to become allies rather than opponents.

Conducting a stakeholder analysis will help you to understand which institutions and individuals have a ‘stake’ in your issue, as well as their interests, support or opposition (to you and your priorities), influence and importance. Finding where different stakeholders stand on your issue(s) will help to protect your advocacy efforts from any unforeseen surprises and false assumptions.

In conducting a stakeholder analysis, the following steps must be followed:

1. **Identify the key audience** from the large array of groups and individuals that could potentially affect or be affected by the proposed intervention. For example, in building an enabling environment for agriculture transformation could include:
   - Politicians (local, provincial, national, international)
   - Farmers’ organisations
   - NGOs (national and international)
   - Agri-businesses and business leaders (national)
   - Rights organisations
   - Media

2. **Assess stakeholder interests** and the potential impact of advocacy on these interests. Questions that you should try to answer to assess the interests of different stakeholders include:
   - What are stakeholders’ expectations in advocating for an enabling environment for agriculture transformation?
   - What benefits are likely to result for the stakeholders from this advocacy work?
   - What resources might the stakeholders be able and willing to mobilise for it?
   - What stakeholder interests’ conflict with the advocacy goals?

3. **Assess the influence and importance of the identified stakeholders.** Influence refers to the power that the stakeholders might have in creating an enabling environment for agriculture transformation. This power may be in the form of stakeholders that have formal control over the decision-making process or it can be informal in the sense of hindering or facilitating the advocacy’s implementation. Importance relates to how significant the active involvement of the stakeholder is for achievement of the advocacy goal.

4. **Outline an audience participation strategy.** This plan should describe ways that the different stakeholders will be involved in different stages of the advocacy planning and implementation. The involvement of stakeholders should be planned according to:
   - Interests, importance, and influence of each stakeholder.
   - Effort needed to involve important stakeholders who lack influence.
   - Appropriate forms of participation throughout the advocacy cycle.

In principle, different methods can be employed to gather the information required for a stakeholder analysis.
In 2002, The World Bank conducted poverty and social impact analysis (PSIA) studies in the agriculture sector in several countries including in Zambia, where the PSIA assessed the poverty and social impacts of a controversial land reform proposed by the Ministry of Land.

In its draft land policy, the government proposed titling and converting some of the 94 percent of land under customary law into state-owned land. The reasoning behind the proposal was that secure title would allow longer-term investments in productivity-improving measures, better access through collateral to credit markets and smoother transfer of land to more-efficient uses. Other benefits included improved dispute resolution, possibilities of revenue generation by local governments, and more equitable access to land, with specific measures to reach the poor and also women.

Several previous studies identified land titling to be a critical step needed to improve investment and efficiency for smallholders and commercial producers. Many donors had noted that through more market-driven processes many of the problems facing the Zambian agricultural sector would be cured. However, past reforms had not been implemented as originally designed due to controversies and resistance. Consensual solutions again had not had the intended poverty-reducing and economic development effects. There was a clear risk that the 2002 reform proposal would follow a similar path of political conflict and resistance.

The PSIA team paid resolute attention to an inclusive and consultative process to create ownership for the research findings and identify the common ground amongst civil society, policy makers and donors. The research findings revealed surprising results that made a substantial case for re-examining the underlying logic of privatisation of land in Zambia.

Findings demonstrated that access to land is only a weak determinant of well-being for most households in rural Zambia. Access to other assets, such as livestock, land quality, farm capital, input and output markets, and agricultural services are equally important parameters. Labour and other capital assets were more important to typical smallholder farmers. Given available labour and existing technologies, smallholders were not able to efficiently farm the land they had. While tenure security (proposed under the reform) is recognised as beneficial to investors, a lot of different stakeholders were sceptical of the central government’s ability to guarantee such security.

Rural Zambians were sceptical of private land markets and many believed that it would eventually lead to increased landlessness and rural poverty, instead of more agricultural investment and employment. Women expressed concern about rights to hunt and gather on privately held land and were doubtful as to whether a formal legal system would be as strong as traditional systems in protecting their rights. Although title to land might be an effective form of collateral for agricultural loans, stakeholders had evidence of alternatives (such as group liability, contractual arrangements) and questioned whether credit would be widely available even with title.

The most compelling arguments against reform of the traditional tenure system were related to power balances in rural areas: stakeholders felt that by removing the power to allocate land from traditional authorities, a power vacuum would be created in rural areas, possibly undermining peace and cohesion in the communities. The stakeholders’ reservations about fast-track titling were identified early in the process and could be substantiated in the subsequent analysis. These findings persuaded policy makers to rethink the necessity of a major revision of existing land policies in Zambia. Marginal policy changes and more attention to institutional development might instead be enough to stimulate the needed growth in the agricultural sector.
2.5. Why is it Important to Work with Others in Advocacy?

Advocacy is often more effective when we work together with others who are concerned about the same advocacy issue as us and can help us create and implement an advocacy plan. There are both advantages and disadvantages to working with others, but the main reasons why it is important to do so are because it is strategic and practical, and it builds capacity.

One of the most common reasons cited for not wanting to work with others in joint advocacy is differences in faith and/or politics. It is important to be clear: regardless of faith and/or politics, if there are people, groups and organisations who are concerned about the same advocacy issue as us, and who can help us create and implement an advocacy plan, then we should be trying to work with them! If we have doubts, fears or reservations, we need to identify ways of overcoming them.

What are the different ways of working with others? Working with others involves identifying appropriate people, groups and organisations, and making contact and building strategic relationships with them. Whether it is done formally or informally, it is sensible to clarify the nature of the relationships involved.

There are many ways of working with others in advocacy, and it is important to be aware of the different types of models available, so that an informed decision can be made about what is most appropriate. If necessary, we may need to create a written agreement that sets out the expectations of each person, group and organisation involved, and the ways they will cooperate with each other.

The following models are some of the most common ways of working together to do advocacy (look up the definitions of these terms if you need more clarity):

- Network
- Alliance
- Coalition
- Association
- Forum
- Partnership
- Task force
- Umbrella body

2.6. The Policy Advocacy Cycle

The Policy Advocacy Cycle is a useful way of visualising what needs to be done in your advocacy work. It takes you through each stage of the process of developing an advocacy initiative. The different stages in the policy advocacy cycle in practice overlap. The time it takes to complete all the stages and the necessary detail will vary greatly, depending on the urgency and complexity of an issue, the amount of information needed to be able to act and the advocacy methods chosen.
The traditional tools of identifying stakeholders do not cater for youth interests and their participation:
1. What other methods could be used?
2. Do we have the right tools to understand the interests of the youth and their potential power?
3. What are the best tools for deciphering youth interests in FANR issues?
4. What can be done to make the process of identifying target audiences sensitive to youth interests?

Africa: Agriculture Challenges Facing Africa's Food Systems

Every day - all around the world - farmers face the same common threats to their productivity and livelihood. In Africa, however, the challenges go beyond damaging weather, pests and disease. Farmers at all scales of production need access to the inputs required to produce a successful crop - high-yielding seeds using effective fertilizers and sufficient water. Even when these are available, input pricing is often too high for smallholder farmers.

https://allafrica.com/stories/201606100766.html

1. Identify at least one policy issue in the above excerpt

2. Draft an advocacy objective that responds to the advocacy issue; contributes toward achieving the advocacy goal; and meets the criteria and elements of SMART objectives.
ADVOCACY CYCLE STAGE ONE: ISSUE IDENTIFICATION

3.1. Introduction
In Section 2, the advocacy cycle was introduced. This section considers Stage One of the Advocacy Cycle. It explores how to identify and how to prioritise the potential issues that could be addressed through advocacy interventions. It particularly focuses on envisioning change as a way of establishing which issue to focus on.

This section explores a series of questions and answers.

- Why is issue identification necessary in advocacy?
- What is an advocacy issue?
- How do we identify potential advocacy issues?
- How do we prioritise potential advocacy issues?
- What is the relevance of developing a ‘vision for change’?

3.2. Why Is issue Identification Necessary in Advocacy?

Issue identification describes the process of identifying and prioritising needs and problems in a community. This can be done either by a community themselves or by an organisation or group serving in a community. It is usually done with the assistance of a facilitator. It is the first step towards undertaking any relief, development or advocacy intervention. It lays the foundations that enable a community, group or organisation to develop and build appropriate projects and programmes, based on a carefully selected issue.

If the issue is not well selected, the project or programme may face problems, particularly in advocacy, where everything depends on an appropriate issue being identified. One person alone is not likely to know the needs and problems of everyone in the community, group or organisation. In a community or group context, care needs to be taken to seek views from a wide range of people, including men, women and children, and not just from the community leader.

Poor, vulnerable and marginalised people need to be trusted with insights into their needs and problems and empowered to identify them. Generally, people from the outside, however well-meaning, will not provide lasting solutions or depth of understanding. In an organisational context, care needs to be taken to ensure that staff members with different roles are involved in the decision-making process, and not just the organisational leader.

3.3. What is an Advocacy Issue?

An advocacy issue is a problem or need which will only be changed or met if there is a change in a law or policy, or a change in the implementation or practice of a law or policy.

An important part of the process is to identify the smaller problems and select the one that can be addressed through advocacy with most impact. Sometimes, this will only become obvious in Stage 2 of the Advocacy Cycle – Research and Analysis.

Issue identification involves two steps.
- Firstly, you must recognise and identify potential advocacy issues.
- Secondly, you must select and prioritise a specific advocacy issue.

Many factors can contribute to issues being selected for consideration. These include:
- the views of communities and partners
- the views of staff, volunteers and supporters
- programme experience
- organisational priorities
- strategic or time-bound opportunities
- the priorities of funders and donors.

Sometimes, an issue will be obvious because it will be based on our current project or programme work and be widely accepted as an important issue to address. Such issues might include universal primary education or clean water. Occasionally, an issue will require thinking beyond the immediate context, particularly if it is deeply challenging to society’s perceptions, norms and practices.

EXAMPLE

Food Security Challenge

An advocacy issue may be the lack of affordable seeds, where the problem will only be changed when the government policy of agriculture input subsidies for small-scale farmers is implemented across the whole country. The process of issue identification will highlight a variety of needs and problems facing a community, group or organisation. Not all the needs and problems will require an advocacy response. The main issue is usually a problem that is too large to tackle all at once. Normally it is made up of many smaller problems. For example, the main issue may be food insecurity, and the smaller problems may be unequal land distribution, poor rains, insufficient investment in irrigation, etc.
3.4. How do you Prioritise Potential Advocacy Issues?

We all have limited capacity, limited time and limited resources to do our work, whether it is development, advocacy or a mixture. Therefore, we must be strategic in deciding what we will do and how we will do it. There are various tools available to assist in prioritising issues. What is important to remember is that if the priority need requires a change in policy or practice, then it may be an advocacy issue. Initially, there may be more than one main issue. If this is the case, decisions will have to be made about whether to tackle all the main issues simultaneously or whether to focus on one at a time.

The most strategic advocacy issues usually:
- Have significance and importance to people in the affected communities
- Require a change in policy or practice to bring about change
- Will block progress towards change on other issues if left unaddressed
- Have potential to unlock possibilities for other changes if dealt with successfully
- Are issues people feel passionately about and that people agree need to change
- Have a problem and a solution, which are easy to communicate, in simple language, to diverse audiences
- Are winnable and/or achievable, at least in the long term, even if not in the short term
- Make full use of opportunities, such as landmark moments, to influence change.

For a checklist of criteria to consider, please see Annex 1: Issue selection criteria checklist.

3.5. What is the Relevance of Developing a ‘Vision for Change’?

A vision for change focuses on solutions, not problems. It encourages people to dream dreams and provides them with something to aspire to. It enables them to envisage what their community and society could be like if things were to change for the better. It can be very motivational.

Developing a vision for change is important in the issue identification process because it will help you to think about what changes you want and/or need to see. Having a clear sense of the change you want to see is critical in determining the issue you will select, the plan you will create, the data you will collect, the progress you will monitor and the impact you will have.

One way of visualising change is to imagine what the newspaper headlines will say if you are successful in your advocacy work. This can be helpful because it forces you to use concise and simple language, which is accessible to the public.

As part of the planning process you should consider the steps that will lead to this change, and the markers of progress that will demonstrate that those steps have been achieved. It can also help to have a vision for change during the other stages of the Advocacy Cycle because people react to change in different ways. Sometimes, people are resistant to change, particularly if power dynamics are threatened, or where there is a misunderstanding about the potential implications, or perhaps fear. When this happens, the people who understand the vision for change will play an important role in persuading and negotiating with those who are resistant.

Reflecting on the environment that you are working in...
1. What are some of the issues that you would like to consider for advocacy?
2. What is your vision for change?

Use the Issue Selection Criteria Checklist in Annex 1 to prioritise the criteria to reach the one issue you would like to pursue for advocacy purposes.
ADVOCA CYCLE STAGE TWO: RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

4.1. Introduction

In Section 2, the advocacy cycle was introduced. This section introduces Stage Two of the Advocacy Cycle. It explains how successful advocacy depends on information that is accurate, reliable and sufficient. It considers the importance of gaining a deeper understanding of the advocacy issues identified in Stage 1 of the Advocacy Cycle, including the causes, effects and potential solutions, within the wider context. It also explores what types and sources of information need to be found and analysed, and how to assess them for their usefulness.

This section explores a series of questions and answers.
• Why is it necessary to do research and analysis in advocacy?
• How do we do research and analysis?
• What do we need information about?
• What types of information are required?
• What sources of information are available?
• How do we identify which policies and practices to research and analyse?

4.2. Why is it Necessary to do Research and Analysis in Advocacy?

All advocacy work needs to be based on accurate, reliable and sufficient information. In most instances, this information can only be obtained through research and analysis. This involves gathering, examining and scrutinising information. For successful advocacy, it needs to be timely, relevant and accessible to those we are trying to influence.

If we have good research and analysis, our advocacy will be based on a rational argument with evidence to back it up. If we have not done any research and analysis, or if our research and analysis has been inadequate, our advocacy will be at risk of failure. It is therefore vitally important to do research and analysis in advocacy. Advocacy research has a specific purpose: to influence the formal and informal policies established by policy makers and others in power. Thus, it is important to collect good information and present it in a compelling manner.

The ideal is that your research will clearly show the needs or problems you want to address are real and serious, and the methods you recommend for addressing them have, in fact, been proven successful. When this ideal isn’t quite realised, however, you may find that you must adjust your approach to be persuasive - you may reframe the issue, for instance, or personalise it by collecting the testimony or stories of individuals affected. Whatever your approach, your goal is to make your research as compelling as possible, whether you’re trying to increase funding for a local programme, or to change the way the world deals with the gap between rich and poor countries.

You might conduct research to influence policy for a variety of reasons, and some of them may be surprising.
• To show that there’s a need for intervention
• To show that a need or issue exists
• To confirm that what’s addressed is, in fact, what needs to be addressed
• To support or discredit a specific method or practice
• To identify and advocate for appropriate policy in a given situation
• To point out incompetence or corruption in government, business, or elsewhere that affects the public interest
• To give yourself a solid base for advocacy
• To maintain your integrity and make sure that you’re doing the right thing.

4.3. How do we do Research and Analysis?

Research involves the focused collection of information and data, while analysis tries to understand what the data shows and to draw conclusions. Depending on the issue, you may need to do primary research and/or secondary research before you do your analysis. For many organisations, their role is not to do research themselves, but to use authoritative research produced by others (including the United Nations, universities, think tanks and other NGOs) and to bring the experience of grassroots communities into the discussions about the issue.

Primary research comes from original sources. It is first-hand information obtained directly from those involved and affected. If you decide to do primary research, you must identify who to interview or survey, what you are going to ask them, and how.

KEY CONCEPT

EXAMPLE

You may decide to interview or survey a cross section of the population, or to approach everyone in one area. The combination of people you approach should be broad and representative of the whole population, considering gender, age, household situation and other key characteristics, so that accurate conclusions can be drawn. You should not rely on the viewpoint of a single person or an exclusive group of people.
Secondary research comes from sources that already exist. It is second-hand information that has been recorded. It is often called ‘desk-based’ research because it can be done using websites, books, reports, consultations, statistics or information collated by other researchers. If you decide to do secondary research, you must find trustworthy sources that are easy to use.

Analysis involves taking the research you have gathered, asking questions about it, identifying patterns, themes and gaps – including loopholes – and collating it together into key findings and recommendations that can be disseminated. Analysis provides an in-depth understanding of your research. Sometimes, it can be tempting to spend all your time collecting information, and researching and analysing it, without allowing any time to take action. So, it is important that you get a balance between having enough information to enable you to act on it and gathering so much information that you will never act on it!

4.4. For What Do You Need the Information?

Information should only be gathered if it is accurate, reliable, relevant and sufficient. It should lead you to a greater depth of knowledge and understanding of the issue. Wherever possible, you should try to use the technique of triangulation, which means you use at least two different types or sources of information to verify your data. It is good practice to gather information about the following, using the most appropriate tools:

- **Context**
  - What is the specific context for the identified problem?
  - What is the wider situation in the country, in terms of socio-economic, cultural, economic, religious and environmental factors?

- **Causes**
  - What are the causes of the problem?
  - What factors are making it worse?
  - Are they socioeconomic, cultural, economic, religious, environmental or other factors?

- **Effects**
  - What are the effects of the problem?
  - How is it affecting poor and vulnerable communities?

- **Role of government**
  - What is the role of government in the problem?
  - What laws, policies and practices relate to the problem?
  - What budget information is available in relation to the problem?
  - Who has the power and authority to bring about change?
  - Are they willing and able to do something?
  - How will you access them?

- **Solutions**
  - What do you think needs to be done to resolve the problem?
  - What are you going to propose?
  - Are your proposals realistic?
  - How will you defend your position?
  - Do you have a clear vision for change, and a clear plan for how change will come about?

- **Stakeholders**
  - Who else is interested in the problem?
  - If they are in favour of what you are asking, how can you work with them as allies?
  - If they are undecided, how can you persuade them to help you?
  - If they are opposed to what you are asking, how can you address their objections as opponents?

- **Resources**
  - What resources might be available (including money, equipment, volunteers, supplies, building space, etc) to help you do your advocacy?
4.5. What Types of Information are Required?

Information is needed that will provide facts, figures, data, stories and evidence that can be used to research and analyse the situation. It is important to collate a mixture of quantitative information and qualitative information. Using a variety of types of information can help to provide a balanced picture, verify facts, understand the latest developments, identify possible targets and allies, and understand the arguments of any opponents.

Different types of information might include:

- **Primary information sources** are an original, first-hand information source. They provide us with information directly from the people affected by, impacted by or interested in the issue. It is information that we collect ourselves, systematically and accurately, using data collection tools such as interviews, questionnaires, observation or statistical analysis.

- **Secondary information sources** are second-hand information sources. They provide us with information that already exists or that has been collated by someone else. Potential sources of secondary research include:
  - **THE INTERNET** – a wealth of information if we know how to search, and where to look
  - **LIBRARIES** – a librarian may be able to help us locate what we need
  - **UNIVERSITIES** – we may be able to benefit from academic research, seminars and libraries connected to universities
  - **GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS** (local, national and statistical offices) – sources of information on policies and statistics often produce research documents and provide useful information
  - **DONORS AND INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS** – provide detailed analysis, often over many years
  - **THE MEDIA** (newspapers, magazines, radio, television) – good for stories and quotes.

It is important to think about how to use the different types of information. Some information may be considered to be more trustworthy and/or legitimate than other information. This can influence how effective you are in your advocacy work.

**What sources of information are available?**

There are many places where we can look, and many people we can ask, to help us find useful information for our advocacy. Some information will be easy to obtain, while other information may require effort to find it. It is a good idea to distinguish between primary and secondary information sources.

- **Primary information sources**
  - Independent reports & documents
  - Government reports
  - Poverty indicators
  - Law & policy documents
  - National Statistics
  - Environment assessments
  - Local Authorities records
  - Human rights reports
  - Reports from international institutions, e.g. the UN or World Bank
  - Eye-witness accounts
  - Budgetary information

- **Secondary information sources**
  - THE INTERNET
  - LIBRARIES
  - UNIVERSITIES
  - GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS
  - DONORS AND INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS
  - THE MEDIA
Research and analysis must always involve an assessment of the laws, policies and practices that relate to the issue identified. It should also consider the role played by the national government, overseas governments and international institutions (such as the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the United Nations) in addressing this issue.

Where we know that the policy documents exist:

- Submit formal written requests to the government departments asking for access to the policy documents. Be sure to keep a record of all correspondence.
- Speak to other agencies and organisations to find out if they have copies of the policy documents or if they know of anyone who does.
- Approach the media and ask them to report about the difficulties faced in accessing policy documents.
- Talk to key people in the relevant government departments, or outside the government, to see if they have copies of the policy documents or if they know anyone who does, or if they could put pressure on someone else to release access to them.

Where the policy documents are incomplete or unreliable:

- Supplement the policy documents with information from other sources, such as universities, civil society organisations or international bodies.
- Interview officials in the relevant government departments to clarify what is incomplete or missing or does not match another reliable source.
- Ask an expert, such as a statistician, to assess which aspects of the data can or cannot be used. Where the policy documents do not exist:
- Gather information about the issue directly.
- Use existing information sources to extract the information needed.
- Ask the government to begin recording the information needed.

4.6. How do we Identify which Policies and Practices to Research and Analyse?

Reflecting on the issue that you selected in section 3...

1. How would you go about building the evidence for your advocacy work?
2. What types of information will be required?
3. What sources of information are available?

**KEY CONCEPT**

**REFLECT**

Reflecting on the issue that you selected in section 3...

1. How would you go about building the evidence for your advocacy work?
2. What types of information will be required?
3. What sources of information are available?

**ACTIVITY**

1. When should you do advocacy research?

2. Why should you do advocacy research?
ADVOCACY CYCLE STAGE THREE - PLANNING FOR ADVOCACY

5.1. Introduction

In Section 2, the advocacy cycle was introduced. In this section you will focus on Stage Three of the Advocacy Cycle. It explains how to use the information about the issue that has been researched and analysed in Stage Two to plan an advocacy project or programme. It outlines why planning is so important in advocacy, and what we need to know before deciding whether advocacy is an appropriate response to an issue. It is important to refer to Section 7 when planning, because many of the considerations that arise during the planning process also arise during monitoring, reviewing, evaluation and learning.

This section explores a series of questions and answers.

- What is an advocacy plan and why is it necessary to have one?
- What do we need to know before we make an advocacy plan?
- How do we develop an advocacy plan using a Theory of Change?
- How is an advocacy plan like a regular programme or project plan?
- How is an advocacy plan different from a regular programme or project plan?
- What frameworks can we use for our advocacy plan, once we have a Theory of Change?
- What are advocacy indicators and why do they matter?
- What are the challenges in setting advocacy indicators?
- What makes a good advocacy indicator?

5.2. What is an Advocacy Plan and Why is it Necessary?

A plan or strategy is a written document that sets out what will be achieved and by when, how you will know whether you have made progress or achieved success, and who will be responsible for what.

A plan is like a road map. It helps you see where you have come from, how far you have come and where you are going. It is essential to know where you are so that you can make wise decisions.

An advocacy plan is a framework that determines what policies and practices you want to see changed, how you want them to change, and the way you are going to do your advocacy work to achieve your desired changes.

Planning is important because it:

- Ensures accountability to, and participation by, allies, communities and donors
- Forces you to think ahead and prepare for future eventualities, including potential problems and opportunities
- Helps you understand any risks or assumptions
- Provides a benchmark against which performance and progress can be measured and assessed

- Clarifies what you are trying to achieve and how you are going to get there
- Allocates resources and responsibilities, including time, staff and funding
5.3. What Do We Need to Know Before We Make an Advocacy Plan?

Before planning an advocacy initiative, it is important to check that you have gathered enough information, that you have analysed it accurately and that you understand it. This should be possible if you have completed Stages 1 and 2 of the Advocacy Cycle (see Sections 3 and 4).

You then need to decide whether to advocate or not, by answering the following questions:

- **Issue** - Does it really need to be addressed now? Is it a priority issue?
- **Causes** - Do you have a good understanding of the root causes of the problem and how they can be addressed?
- **Effects** - Can you identify the effects of the problem and back this up with reliable information?
- **Alternatives** - What are the alternative ways of addressing this issue and is advocacy the best way available?
- **Targets** - Are you clear about who is responsible for this problem and who has the power to bring about change? Do you have access to them and a chance of influencing them?
- **Milestones** - What signs of change are you going to look for? How will you assess whether or not you are on track to achieve your end goal?
- **Allies** - Are you clear about who will support us and what help they will give?
- **Communities** - Will the affected communities be mobilised and involved in the proposed advocacy?

Advocacy planning requires not just an understanding of what you should do, and when and how you will do it, but also an understanding of how change will happen and what role your organisation or community will play. It is possible to create an advocacy plan without this clarity, but it will be challenging to monitor and evaluate it, and the impact of the advocacy will probably be affected.

Advocacy plans need to keep changing in response to changes in the external environment, whether these are opportunities or obstacles.

Opportunities might include unexpected invitations to meet with government officials, and an obstacle might be the government restricting civil society engagement in political processes.

EXAMPLE

Namibia Case

When the north-east region of Namibia suffered a severe drought, the worst for fifty years, the water level was affected, reservoirs collapsed, a major water distribution pipeline fell into disrepair, and water supplies became contaminated by faeces. This caused an outbreak of disease, particularly acute diarrhoea, and people died. It was difficult for the public health system to cope.

FANRPAN partner DevelopmentAid worked with communities affected by the drought. As they did so, they discovered that there was insufficient water for people to drink and produce food, especially in rural areas. They also found that the government had a responsibility to provide people with access to good quality water. DevelopmentAid gathered together women’s groups, their legal representatives, trade unions, civil society organisations, youth groups, schools, churches and members of the communities affected. They all shared their experiences and together they made a plan.

They decided to ask the government to treat the drought as an emergency and force the water companies to decontaminate the affected water supplies. They also decided to request a series of public hearings with the State Prosecutor. Council officials from the affected areas, representatives from the Ministry of Health and representatives from the water companies were all required to attend the public hearings. As a result, the National Department for Anti-Drought Projects was asked to act urgently to repair the damaged water pipeline, the Secretary of State for Health decided to check the quality of the water in the affected areas regularly, and the water companies were obliged to provide tankers to communities that had no water.

The Public Prosecutor’s Office also agreed to mobilise the government to start an awareness-raising campaign about water conservation. DevelopmentAid insisted that all these agreements should be put in writing, in a document called ‘Terms of Conduct’. DevelopmentAid also continued to work their strategy of training community leaders and farmers to get involved in municipal councils and other decision-making forums. This led to more people influencing the setting and spending of local government budgets. It also led to DevelopmentAid revising their planning so that all their future programmes included work to empower people to engage in municipal forums and monitor government actions.
5.4. What Are Advocacy Indicators and Why Do They Matter?

An indicator is a sign of change. It is evidence that a certain condition exists. An indicator tells you that a change you are interested in is happening, but it cannot explain why and how that change occurs.

An advocacy indicator is a sign that change is happening because of your advocacy work. You measure these changes through evidence or means of verification, i.e. information that you can use to show that your advocacy work has made a difference.

When you develop an advocacy plan, it is important to make wise decisions about what signs of change you will look for, and how you will measure the changes. This will help you monitor and review the implementation of your advocacy initiative and evaluate it when it is completed.

Indicators are not the same as targets. Indicators tell you what to measure, but targets assign a specific value to the measurement. Sometimes, targets are simply a guess, especially if you do not have experience or research to draw upon.

Annex 4 presents a framework for understanding possible outcomes and impacts of advocacy work.

**KEY CONCEPT**

**Example**

Indicators and Targets

An indicator may be ‘Increased knowledge of malnutrition prevention methods among mothers’, while a target may be ‘Increased knowledge of malnutrition prevention methods among 80% of mothers in Chikwakwa village’.

It is generally recognised and accepted that it is difficult to plan, measure, assess and demonstrate the impact of advocacy work. However, it is good to be aware of the most commonly accepted challenges so that an advocacy plan can be adapted:

- **Advocacy** is ‘messy’ - Change does not occur in a neat and ordered fashion. Change is often unexpected, difficult to attribute and not always easy to identify.

- **Advocacy timeframes are long** - Traditional development projects often put too much emphasis on short-term aims, but advocacy is a long-term process with potentially unpredictable timescales.

- **External factors are unpredictable** - Advocacy deals with complex social change. It is often difficult to determine exactly what caused a certain impact, or the full effect of an advocacy action, even after the event.

- **Sometimes change is only partial** - It is rare to obtain an outright or absolute victory in advocacy. Unfortunately, it is difficult to measure intermediate progress, incremental changes, negotiated compromises or partial achievements.

- **Traditional monitoring is inappropriate** - Conventional tools for monitoring, reviewing and evaluating development work are inappropriate for advocacy work because they fail to capture the complexity of what has occurred in advocacy, particularly when the unexpected happens or when situations do not go as planned.

- **Data gathering is complicated** - It can be difficult to know what baseline to use in assessing advocacy impact. There can be a lack of objective data available, and the data that is available can be costly to obtain and analyse.

To overcome these challenges, indicators must be:

- **Clear, causally linked and not too ambitious**.

- **A mix of quantitative and qualitative**. They are presented as numbers or percentages. For example, how much media coverage an issue has had, or how many people have been mobilised to campaign. Qualitative indicators are descriptive, and they measure quality. They are written in words. For example, records of interactions with a decision-maker, assessment of a coalition’s performance, quotations from people in a community affected by an issue.

- **Disaggregated**. This considers gender, age, community, ethnicity, and so on. For example, the number of women and men involved in decision-making processes, the level of public engagement with the issue by the young, the middle-aged and the elderly.

- **Focused on the process of advocacy, as well as the result**. For example, if people are empowered by advocating together on an issue, or by working together on a campaign, that can have its own value, whatever the outcome.

- **Useful, based on information that is available at the right time**. For example, it is no good having an indicator that relies on national government statistics only published every ten years if we want change at the provincial level on an annual basis.

- **Cost-effective, inexpensive, straightforward and in proportion to the overall budget**. Indicators should not be so difficult to measure that they take too long or too many people to measure, nor so complicated that affected communities cannot use them.

Indicators can and should be applied to every aspect of an advocacy plan. It can be tempting to focus only on indicators that measure outcomes, but it is wise also to include indicators for outputs and activities. This is because a combination of indicators enables us to demonstrate the progress that our project or programme is making, and how it is contributing to impact.

A detailed Advocacy Planning Checklist is provided in Annex 4.
5.5. What Are the Risks Involved in Advocacy and Should You Address Them?

Everything we do involves risks. Whether we are aware of it or not, we constantly seek to avoid, reduce or mitigate risks. We need to consider the main risks we face as an organisation before we undertake our advocacy work.

Some of the main risks of advocacy include:

- **Reputational** - Loss of credibility, lack of legitimacy, compromising of messages, reliance on incorrect information, etc.
- **People** - Illness, intimidation, harassment, violence, imprisonment, death, etc.
- **Property** - Forcible closure of buildings, confiscation of paperwork, arson attacks, theft of key documents, etc.
- **Political** - Changes in regimes, key decision-makers leaving office, public opinion, government policy, foreign influence, etc.
- **Operational** - External disruption to plans, loss of access to finances, failure to secure access to decision-makers, revocation of legal status, etc.
- **Procedural** - Lack of accountability, poor governance, inability to seize timely opportunities, etc.
- **Project** - Cost over-runs, jobs taking too long, diversion of focus because of an emergency, etc.
- **Financial** - Fraud, bribery, diversion of funds, loss of jobs or livelihoods, etc.
- **Technical** - Inability to accommodate advances in technology, technical failure, etc.
- **Natural** - Threats from weather, natural disaster, accident, disease, etc.

The following steps can assist you in addressing these risks:

**STEP 1 Identify threats** - The first step is to identify potential threats, making sure that none of them is overlooked. This can be done by:

- Working through a checklist, such as the one below, and noting the applicable threats
- Deliberately trying to spot areas of vulnerability within an advocacy plan, for example in relation to specific relationships, systems, structures, etc
- Consulting with different people who might have different perspectives about the likely impact of threats.

**STEP 2 Estimate risks** - The second step is to work out the likelihood of each threat being realised and to assess its impact. One approach to this is to estimate the probability of the event occurring, and to work out how much it would cost to set things right if it occurs, in terms of both finances and relationships. This provides estimated values for each risk. An alternative approach is to consider both the likely impact of the risk and the likelihood of the risk occurring, grading them separately on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is very low and 5 is very high. Multiply the numbers together and the higher the score, the higher the estimated risk.

**STEP 3 Manage risks** - The third step is to work out ways of managing the risks while acknowledging that some will remain high despite your best efforts. This needs to be as cost-effective as possible, in light of their estimated value. Sometimes, it may be better to accept the risk than to use excessive resources to eliminate it. This should be done with wisdom and discernment. Risks can be managed in several ways:

- **By using existing resources** - Improvements in existing methods and systems, changes in responsibilities, improvements to accountability and internal controls, etc.
- **By contingency planning** - This involves deciding to accept a risk but choosing to develop a plan to minimise its effects if it happens. The plan allows for immediate action in the event of the risk occurring and a crisis management situation.
- **By investing in new resources** - This involves deciding whether to bring in additional resources to counter the risk, or even insuring against the risk.

**STEP 4 Regular reviews** - The fourth step is to carry out regular reviews. This might involve formal reviews of the risk analysis, perhaps each time there are changes in circumstances. It might also involve adapting plans, allocating additional budget or alerting external contacts.
Reflecting on the advocacy issue you selected in section 2...

1. What would be your indicators of success?

2. What are some of the risks you might face when implementing your advocacy initiative and should you address them?

Use the Advocacy Planning Checklist provided in Annex 5 to develop a draft advocacy work plan using the following questions as your guide:

1. What should done?

2. When should it be done?

3. How will it be done?

4. What change is expected?

5. What role will your organisation or community play?
Notes
6.1. Introduction

In Section 2, the advocacy cycle was introduced. This section now focuses on coalition building, developing advocacy messages, using media and policy dialogues as well as engaging policy makers directly in advocacy. The section identifies the elements of an effective advocacy message and how to tailor a message to the interests of a target audience. It explains what the term mobilising means, the benefits and risks involved in mobilising people and its relationship with awareness-raising. It explains what it is, why it is important and how to use the media.

This section explores a series of questions and answers.

- What does ‘coalition building’ mean?
- Why establish coalitions?
- How do you build a successful coalition?
- What are the benefits of coalitions?
- What are the components of media that matter in advocacy?
- What opportunities exist for working with the media in advocacy?
- What are media messages and how are they created?
- What is good practice for working with the media in advocacy?

6.2. What is Coalition Building in the Context of Policy Advocacy?

It is important to build coalitions. You build a coalition when you form an alliance with two or more persons, institutions or organisations to work together to achieve a common goal.

A coalition is an alliance or partnering of groups to achieve a common purpose or to jointly engage in an activity. In other words, it is a process through which parties (individuals, organisations, or nations) come together for a common interest.

Why establish a coalition?

- You form a coalition with other people or groups of similar values, interests, and goals, allowing the members to combine their resources and become more powerful than when they each act alone. Therefore, coalition building is a basic way whereby the disempowered, or parties affected by a problem or an issue, can develop their power base and better defend their interests. Coalitions may be built around any issue and at any scale of society, from neighborhood problems or issues to the national and international level.

How do you build a successful coalition?

Building a successful coalition involves a number of steps. The early steps centre on the recognition of compatible interests. Sometimes this happens naturally. Other times potential coalition members must be persuaded that forming a coalition would be to their benefit. To do this, you need to demonstrate:

i. that your goals are similar and compatible,
ii. that working together will enhance both groups’ abilities to reach their goals, and
iii. that the benefits of coalescing will be greater than the costs.

6.3. Developing Advocacy Messages

Advocacy messages are developed and tailored to specific target audiences to frame the issue and persuade the receiver to support the network’s position.

There are three important questions to answer when preparing advocacy messages:

- Who are you trying to reach with the message?
- What do you want to achieve with the message?
- What do you want the recipient of the message to do because of the message (the action you want taken)?

A strong message is credible, concise, relevant, compelling and communicative of values. Credible. It is factually accurate, provides information to back up assertions, and is delivered by people that are trusted on the subject.

An effective advocacy message is one that:

- Informs the audience about the advocacy issue or problem.
- Persuades the audience that the problem needs to be addressed, that the benefits of addressing the issue outweigh any risk, and that the proposed solution(s) are appropriate and effective strategies.
- Moves the audience to action. A successful message is one that gives a clear call to action and inspires the audience to take the action or actions that are proposed.
- Concise. A good message is clear and simple. Crisp messages that people can understand and remember are much more effective than messages that are long or wade into policy minutiae.
- Relevant. It starts with a person’s interests—what they already know and think—and moves them to where you want them to be.
Effective messages also:

- Use facts and figures
- Use real-life, human examples
- Are appealing on a personal level
- Are simple, concise
- Use appropriate language
- Use a credible messenger
- Use tone and language that are consistent with the message (e.g. serious, humorous)
- Provide a clear call to action

A strong overarching message will hold your entire advocacy strategy together. If you really want to influence decision-makers, you should invest time in developing this message early in your advocacy planning. If your messages are numerous, vague or too complex they might not grab the attention of your target audience or have a real memorable impact.

An **advocacy message** is a concise and persuasive statement about your advocacy goal that captures what you want to achieve, why, and how. Since the underlying message aims to create action, your message should also include the specific actions you would like the audience to take.

In advocacy there can be two types of messages:

1. **Primary or core message**: This is your main message. It will be: broad – appealing to all audiences; the theme that will hold your advocacy campaign together; simple and direct in order to gain maximum attention – you may be addressing an audience of thousands or even millions of people with widely differing views and knowledge. It should include the following:
   - **Statement**: your central idea or the analysis/cause of the problem. It outlines why the change is important
   - **Evidence**: supports the statement with (easily understood) facts and figures, using tailored language
   - **Example**: adds a human face when communicating
   - **Goal**: highlights what you want to achieve
   - **Action desired**: the solution (or partial solution) to the problem. This forms the core of an advocacy message and distinguishes it from many other types of communication.

2. **Secondary or tailored message**: These messages should: support your core message and explain how it can be achieved; be concise and memorable; be targeted to the needs, perceptions and preferences of your target audiences – answering the question “what does this have to do with me?” You can have several secondary messages. These may be tailored to wider, more specific audiences e.g. decision-makers, the media, professionals, the general public.

### 6.4. Building Advocacy Capacity

Having decided on your way into the process and identified your target audience(s), the planning now turns to who should take on the role of the “face” of the advocacy campaign. Your message can have a very different impact, depending on who is delivering it. In advocacy, the messenger is often as important as the message. Messengers are those who have influence, or power over, the key targets to bring about the desired change.

It is important to consider the following issues in making plans for this element of your advocacy planning:

- **Who should be the face of the campaign?** Do you have what it takes to be the messenger, or should you choose someone else?
- **What other support do you need for your campaign to be taken seriously?**

One way to assess your level of preparedness for policy advocacy is to conduct a capacities assessment. Annex 3 presents an inventory list of key capacities for policy advocacy for you to consider.

Although it often happens that a particular advocacy initiative is closely linked with an individual, the messenger does not necessarily refer to an individual. Instead, it is commonly an organisation or a coalition that takes the lead with a team of people who actually engage in the defined range of advocacy activities.

The legitimacy that comes with the support from others and a lead advocate or organisation with a solid reputation are key factors in getting doors to open throughout the advocacy process. Identifying policy champions can be a challenging task. Individuals need to be selected based on project needs.

The most well-known example of policy champions are celebrity activists. These individuals can use their fame to raise money and awareness for important issues but are often not as involved at the policy formation level. The reality is that policy champions are normal individuals who possess a combination of the following:

- Good social skills
- Self-motivation
- Familiarity with policy issues and implementation
- Connections to the policy audience in question

There is a need for frank assessment of reputation and capacity in choosing the right messenger(s) and supporters:

- **Reputation** – Do you have the resources, credibility, reputation, visibility, and support to be taken seriously by the key players?
- **Skills** – Do you have the range of communication and interpersonal skills required to successfully take on the multiple roles the messenger plays?
- **The face of the campaign** – Who should be the face of the campaign? You or someone else?
- **Identifying a messenger** – Can you identify a suitable policy broker to play a specific role?
- **Other support** – What other support do you need for your campaign to be taken seriously?

The choice of messenger could provide credibility, clarity or empathy to the message and the issue. A local community leader, religious leader, celebrity or children’s group, for example, may sometimes be more effective at delivering a
message and being heard. The decision of who will make an effective and strategic messenger depends on the advocacy priority, and on internal and external assessment of the advocacy situation.

Tools to enhance their message-sharing experience include practice sessions on how to address different audiences. Talking with government officials or community leaders is not the same as answering questions from journalists or appearing in a live interview. Consulting with advocacy messengers to find out which audiences will make them most comfortable and effective.

It is important to equip identified messengers with policy advocacy skills they can use to demand better policies, services and programmes for their communities.

The process starts from self-awareness and how young people can tap into their passion and potential, followed by practical steps on how to identify key advocacy issues/problems in the community, how to develop an advocacy action plan and how to build necessary coalitions to champion your cause. While youth can be trained to advocate on any issue, young messengers are best suited to salient causes including better policies on youth employment, youth-friendly health care service delivery, growth and development of entrepreneurship, science and technology and environmental conservation to preserve a more sustainable future.

Capacity for advocacy needs to be present at different levels.
These are:

**Individual Capacity**: Consists of the following key components:

- Practical skills – negotiating, communicating, influencing, listening skills, research skills, understanding research for policy.
- Partnership skills – identifying basis of unity, collegiality, ability to collaborate, ability to compromise.
- Personal abilities and behaviours – enthusiasm, resilience, focus, sense of humour.
- Knowledge – practical and/or formal knowledge of a particular field, of local and national policy contexts, of local issues.
- Understanding – ability to interpret knowledge and experiences, determining when to criticise and when to cooperate.

**Organisational Capacity**: Consists of the following components:

- Strategic leadership and planning
- Financial management, planning, and accountability

Beyond your own team of messengers or advocates, having the broader support of others, whether in a formal coalition or a more informal network of supporters, is also a major factor in effective advocacy. Being able to show that influential individuals, organisations, associations of stakeholders, or even advisors and other policy makers are on your side is pivotal to building the legitimacy of the position you are pushing forward.

In fact, experience shows that the most successful networks supporting policy advocacy initiatives normally include a wide range of actors, including researchers, decision makers, NGOs, and affected stakeholders. You really do need friends in the process, but this does not just mean teaming up with those already close to you: it’s about building strategic alliances.

Building such **purposeful networks** means engaging all actors as early as possible and keeping them on board through the process, which also means that coordination and communication are critical. In fact, building this support is often the first step in many advocacy campaigns, as the approval and support of a broad consensus of people can make the difference between a decision maker listening to and engaging with your ideas or just ignoring them. You should strategically consider who you need and can get as supporters and how to build broader support in the network. **Personal and informal relationships are often very important in this kind of work.**

You should also think beyond just the level of support that coalition partners can bring, but also the resources and capacities that you don’t have and could use in your advocacy effort. For example: analytical capacity, funding, previous advocacy experience, access to other networks, constituencies, research, data, media, and international organisations or policy makers. As already mentioned, targeting your selection of other support based on identified resource or capacity gaps and based on the skills and experience that complement yours is more focused and prudent than just aligning yourself with friends in the network.

---

**EXAMPLE**

**Journalist Training**

FANRPAN has experience in building the capacity of a core body of FANR journalists to act as ambassadors who promote and disseminate information on Climate Smart Agriculture. FANRPAN together with Inter Press Service (IPS) hosted two pilot projects in Namibia (2010) and Maputo (2009) during its Annual Policy Dialogues, whereby journalists were trained to report on FANR issues. This involved a two-day training session followed by journalists attending the Regional Dialogue and reporting on issues explored at this forum to their media houses. A further initiative was for journalists to contribute to a newsletter that packaged stories that were specific to the issues under discussion.
Where possible you should analyse the policy processes at national, regional and global levels to decide how best to get your message heard by your target audience. It will simply not be possible to engage in all opportunities at all levels and spreading your messages too broadly can result in them losing clarity and appeal.

It is important to make sure you select your messaging format carefully and be aware that multiple communication strategies might be needed if you have different target audiences or are engaging at different levels. Advocacy is often most effective when messages are delivered in a variety of ways that reinforce and complement each other.

There are many different mediums you can use to deliver your advocacy messages, for example briefing papers and meetings, websites or press releases. These usually work better when used together than individually. It is important to choose methods that suit your audience and that they will find accessible and credible.

### Engaging the media for policy advocacy

The media have an important role to play in public advocacy initiatives, especially campaign-based approaches. Not all advocacy work uses the media, and a media-based approach carries risks as well as opportunities. The media can bring a mass audience, potentially increasing the profile and credibility of your initiative, but they can also bring bad publicity and may contribute to mobilising opposition as well as support.

The media includes traditional media platforms such as radio, television, newspapers and magazines, and electronic and online media such as email, the internet, social networking sites and blogs. It is a powerful force that can build awareness, shape public opinion and influence decision makers and their decisions, leading to changes in laws, policies and practices.

Using the media well and integrating our media activities into our wider advocacy strategy, can greatly enhance our advocacy work and increase the chances of bringing about the changes we desire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written</th>
<th>Spoken and visual</th>
<th>Relational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press Releases</td>
<td>Radio interview</td>
<td>Putting on a breakfast or lunch for journalists and inviting them to come and find out about an advocacy initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters to the editor of a local or national newspaper or magazine</td>
<td>Television interview</td>
<td>Inviting a journalist to an event or to see what is happening in one of the communities affected by an advocacy issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature-length articles for newspapers or magazines necessarily need to relate to a current news topic.</td>
<td>Phoning in to a radio talk show</td>
<td>Organising joint events with the media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogs written from a personal viewpoint</td>
<td>Radio or television programmes</td>
<td>Working through social media, engaging journalists on twitter, Facebook etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background information for journalists on the issue</td>
<td>Film footage on social networking sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This list is not definitive. New ways of working with the media continue to be identified and developed, so it is important to keep an open mind and use different methods of engagement.

### Media messages and how are they created

A media message is the most important point that we want the interviewer and the public to pick up from our media work. It is the key topic that gets emphasised, whatever media channel we choose to use.

For example, our media message may be that we want the government to take a particular action (e.g. pass a law, provide water to a certain region), or it may be that we want to bring attention to a situation (e.g. an increase in child trafficking from poorer regions of the country), or it may be that we want to highlight a good news story about success (e.g. a women’s cooperative working together to build a local school).
Advocacy through policy dialogues

Gaining entry and exerting influence at the early stages of policy design in the policy-making process can be very effective in shaping policy outcomes. Active participation in the policy process requires engagement with bureaucrats and politicians, not all of whom may be supportive of civil society having a say in the policy design.

Structured discussions about key policy issues can contribute to the development and implementation of effective agriculture policies in several ways. These can include:

- Facilitating dialogue between people with different types of expertise and different perspectives;
- Bringing potential opposition into the policy development process;
- Exposing, clarifying, or resolving disagreements regarding the evidence; and
- Clarifying judgements that need to be made based on the evidence, thereby allowing policy makers and stakeholders to generate ideas and actions that can help to move the development and implementation of effective policies along.

A policy dialogue is an organised and deliberate interaction between two or more actors about the allocation of values. These values will result in the new policy changes. These are:

- Bringing groups that are diverse to the same place for a discussion.
- Focusing on any common or planning problem that is in the interest of the majority.
- Having a policy lifecycle with a beginning, middle, and end.
- Formulating practical and simple solutions to problems.

Having an all-inclusive discussion

There are certain factors you need to take into consideration when you have an all-inclusive platform for discussion and when the goal is to generate solutions to problems, namely:

- Participation must be equal between all parties.
- There must be an acceptance of different views.
- Agendas need to be set by members.
- Research outputs must be given entry into policy.
- Information must be shared freely among all members.

Policy dialogue will happen at different times in the policy development process. There are times when the policy dialogue occurs at the beginning of the process, with the main aim of clarifying the problem that is identified. There are other times that policy dialogue will occur later in the process. This may occur when the focus is on advantages or disadvantages of the implementation of the solutions. The timing of the policy dialogue will depend on the main aim of the policy dialogue.

The key characteristics of policy dialogues:

1. An iterative process
2. Considering both the technical and political aspects of the problem in question
3. Very variable and broad in nature
4. Involving evidence-based and politically sensitive discussions
5. Including a broad range of key stakeholders, and
6. Having a concrete purpose or outcome in mind, e.g. a decision, a plan, or a deliverable (e.g. a report or review).

Factors of successful policy dialogue

Successful policy dialogue needs to have a clearly defined purpose/set of objectives, coupled with a clear vision of which outcomes and results are expected. If these aspects have not been defined and crystallized from the outset, the rest of the process can suffer as the dialogue will lack structure, direction and purpose, which can hamper the achievement of objectives.

In addition, it is imperative that policy dialogue preparation includes gathering of relevant information, preferably evidence-based, as the presentation of available evidence will invariably help justify the implementation of policy reform. Context and stakeholder analysis should also be carried out as part of the policy dialogue preparation, as there are several benefits to this.

Policy dialogue processes should also be underpinned by an adequate level of funding and resources, to avoid the process of stalling and/or losing momentum. Sufficient preparation time is crucial to ensure that all the relevant evidence can be gathered, and stakeholders prepared so that they can participate meaningfully.

Policy dialogue discussions should be led by using effective moderation techniques, and these will differ according to the objectives of the dialogue. For example, seeking consensus and seeking majority agreement require different moderation approaches and skills.

Direct communication with decision-makers

Direct communication with decision-makers can be a powerful, cost-effective advocacy tool. This may be done through letters, telephone calls, faxes, and emails – but personal meetings are often the most effective way to communicate. Consider having some simple print materials produced to reinforce your points and the actions you would like decision-makers to take. Information should be easily accessible, and it is advisable to use bullet points with easily understood illustrations.

When meeting directly with policy makers (or their staff) consider employing the following tips:

- Work with policy makers on a one-to-one basis. Target those policy makers who make policy or work on the issues you plan to address.
- Be concise and clear about your interests.
- Be a good listener. Hear what the legislator has to say about the issue. Respect the right of the policy makers to disagree with you and vote against your issue.
- Offer to serve as a source of information to the policy maker on your issue.
- Be polite and keep your appointment to the time you agreed on unless the policy maker initiates spending more time.
- Provide written materials and follow up immediately on any commitment made during the visit.
- Don’t visit the same policy maker more than once for the same issue unless you have something different to say.
• Don’t be sarcastic, critical, or threatening, or embarrass the legislator in any way.
• Don’t tell legislators how to vote. Instead, tell them how a given vote will affect their constituency.
• Don’t show anger or resentment toward a legislator who votes against your cause. Look for ways you can work together next time and make it happen.
• Thank the legislator for time and interest in your issue.

Remember that meeting with policy makers’ staff can be as important as meeting with the legislators themselves. Staff are typically those with the deeper expertise on specific issues.

The elevator pitch - You may find yourself in a situation where you unexpectedly meet a policymaker or staff member who is influential on the policy issue you are pursuing. In cases like this, you have less than a minute to make an impact. To make the most of this moment, it is critical that you have prepared a pitch in advance.

Appropriate settings to use an elevator pitch include:
- Elevator (lift)
- Grocery store
- Buffet line
- Airport
- Conference

General tips and strategies:
- Frame the elevator pitch around the point of view of the person to whom you are speaking.
- Center your pitch on a problem this influential person can help solve.
- Speak his or her language. Use plain, simple language – not jargon.
- Your goal is to pique the person’s interest and leave him or her wanting to know more.
- Be passionate, concise and succinct.
- Don’t overstay your welcome.
- Most importantly – practice, practice, practice!

General outline for an effective pitch:

Introduce yourself and make a compelling case:
- Introduce yourself.
- State the case you wish to make using powerful details that are important to the listener.
- Suggest how the listener can resolve the problem.
- Explain how you can make his or her work on this issue easier.

Just before your 30 seconds are over:
- End with a call to action—a future meeting or a phone call to continue the conversation.
- Ask for a business card and supply one, as well.
1. Reflecting on your work environment, what internal advocacy capacities have you developed?
2. Have these been tested yet, and proved successful?
3. What are the opportunities you have for delivering advocacy messages?

**ACTIVITY**

When developing messages, it’s important to think through a few questions to ensure what you are saying is both well-targeted and engaging. Using the Elevator Pitch Worksheet in Annex 6, develop your advocacy message. Try answering these questions before developing your message:

1. **Who is your audience?** Be specific.

2. **Why are you engaging this person/group?** What can they do and how is it in their interest to help?

3. **What common ground do you share with your audience?** How can you “go to them” rather than making them come to you?

4. **What story can you tell that will capture them?**
MONITORING, REVIEWING, EVALUATION AND LEARNING

7.1. Introduction

In Section 2, the advocacy cycle was introduced. This section focuses on monitoring, reviewing and evaluating an advocacy initiative, or an advocacy component within a broader project or programme strategy. It explains the differences between monitoring, reviewing and evaluation, how they interlink and why they are important, with special emphasis on learning. This section explores a series of questions:

- What are the differences between monitoring, reviewing and evaluation?
- Why bother with monitoring, reviewing and evaluating advocacy?
- Why is learning so important?
- How can advocacy be monitored and reviewed?
- How can advocacy be evaluated?

7.2. What are the Differences between Monitoring, Reviewing and Evaluation?

Monitoring, reviewing and evaluation are processes that combine to enable us to assess the impact of our work. In advocacy, they help us find out whether we have influenced, or made progress towards influencing decision-makers to bring about changes in laws, policies and practices that favour poor, vulnerable and marginalised people.

If we have undertaken an advocacy project of definite duration, that was designed to achieve specific impact and changes, then our success will be determined by whether the project has delivered the right outputs at the right time and at the right cost.

If we have undertaken an advocacy programme, a group of related projects managed in a coordinated manner to get benefits and value not available from each project individually, then our success will be determined by whether the programme has coordinated and prioritised resources across the projects, to cause the broader, strategic, desired outcomes to be achieved.

Monitoring describes the process of systematically gathering data throughout the duration of a project or programme. It is conducted on an ongoing basis as a way of tracking progress and checking that we are doing what we said we would do, when we said we would do it. It identifies successes and failures and helps determine whether or not the project or programme is on track. It allows us to identify issues early on, providing us with an opportunity to take corrective action or make proactive improvements as required. Reviewing is done regularly throughout the duration of a project or programme, but occasionally rather than continuously. It provides periodic assessments of a project to check whether it is on track, on budget, on time and making progress towards achieving the desired changes. It ensures that we are learning from the project or programme and that we capture important lessons, which can be used to shape the project or programme, or the future design and implementation of other projects and programmes.

Evaluation is conducted at the end of a project or programme, but sometimes also midterm, to analyse what has been done and determine whether it has been effective. It assesses the wider benefit and change created by a project or programme. It should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making processes of advocates, allies, communities and donors. It is considered good practice to commit time and resources to evaluation. Many types of evaluation can be used, including real-time, participatory, and impact evaluations. The type undertaken depends on the context of the project or programme, the desired outputs and outcomes, and the resources available to undertake it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Reviewing</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When is it done?</td>
<td>continuously</td>
<td>regularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is it assessing?</td>
<td>measuring efficiency and outputs</td>
<td>effectiveness, relevance, immediate impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who does it involve?</td>
<td>communities, staff, allies</td>
<td>communities, staff, allies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is responsible for doing it?</td>
<td>staff</td>
<td>staff or external consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What evidence is it assessing?</td>
<td>internal</td>
<td>internal and external</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is it for?</td>
<td>communities, staff</td>
<td>communities, staff, allies, donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why is it necessary?</td>
<td>to confirm design of project or programme and make minor changes in design</td>
<td>to confirm design of project or programme and make minor changes in plan or strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.3. Why Bother with Monitoring, Reviewing and Evaluating Advocacy?

Advocacy requires an approach and a way of thinking about success, failure, progress, and best practices that is very different from the way we approach traditional philanthropic projects such as delivering services or modelling social innovations. It is subtler and more uncertain, less linear, and because it is fundamentally about politics, it depends on the outcomes of fights in which good ideas and sound evidence don’t always prevail.

There are several reasons why we need to monitor, review and evaluate advocacy work:

**Accountability**

It enables us to be accountable to all our stakeholders, including:

- People in the communities affected by the advocacy issue, and those who have benefited from the activities of the project or programme. This is particularly important if we have been advocating on their behalf
- Allies, and other organisations with whom we may have undertaken advocacy as part of a network, coalition, alliance or other joint initiative
- Targets, such as the decision-makers whom we have been seeking to influence
- Donors who have funded our advocacy work and those who have supported it with resources.

**Learning**

Learning from success means we can reward it and build on what we have done well and learning from failure means we can correct it and make sure we do things differently to avoid it happening again. We can capture lessons learned as we reflect on progress, assess our impact, celebrate achievements, recognise issues and address problems, and adapt our plans, strategies and ways of working.

**Demonstration of impact**

It helps us to assess the progress we have (or have not) made and why, and it enables us to demonstrate the changes and impact that our work has brought about. This helps us win support for our work.

**Participation**

Monitoring and reviewing our advocacy work enables our stakeholders to provide feedback and shape the way the work is taken forward. Evaluating our advocacy work allows key stakeholders to assess the impact of the work and participate in how things are taken forward.

7.4. Why is learning so important?

During the lifetime of an advocacy project or programme, many lessons will be learned. Some of these lessons will be based on success, which can help others improve. Others will be learned from failure, which can help others avoid similar mistakes.

To understand lessons learned, we need to understand what worked or did not work – when, where, with whom, under what circumstances and why – and this means being able to analyse what work was done, the context in which it was done and the outcome of that work. Capturing this may depend on how well we did our planning. For example, how did we handle disagreements when we worked with others in coalitions, alliances or networks? Did we make assumptions that turned out to be incorrect? Were there risks that we did not identify correctly, or that could have been managed better?

Learning only happens when there is sufficient time to reflect on practice, identify lessons and share them with others, and when they have the chance to absorb and apply the lessons. This may require us to schedule regular monitoring meetings, to reflect on progress and improve our practice. It may also require us to be open-minded in reviewing, so that difficulties can be acknowledged, rather than disguised.

A learning review (which can include a peer review) is a formal planned activity, which can be done virtually or with key stakeholders physically present. It can be undertaken at any stage of an advocacy project or programme, to review progress, learn from what is going well and not so well, check the scope of the plan or strategy, and make any necessary adjustments where required. It may look at process and/or technical issues to check that the project is seeking to achieve what it said it would. It normally involves key stakeholders who are directly or indirectly involved in implementing the work, in order to gain their insights and observations. You should expect some negative findings as well as positive ones. Specific recommendations should be proposed for applying the learning in the project as it progresses and/or for future initiatives.

7.5. How can Advocacy be Monitored and Reviewed?

Monitoring and reviewing both involve gathering data. The data gathered must be useful. If data is not analysed and used, then there is no point recording and collating it. Sometimes we collect data that is irrelevant, which can be a waste of time, effort and resources.

It has been famously said that not everything that counts can be counted. And not everything that can be counted, counts. In other words, we must ensure that we gather data that is both quantitative and qualitative:

- Quantitative data is about numbers, amounts, averages and statistics. It can be objective, so it often needs to be contextualised. It can be used to prove that something has improved or changed.
Evaluations are considered good practice. There are several ways they can be done. The option we choose will depend on the nature of our advocacy project or programme, and factors such as time, money, resources, staff capacity, the indicators set when we made our advocacy plan or strategy, the levels of accountability required by donors and beneficiaries, the extent of stakeholder participation expected, and the lessons learned.

Some of the most common methods include:

- Knowledge Attitude Practice Surveys: an educational diagnosis of the community, revealing increases in knowledge about the issue, attitudes towards the issue and change in practice.

- Community-led video diaries: community members use cameras to record changes that have occurred using film (or video).

- Outcome Mapping: a measurement process that focuses on behavioural change exhibited by beneficiaries, comprising a lengthy design phase followed by a cyclic record-keeping phase.

- Most Significant Change: the collection and interpretation of stories of change, in order to facilitate improvement.

- Cost–Benefit Analysis: a systematic process for comparing the total expected cost of each option against the total expected benefits, to see whether the benefits outweigh the costs, and by how much, and for determining if a sound investment decision was made with the project or programme.

- Social Return on Investment: a principles-based method for measuring social and other non-financial value relative to resources invested, to evaluate impact on stakeholders, identify ways to improve performance and enhance investments.

### 7.6. How can Advocacy be Evaluated?

#### KEY CONCEPT

**Example**

Sample Implementation Evaluation Questions

Once the purpose and focus of the evaluation are determined, specific evaluation questions should be identified. The following are some sample policy implementation evaluation questions. Identifying the core components of implementation can be challenging but doing so can be essential to focusing the evaluation.

The evaluation questions selected will guide the selection of an appropriate evaluation design.

- Did the policy clearly identify the critical implementation steps?
- Was the policy implemented according to the policy requirements?
- What inputs and resources were required to implement the policy?
- Were all of these inputs and resources available?
- What key activities were completed during policy implementation?
- Did the activities result in the anticipated outputs?
- Was the policy implemented consistently across communities or environments?
- Were there any unintended consequences?
- What external factors influenced the implementation?
Evaluations must:

- Be participatory: people-centred and involving stakeholders of an advocacy project or programme such as affected communities, allies and targets.

- Assess impact: analysing the changes that can be attributed to an advocacy project or programme, both intended and unintended, by asking how things would have changed if the work had not been undertaken.

- Be objective: conducted by a person or people who have not been involved in the advocacy project or programme, and who are able to be neutral in their views about the work.

The following decisions need to be made before going ahead:

- Who? Who should do the evaluation? It could be done by a small internal team or by an external person or team.

- When? When should the evaluation be done? It is normally done as soon as possible after the end of a project or programme. If it is left too long, the key people involved are likely to begin forgetting important information.

- What? What should be evaluated? It is important that the evaluation identifies both planned and unplanned change. It also needs to assess efficiency (i.e. whether resources were used appropriately and strategically) and effectiveness (i.e. whether the advocacy has had an impact that is sustainable and transformational).

Finally, successful advocacy needs low-key, detailed and long-term engagement, demanding in-depth knowledge of personalities and structures, compromise and strategic timing. It needs to start from a point of understanding the policy process, and the political realities that face decision-makers at all levels. Governments, for their part, could certainly afford to be more open in acknowledging their constraints, or lack of capacity. But unless advocates meet them in the middle, conversation degenerates to mutual incomprehension. Simply shouting louder does no more than compromise credibility and alienate those that advocacy is intended to influence.

Reflecting on the advocacy issue you prioritised in section 2...

1. Will there be a need to conduct an evaluation?
2. How will you capture lessons learnt?
3. Would you conduct the evaluation yourself? Please explain your answer.
4. How would you assess your own overall readiness to conduct an effective policy advocacy campaign?
5. What strengths do you bring to the effort?
6. What areas may require assistance or support, possibly from others?

Using the advocacy plan you developed in section 5, how would you:

(i) monitor
(ii) review; and
(iii) evaluate the activities in the plan?
PUTTING IT ALL TOGETHER – CALL TO ACTION

In this module you have been exposed to:

i.) how to engage in policy advocacy;

ii.) the four stages of the policy cycle including a. Issue Identification; b. Research and Analysis; c. Planning for Policy Advocacy; d. Taking Action; and

iii.) monitoring, reviewing, and evaluation of policies. The concept of policy advocacy has been explored in detail.

The module explains how to identify policy issues and analyse policy dynamics. It has also demonstrated how goals and objectives for policy advocacy are set and target audiences are identified. Further, you have looked at strategies for influencing stakeholders; approaches of developing policy advocacy messages, building coalitions, and developing and implementing action plans.

This knowledge equips you with the necessary skills to effectively engage in policy advocacy.

At this stage, you should be able to appreciate the policy advocacy cycle and identify various stages where youth can contribute.

- With the knowledge that you have acquired, how would you contribute to policy advocacy in agriculture?
- In your own environment and language, would you be able to share your knowledge of policy issues that require advocacy with other stakeholders? How would you go about it?

What’s next after Module Two?

With the understanding gained of the policy context in Module One and how you to engage in policy advocacy in this Module, Module Three takes a case study approach to illustrate policy development processes in the agricultural sector. Three cases studies have been used to enhance your understanding of agriculture policy processes:

1. Women in Agriculture
2. Climate Smart Agriculture
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**Annex 1: Developing Advocacy Goal and Objectives**

The goal of advocacy is the desired outcome or change in the policy environment. The pursuit of that desired outcome is generally long-term. It can be general, and it can be your vision.

**Advocacy Objectives** are the smaller steps you must complete to reach your overall goal. They should be clear and focused and should include: the change you want to see, who (e.g., person, institution, office) will make the change, and when it will be achieved. They should be limited in number (no more than three).

Objectives for an advocacy intervention should be **SMART**: specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and time-bound. They should clearly state what would change, who will make that change, by how much, and by when. Generally, the timeframe for an advocacy objective will be one to three years.

**Why use SMART objectives?**
- To provide a structured approach to developing and designing a work plan.
- To systematically monitor progress towards a target
- To set the stage for measuring performance and identifying opportunities for improvement
- To succinctly communicate intended impact and current progress to stakeholders
- To concretely describes how goals will be met.

**How to Write SMART Objectives**

1. **Specific Objectives** should be well-defined, and clear to other team members and to stakeholders who also understand the plan.

   Consider these prompts:
   - What:
     - What exactly will you do?
     - What is the action?
     - What do you intend to impact?
   - Who:
     - Who is responsible for carrying out the action?
     - What are you intending to impact or who is your target population?

   Note that not all of these questions will apply to every objective.

   **Example Objective**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Objective</th>
<th>How Can We Fix It?</th>
<th>SMART-er Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff will be trained in Quality Improvement.</td>
<td>We need to clarify the WHO and WHAT to make this objective “smarter.”</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture Research Services will offer Quality Improvement training opportunities to staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Measurable Objectives** - This involves selecting what will be measured to show improvement, impact or success. There may be existing measures and targets that are required for a specific programme. Try to pick a measure that is meaningful.

   Consider these prompts:
   - How much and in what direction will the change occur?
   - What data will be used to prove the target is met?
   - Where will this data come from?
   - Is there a stand-in or proxy measure to use if this objective cannot be directly measured, or is there another measure that would be more appropriate to use instead?

   **Example Objective**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Objective</th>
<th>How Can We Fix It?</th>
<th>SMART-er Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture Research Services will offer quality Improvement training opportunities to staff.</td>
<td>We need to clarify the MEASURE and TARGET to make this objective ‘smarter’.</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture Research Services will offer Quality Improvement training opportunities resulting in 75% of staff completing Quality Improvement 101.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Time-Bound Objectives** should be achievable within a specific time frame that isn’t so soon as to prevent success, or so far away as to encourage procrastination.

   Consider these prompts:
   - When will this objective be achieved?
   - Is this time-frame realistic? Should it be closer or further in the future?

   *Example Objective*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Objective</th>
<th>How Can We Fix It?</th>
<th>SMART-er Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture Research Services will offer Quality Improvement training opportunities resulting in 75% of staff completing Quality Improvement 101.</td>
<td>We need to clarify the TIME to make this objective ‘smarter.’</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture Research Services will offer Quality Improvement training opportunities resulting in 75% of staff completing Quality Improvement 101 by 31 December 2019.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Achievable Objectives** should be within reach for your team or programme, considering available resources, knowledge and time.

   Consider these prompts:
   - How can this objective be accomplished?
   - Given the current time frame or environment, can this objective be achieved? Should we scale it up or down?
   - What resources will help us achieve this objective? What limitations or constraints stand in our way?

   *Example Objective*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SMART-er Objective</th>
<th>How Can We Fix It?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture Research Services will offer Quality Improvement training opportunities resulting in 75% of staff completing Quality Improvement 101 by 31 December 2019.</td>
<td>To clarify achievability, it may be helpful for the Department of Agriculture Research Services to explain who is conducting the training, identify any related costs in the budget and consider whether it is possible to complete in the time frame.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Relevant Objectives** should align with a corresponding goal. Consider if and how successfully completing an objective will be relevant to achieving the goal. It should also be considered whether an objective is relevant or important to stakeholders.

   Consider these prompts:
   - Will this objective lead to achieving this organisation’s goals?
   - Does it seem worthwhile to measure this objective? Does it seem reasonable to measure this objective?

   *Example Objective*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SMART-er Objective</th>
<th>How Can We Fix It?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture Research Services will offer Quality Improvement training opportunities resulting in 75% of staff completing Quality Improvement 101 by 31 December 2019.</td>
<td>To clarify relevance, it may be helpful to think about how many staff members have already completed the training, if any. If there has already been a high number of staff members who have completed this training, maybe they should be offered a higher level training or re-write the objective to include attending any QI training.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Different Ways to Write SMART Objectives**

There are multiple approaches and ways to explain how to write SMART objectives. Here are some other sentence structures for objectives:

- [Who] will do [what] resulting in [measure] by [when].
- By [when], [who] will do [what] resulting in [measure].
- By [when], [measure - includes who and what].
- [Measure – includes who and what] by [when].
 Annex 2: Issue Selection Criteria Checklist

The following criteria can be used to assess the appropriateness of a potential advocacy issue. It is a suggested framework and a source of guidance, rather than a prescriptive checklist. Of course, more ‘Yes’ answers indicate that an advocacy issue is potentially appropriate. More ‘No’ answers could mean that the proposed issue may be inappropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is it a priority?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will addressing this issue help to improve the lives of people who are poor, vulnerable or marginalised?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will advocacy contribute to change on this issue?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is advocacy the best tool for addressing this issue?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there momentum around this issue from other groups and organisations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is it achievable?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does this issue have a specific and achievable goal (whether long-term or short-term)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do effective coalitions exist, or could they be started, to add value to achieving the goal related to this issue?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do we have access to the decision-makers who can influence change on this issue, either in our own right or in coalition with others?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is it sellable?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the issue new and fresh enough to engage diverse audiences?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the issue relevant to our organisational mandate and constituency?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could this issue be interesting to the media?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are supporters and donors interested in this issue?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the issue on the political agenda or potentially politically topical?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there sufficient stories and examples to engage the public?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do a variety of targets exist in relation to the issue?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can links be made to other issues to broaden the potential audiences who might engage with it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is it appropriate?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the issue fit with our organisational priorities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will advocacy on this issue allow us to meet our organisational aims?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are we clear about our specific contribution (i.e. our ‘value added’) towards seeing change on the issue?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If other organisations are working on this issue, how important is it that we work on it too?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could advocacy on this issue improve our organisational reputation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3: Capacities for Policy Advocacy Assessment

One way to assess your level of preparedness for policy advocacy is to conduct a capacities assessment. Consider the inventory list of key capacities for policy advocacy below. Review each category and the accompanying questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A. Credibility | • Can your organisation legitimately speak on behalf of those affected by this issue?  
• Am I/Is our organisation perceived as objective and trustworthy? Could we be perceived as politically partisan ? In other words, are we considered to be linked to a political party?  
• Am I/Is our organisation known and respected by decision-makers? |
| B. Issue Identification | • Do I/Does our organisation have the capacity to conduct an issue identification exercise, such as a survey, community assessment, focus groups, or other form of research, using standards for best practice?  
• If I/we cannot conduct my/our own issue identification exercise, do I/we have access to sound research or data from other sources?  
• Do I/Does our organisation fully understand the issue identified for advocacy? Would I/we be considered issue experts? |
| C. Research, Analysis and Policy Development | • Do I/Does our organisation have the capacity to collect and analyse data or conduct original research on an issue identified for advocacy?  
• If not, do I/we have access to other forms of reliable data and the ability to apply findings to this issue?  
• Do I/Does our organisation have the capacity to analyse information in such a way that allows me/us to come up with legitimate policy alternatives or issue solutions?  
• If not, do I/we have partners that can provide this capacity?  
• Do I/Does our organisation have the skills to financially manage a policy proposal and identify revenue streams for implementation?  
• If not, do I/we have partners that can provide this capacity? |
| D. Community Outreach and Grassroots Organising | • Am I/Is our organisation known and respected by local communities affected by this issue?  
• Do I/we have strong relationships with community leaders in the area?  
• Do I/we know and understand how targeted audiences in the area get their information?  
• Do I/we have the resources and skill capacity to organise outreach and mobilisation activities in the area?  
• What are the main constituency groups that I/we service now? How are they connected to this issue? |
| E. Relationships with Decision-makers | • Am I/Is our organisation known and respected by those with the authority to make decisions on this issue?  
• Do I/Does our organisation have the relationships necessary to secure meetings and other forms of engagement with decision-makers on this issue?  
• If I/we do not have the appropriate direct relationships with decision-makers, can I/we partner with other organisations or individuals that do? |
| F. Understanding the Decision-making Process | • Do I/Does our organisation understand how and when decisions are made on this issue?  
• Do I/Does our organisation have access to the meetings or other formats during which decisions are made on this issue? |
| G. External Communication | • Do I/we have the capacity to transform language from research and policy into short, clear messages for targeted audiences?  
• Do I/we have the ability to identify key audiences for mobilisation?  
• Do I/we know how to find out where these audiences get their information and what means of communication will be most effective with them? |
| H. Internal Communication for CSOs and Coalitions | • Is there strong leadership in the organisation for policy development and advocacy?  
• Does everyone in the organisation understand their roles and responsibilities in terms of policy development and advocacy?  
• Are mechanisms in place for all staff to be aware of our priorities and messages? |
| I. Ability to Form Networks and Coalitions | • Am I/Is our organisation a member of any professional networks, coalitions or partnerships?  
• Do I/Does our organisation have good working relationships with others working on this issue, including civil society organisations, community leaders and government departments?  
• Am I/Are we in a position to maximise the impact of our policy advocacy effort by building partnerships with other organisations and individuals that carry different strengths and assets from our own? |
| J. Resource Management | • Do I/we have sufficient human resources to achieve our policy advocacy goals?  
• Do I/we have the capacity to recruit and train volunteers within the timeline of our policy advocacy campaign?  
• Do I/we have sufficient financial resources to achieve our policy advocacy goals?  
• Am I/Are we managing our time well enough to achieve our advocacy goals? Are priority actions and achievements given enough time and resources?  
• Are there other human or material resources that I/we need to bring to this campaign?  
|
## Annex 4: Framework for Understanding Possible Outcomes and Impacts of Advocacy Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension of work</th>
<th>Intermediate objectives</th>
<th>Longer-term objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Policy change                                            | • Increased dialogue on an issue  
• Raised profile of issue  
• Changed opinion (whose?)  
• Changed rhetoric (in public/private)  
• Change in written publications  | • Changed policy  
• Change in legislation  
• Change in resource allocation  
• Policy/legislation change implemented (and in the very long term)  
• Positive change in people’s lives as a result of the policy/legislation change |
| 2. Strengthening civil society by working with individual organisations and networks | • Change in individual members’ skills, capacity, knowledge and effectiveness?  
• Change in individual civil groups’ capacity, organisational skills, effectiveness?  
• Greater synergy of aims/activities in networks/movements  
• Change in collaboration, trust or unity of civil society groups  | • Increased effectiveness of civil society work  
• Civil groups active in influencing decision makers in ways that will benefit poor people  
• Civil groups monitoring implementation of policies/programmes.  
• Partnerships and networks effective and sustainable |
| 3. Supporting people-centred policy making                  | • Greater awareness of individual rights and the power systems that withhold rights  
• Change in local people’s skills, capacity, and knowledge to mobilise and advocate on their behalf  
• Increased reporting of rights violations  
• Existence of systems to monitor rights  
• Claims made by CBOs for enforcing rights  
• Greater freedom of expression  | • Improved access to basic rights such as health, housing, water, food, non-discrimination  
• Increased participation of civil society groups in influencing decisions  
• Change in accountability and transparency of public institutions |
| 4. Enlarging democratic space or the space in which civil society groups can effectively operate in society | • Greater acceptance/recognition of civil groups  
• Existence of fora for civil groups to input into a wider range of decisions  
• Increased legitimacy of civil society groups  |
Annex 5: Advocacy Planning Checklist

This tool provides a quick and easy overview, which can be helpful for deciding whether to advocate. It is a reference guide only and should not be used as a substitute for working through all the stages in the Advocacy Cycle and developing a proper advocacy plan. (It can be useful as a reference guide for writing a research report and/or developing a position paper.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the problem?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is it serious? Is it urgent?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the effects of the problem?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How does the problem affect people who are poor, vulnerable and marginalised?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does it impact certain groups more than others? If so, who and how?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do we have enough information to verify this?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the causes of the problem?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the role of the policies and practices of the national government?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the role of NGOs and other groups?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What contribution is made by cultural, environmental and socioeconomic factors?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do we have enough information to verify this?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What do we think needs to be done?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is our vision for change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are our suggested solutions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are their advantages and disadvantages?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can we defend our position?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are our proposals realistic?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do we have sufficient information in support of our suggestions?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who has power to bring about change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who is responsible for the problem and the solutions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do we have access to them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are they open to discussion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do they agree they have responsibility for change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are they able to do something?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who else is working on the problem?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who can we work with to address the problem?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are they having any impact?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there people who are not yet addressing the issue, but could be persuaded to help us? Who might oppose us, and how will we respond to their opposition?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What risks might we face?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What have we done to identify, assess and reduce the risks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the risks greater if we do nothing than if we go ahead with advocacy work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What assumptions have we made?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do we have adequate information for a risk analysis?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do we have an advocacy plan?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are we clear about our desired Impact, Outcomes, Outputs, Inputs and Activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes are we seeking?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will we measure those changes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have we got relevant and sufficient indicators in place?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are we confident about our proposed advocacy activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have they worked before?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there alternatives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do we have the skills and resources we need?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 6: Elevator Pitch Worksheet

Here is a short worksheet to help you flesh out your messages (remember to keep it short, clear and concise!)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who is your audience?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you want from your audience?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is in this for them?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Messages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tell us the problem (provide context)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell us about solution(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell us what we can do to help (the “ask”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell us a story that explains the problem, solution, or ask.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why is this urgent? Why today and not tomorrow?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is it that you hope will ultimately happen or be different?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENHANCING UNDERSTANDING OF AGRICULTURE POLICY PROCESSES

Case studies – A Practical Approach for Youth
### Abbreviations and Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACGG</td>
<td>African Chicken Genetic Gains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>Acquire Immune Deficiency Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATONU</td>
<td>Agriculture to Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>African Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CISANET</td>
<td>Civil Society Agriculture Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>Climate-smart agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECA</td>
<td>University-School of Communication Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAEF</td>
<td>Faculty of Agronomy and Forestry Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FANR</td>
<td>Food Agriculture and Natural Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FANRPAN</td>
<td>Food Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Analysis Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDC</td>
<td>Foundation for Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHG</td>
<td>Greenhouse gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>Human Immune Virus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVI</td>
<td>Household Vulnerability Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILRI</td>
<td>International Livestock Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>Members of parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASFAM</td>
<td>National Smallholder Farmers’ Association of Malawi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Non-governmental Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSI</td>
<td>Nutrition sensitive initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCHC</td>
<td>Reproductive and Child Health clinics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECs</td>
<td>Regional Economic Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWET</td>
<td>Story Workshop Education Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPA</td>
<td>Theatre for Policy Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEM</td>
<td>University of Eduardo Mondlane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARM</td>
<td>Women Accessing Realigned Markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ABOUT THIS MODULE

This module follows the basic tenets of policy development and policy advocacy presented in the first two modules of this manual. To get the full value from this third module, you should ideally work through the preceding modules first to gain a thorough understanding of the subject.

In this module you will work through three case studies that provide descriptive situations meant to stimulate your thinking in applying what you know and develop new ideas to manage a situation or solve a problem. As a training tool, the case study method is designed to develop decision-making skills, enhance team spirit (for group training set-up), better communication and interpersonal skills and strengthen your analytical skills. The case studies in this module have been put together to help you to embed your understanding of policy development and policy advocacy.

The case study module is highly adaptable and involves problem-based learning and promotes the development of analytical skills. By presenting content in the format of a narrative accompanied by questions and activities that promote individual reflections and group discussion and solving of complex problems, case studies will assist you to move beyond recall of knowledge to analysis, evaluation, and application.

Key module objectives are to assist the users to:

• Gain a basic understanding and analytical skills associated with the FANR policy issues and policy analysis.
• Improve knowledge on how agriculture policies are designed and implemented at local, national, and regional levels.
• Analyse the dynamic processes that influence policy-making decisions.
• Develop skills to design and analyse policy proposals using different policy models.
• Identify critical characteristics of the civil society organisational context that are likely to influence policy design, implementation, and evaluation processes.
• Identify policy problems within the agriculture sectors and use learned analytical skills to identify solutions to those problems.
• Critically analyse regional and global themes and dynamics influencing agriculture policy at national level.
• Develop networking across the civil society, public sector, and private sector divide for influencing policy decision making.

Module Outline

The module has five (5) sections:

• Section 1: Introduction, introduces the training objectives and training schedule, as well as gives instructions on how to use this training manual to get the most out of it.
• Case Study 1: Women in Agriculture
• Case Study 2: Learning, Communicating and Advocating for Climate Smart Agriculture
• Case Study 3: Nutrition Sensitive Agriculture

We hope this module is a useful resource to support you in the process of planning your evidence-based policy advocacy campaigns and achieving policy influence.
CASE STUDY 1
WOMEN IN AGRICULTURE

The Challenge

Women farmers produce 90% of the food in Sub-Saharan Africa (World Bank 2007). They also carry the brunt of the burden of food processing and storage. Despite this critical role, women farmers have limited access to credit, labour, fertilizer and other production inputs, leading to low yields. In addition, they face difficulties in the marketplace when trying to sell their produce. Because of these challenges, female-headed rural households tend to be poorer and more food insecure than their male-headed counterparts.

Though focus on the challenges of women farmers in Africa is increasing, the number of the rural poor continues to rise, in contrast to East Asia and the Pacific, which have started to record declining poverty (World Bank, 2007). Yet, when presented with opportunities, African women farmers have often advanced the frontiers in agricultural productivity and food security. Families in which women farmers are empowered and have greater access to production inputs are often healthier, they have more children attending school, their incomes are higher, and have improved agricultural productivity.

Moreover, due to a combination of structural, cultural and economic factors in Africa, women rarely feature in decision-making processes and local governance systems. As a result, their specific needs as women farmers are not commonly reflected in local and national agricultural policies, or in designs of agricultural research and development programmes. This limits women’s access to input and output markets, often leading to low agricultural productivity, which ultimately restricts the ability of women to fend for their children and families. Low literacy levels characteristically associated with African women further restrict opportunities for them to articulate their needs and grievances.

The Intervention

In response to the challenges faced by women farmers, FANRPAN formulated a project entitled “Women Accessing Realigned Markets” (WARM). It was implemented as a pilot project in Mozambique and Malawi over a three-year period (2009-2012).

The project sought to mobilise, inform, empower and strengthen women farmers’ ability to advocate for agricultural policies and programmes sensitive to their needs. In Mozambique, the project was implemented in two districts, Boane and Marracuene, each with approximately eight village sites. In Malawi, two districts were selected (Lilongwe and Kasungu) and three villages were selected to host the project in each of the districts.

Specifically, the project objectives were to:

- provide a platform for communities to dialogue on issues that affect women farmers’ access to input markets;
- empower women farmers to play a more active role in driving the development agenda;
- align development research agendas to women farmers’ issues;
- align input supply institutions and programmes to women farmers’ needs; and
- bring women farmers’ concerns into national and regional policy debates.

Theatre for Policy Advocacy (TPA)

To give voice to women farmers’ concerns, the WARM project used an innovative tool, called Theatre for Policy Advocacy (TPA), which combines a number of roles. The TPA creates a platform that gives voice to women farmers to articulate messages by using theatrical performances. By using dramatised song, dance and narrative, it enables women to convey to authorities and service providers the problems they face using communication channels that are both culturally acceptable and non-confrontational. Use of drama empowers illiterate women who would otherwise find it difficult to convey or receive information and messages in written form.

In addition, messages would be amplified from the dramatisation of situations and visual projections. Theatrical events facilitate the mobilisation of community leaders, service providers and policy makers, and create opportunities for women to foster dialogue with them. The TPA tool incorporates facilitated dialogues with the audience immediately following the theatrical performances in which community members lead discussions on themes, challenges and messages evoked and conveyed by the dramatic acts. These dialogues involve various stakeholders, for instance the youth, adults, women, men, community leaders, the business community, NGO staff and parliamentarians. Participants subsequently proceed to design action plans and identify individuals and organisations who advocate for action in the achievement of identified solutions. These post-performance dialogues constitute a critical component of the project and are designed so that the solutions derived from the dialogues are community-owned and acceptable to them, hence of greater impact if targeted in development initiatives and policy formulated to address their concerns.

In addition to providing a platform for women to convey their message, the project had two other pillars: the evidence, and development support. The project ensured that the messages in storyline scripts dramatised in TPA performances were research-validated by working with data from agricultural researchers and
policy analysts. Such data collected, using participatory action research methodologies, identified agricultural productivity challenges at the community level. Using an evidence-based approach ensured that real issues received priority, and that researchers and development agencies became familiar with the verified issues of concern to women. By leveraging its policy research and analysis skills, FANRPAN subsequently packaged the messages to inform policy dialogues at national, regional and international forums involving policy makers, researchers, farmers’ organisations, development NGOs and the private sector.

Using the third TPA pillar, development support, the WARM project provided capacity-building assistance to women farmers through collaboration with development partners on the ground. The involvement of development agencies and NGOs with ongoing long-term development commitments to communities complemented programmes, besides leveraging resources and positively influencing the way development partners engage women farmers in their work. In addition, development agencies supported the identification of women farmers for drama groups, and subsequent training of the women in TPA performances and in policy advocacy.

By using this model, the project hypothesised that information dissemination and dialogue processes would enable transmission of genuine concerns to policy makers and other service providers, leading to the revisiting of various policies and programmes affecting women farmers and appropriate adjustments to address their needs.

These adjustments were expected to influence the realignment of markets to increase the ability to sell produce grown by women, increase access to credit, seeds and fertilizers, and improve agricultural productivity and livelihoods. An illustration of the model (Figure 2) depicts the various stakeholder loops the TPA tool connects and supports, finally leading to increased agricultural productivity, the ultimate goal of the WARM project. It is important to note that the project provided capacity building support to all three pillars, by training drama groups in acting, women champions in policy advocacy and researchers in participatory action research.

Implementation Strategy

To achieve project objectives, FANRPAN, in collaboration with identified implementation partners employed various activities:

- Trained researchers from selected universities in each country in participatory action research. Trained researchers subsequently led survey initiatives to establish agricultural productivity data and constraints confronting women farmers;
- Partnered with research institutions who conducted an analysis of input distribution systems and policies at the national level. They then packaged the data for updating the supply and productivity databases, as well as for dissemination to the public;
- Developed theatre scripts with the involvement of implementation partners with expertise in communication arts and applied theatre. The messages incorporated in script storylines emanated from evidence gathered through participatory action research conducted by the universities;
- Identified policy advocates and theatre groups with the involvement of development partners working with women farmers on the ground, and subsequently trained the selected women in policy advocacy and drama performance skills; and
- Staged theatre performances and post-theatre dialogues in target communities as pinnacle activities, and in addition documented and disseminated outputs from the project.

FANRPAN implemented the project in Mozambique and Malawi by collaborating with development organisations, research institutions and universities, organisations with expertise in theatre arts and applied theatre for development (see Table 1), as well as various regional and international organisations.
FANRPAN utilised its node-hosts in Mozambique, Eduardo Mondlane University (Universidade Eduardo Mondlane)-Faculty of Agronomy and Forestry Engineering, and the Civil Society Agriculture Network (CISANET) in Malawi, to identify project partners and run advocacy dialogues (Table 1). At the local level, selected farmer communities worked with two development agencies in each country; the Foundation for Community Development (FDC) in Mozambique, and National Smallholder Farmers’ Association of Malawi (NASFAM) in Malawi. These organisations provided a link between the project and farmer communities. Besides the responsibilities stated in Table 1, expectations were that they would also redefine their development agenda based on outputs from the WARM project. The Eduardo Mondlane University, Faculty of Agronomy and Forestry Engineering (FAEF/UEM) Mozambique, and Bunda College of Agriculture, University of Malawi, had the role of conducting research in respective countries to inform TPA themes, among other roles. Eduardo Mondlane University-School of Communication Arts (ECA/UEM) Mozambique and Story Workshop (SWET) in Malawi constituted stakeholders responsible for the TPA component processes such as script development, directing and staging performances, and coordinating theatre groups at country level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Key Stakeholder Role in Implementation of the WARM Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| FANRPAN Secretariat, Pretoria, South Africa | • Implementing and overseeing the project; administration and regional coordination  
• Identifying partners at the national and local levels  
• Liaising with partners  
• Organising regional policy dialogues  
• Regional, international and national outreach to support the project and disseminate project outputs and lessons learnt |
| Eduardo Mondlane University (UEM)  
The Civil Society Agriculture Network (CISANET) | • FANRPAN Node-host  
• Identifying resources and partners at the national and local levels  
• Convening national policy dialogues  
• Disseminating project outputs and lessons learnt |
| Eduardo Mondlane University, Faculty of Agronomy and Forestry Engineering (FAEF-UEM)  
Bunda College of Agriculture | • Conducting research studies  
• Participating in the TPA process in rural communities  
• Documenting the process and its outcomes  
• Training researchers in participatory action research  
• Identifying national and regional policy options that meet the needs of women by relating data generated at the community-level to national statistics and policies |
| Eduardo Mondlane University-School of Communication Arts (ECA-UEM) Mozambique  
Story Workshop (SWET), Malawi | Contributing the TPA component of project through:  
• Directing TPA professional performances  
• Identification of acting talent and training  
• Development of scripts in partnership with women farmers and development experts  
• Staging performances  
• Facilitating post performance dialogues  
• Coordinating country theatre groups |
| Foundation for Community Development (FDC) | • Coordination of country teams  
• Serve as liaison to the community and participate in setting up the TPA community dialogue platforms  
• Assist in identification of local talent and women farmer champions  
• Refine their own programmes based on impediments identified through the TPA  
• Help empower and motivate women farmer advocates |
Outcomes of the Intervention

At national level, the project TPA processes enabled women farmers to engage and communicate issues with decision makers, policy makers and input service providers. In Malawi, community engagements were with government extension personnel, gender specialists, farmers’ organisations, input service providers (agro-dealers), research organisations, policy makers/members of parliament (MP)/parliamentary committees and decision makers.

Leader made several pledges and commitments during facilitated post-performance discussions especially in Malawi. At Chimpenzu village in Lilongwe District, the sitting member of parliament, Honorable Kuth loyalty, made a pledge to support the Wills, Inheritance and Deceased Estates Bill in parliament during its tabling. In Sokelele Village, the local MP, Mr. Kamanga, pledged to support the same bill. Subsequently, the Bill passed into law as enough support for it existed, some of it most likely from the two MPs.

In Mozambique, the FDC received a special nomination to coordinate the President’s “Open presidency” special session in April 2011 on the ‘Role of civil society in development with special emphasis on gender equality’. This invitation was in part recognition of the work of the FDC as a WARM implementation partner.

Two women policy advocates sponsored by the WARM project attended the session. Also, in Mozambique, persistent presentation of the issue of land rights during the April 2011 presidential dialogue referred to earlier, resulted in a follow-up at provincial level where the presidential office urged the administrators to prioritise this issue in their work.

Capacity building in policy advocacy gave rise to individual women with abilities to articulate women farmer issues in high level policy dialogues as demonstrated by Teresa Sumbane (See Text Box below) who effortlessly and diplomatically engaged Mozambican President Guebeza during a presidential dialogue at State House.
In addition, benefits accrued to partner institutions. TPA introductory performances were staged by students of Applied Art who conducted 18 performances altogether. The exercise presented opportunities for students to apply theory to practice, an unintended project spin-off.

As a result, the University realised that students needed community exposure, as expressed by the ECA-UEM head. In Malawi, the project brought researchers into contact with decision makers, and in addition, the researchers gained skills in using the Household Vulnerability Index (HVI) tool, another unintended benefit. HVI is a FANRPAN-developed livelihoods assessment tool that uses five household asset indices (social, labour, financial, physical, environmental) to determine the level of household vulnerability.

Through the work of women policy advocates, and the TPA processes, clear messages emerged from the communities (Table below), and this is likely to influence policies and programmes that support agricultural input systems in a significant way.

**Policy Advocate Teresa Alexandre Sumbane**

Teresa Alexandre Sumbane is a beneficiary of the WARM capacity building initiative in policy advocacy run in Marracuene District, Mozambique. Besides, she is an active member of the community theatre group using the Theatre for Policy Advocacy tool to articulate issues and challenges facing women farmers in Marracuene District.

Born on October 6, 1982 in Marracuene district, Teresa has 7th grade schooling, is a single mother of two girls and derives her livelihood from farming. She was orphaned at 19 years. At this tender age and with very little background knowledge, she started farming to sustain her young family. With a quiet determination and exceptional leadership, she has constantly been in the forefront seeking and protecting farmer rights.

She helped to establish the Alfredo Namitete Association, which joined the National Union of Peasants (UNAC) as platforms to fight for the rights of the peasants in Mozambique. After joining UNAC, she helped prevent the expropriation of 100 hectares of the association's land to a foreign investor. “Local authorities wanted to give the investor our land. We fought to prevent it and succeeded”, says Teresa. In between representing her community, she runs a market garden on a two-hectare plot (growing cabbage, carrots, cucumber, onion, maize and sweet potatoes).

Following her training in the WARM policy advocacy capacity building programme, Teresa has gained the exceptional ability to engage with leaders and articulate women farmers’ issues on high-level policy advocacy platforms. In April 2011, she represented her community in a presidential dialogue of Civil Society Organisations with Mozambique’s President Guebuza, where she clearly presented her views regarding rural women’s concerns. She urged President Guebuza that on his next visit to Marracuene he should go to places not prepared by protocol to see the reality on the ground!

Her concerns for the women farmers are no longer restricted to her community. When a consultant met her in Marracuene in May 2012, she had recently been to Brazil in solidarity with rural farmers in commemorating La ViaCampesina. This is a global movement with more than 200 million peasants, small to medium-sized farmers, landless people, women farmers, Indigenous peoples, migrants and agricultural workers.

She sees many challenges that are still outstanding, among them unfair markets for community produce, and difficult access to seeds.
### Examples of Clear Messages Emerging from TPA Post-performance Dialogues in Mozambique and Malawi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Community Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boane, Mozambique</td>
<td>Access to credit facilities</td>
<td>The incapacity of women farmers to write down their needs and plans is having an effect in accessing the “Fundo de Investimento de Iniciativa Local (FIL)”</td>
<td>Mechanisms of accessing credit must be simplified for the farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boane, Mozambique</td>
<td>Produce Spoilage</td>
<td>Produce spoilage due to distant markets, lack of dedicated markets, transport shortages</td>
<td>Creation of the local markets; greater involvement by Government, process of commercialisation and creation of transformative industries to buy products and add value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boane, Mozambique</td>
<td>Low producer prices</td>
<td>Weak unions and advocacy skills for organisational influence; Weak unions and skills for negotiations on exchange processes resulting in low prices imposed by the agro-dealers</td>
<td>Capacity development initiatives by Government and development agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boane, Mozambique</td>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td>Domestic violence and lack of adequate support for women farmers by their partners, systems or policies</td>
<td>The local authorities could be more active in mobilising the entire community in finding solutions to the problems related to domestic violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marracuene, Mozambique</td>
<td>Lack of Appropriate Seed</td>
<td>Lack of appropriate seed and know-how on improved seed- and fertilizer-based production techniques</td>
<td>Increased extension support by Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marracuene, Mozambique</td>
<td>Lack of Initiative</td>
<td>The lack of local initiatives/programs</td>
<td>Experience exchange among farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilongwe, Malawi</td>
<td>Gender violence</td>
<td>Culturally-induced gender-based violence</td>
<td>Victim support units and centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilongwe, Malawi</td>
<td>Malpractices related to coupons/voucher allocation</td>
<td>Malpractices affecting access by women at ADMARC input markets and access to vouchers/ coupons</td>
<td>Government must introduce mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilongwe, Malawi</td>
<td>Women access to land</td>
<td>Very few women farmers own land in the communities</td>
<td>Introduction of appropriate empowering policies and by-laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi Women Advocates</td>
<td>Access to technologies</td>
<td>Lack of access to new technologies and limited/dwindling extension services</td>
<td>Enhance the participation of lead farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi Women Advocates</td>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>Impact of HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>New ways of farming that are less labour intensive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REFLECT

Having read the above case study, answer the following questions:

1. What is the policy issue/challenge?
2. Who are the key stakeholders? Who else should have participated in this intervention?
3. What could have been done differently?
4. In your country can you think of related initiatives, and how they have been implemented to influence policy?
5. What are the key issues related to women and agriculture in your area? What do you think should be done to address these issues?
CASE STUDY 2
LEARNING, COMMUNICATING & ADVOCATING FOR CLIMATE SMART AGRICULTURE

The Challenge

By 2050, the world will have to produce at least 70% more food to feed the ever-growing population. According to the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), by 2050 the world’s population would have reached 9 billion, 34% more than today. In addition to producing more food, agriculture has the potential to be the driver of overall development and poverty reduction in the many agriculture-dependent developing countries. With the advent of climate change, agriculture practices and policies need to adapt to feed the 9-billion-strong population by 2050.

Agriculture is widely acknowledged as a major contributor to climate change, but little is said about its potential to mitigate the effects of climate change. It is consistently misrepresented in climate change agendas, resolutions and protocols as mainly an environmental threat. Furthermore, while climate change has been thoroughly researched, not all the results are directly affecting the intended targets. In some cases, this is because scientists are not communicating their results properly. The apparent divide between agriculture, research and climate science is because of academic training and limited investments in bridging the gap. There is a lack of understanding of how climate data can or should be applied.

For a sector that is heavily dependent on climate, innovative action is required to intensify agricultural productivity and achieve food security, adapt to climate change and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The need for effective communication and public outreach to increase support and endorsement of climate smart agriculture (CSA) is essential. CSA may be defined as an approach for transforming and reorienting agricultural development under the new realities of climate change (Lipper et al. 2014). The most commonly used definition is provided by the Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations (FAO), which defines CSA as “agriculture that sustainably increases productivity, enhances resilience (adaptation), reduces removes GHGs (mitigation) where possible, and enhances achievement of national food security and development goals”. In this definition, the principal goal of CSA is identified as food security and development (FAO 2013a; Lipper et al. 2014); while productivity, adaptation, and mitigation are identified as the three interlinked pillars necessary for achieving this goal.

Source: Presentation by Irina Papuso and Jimly Faraby, Seminar on Climate Change and Risk Management, May 6, 2013.
The three pillars of CSA

- **Productivity**: CSA aims to sustainably increase agricultural productivity and incomes from crops, livestock, and fish, without having a negative impact on the environment. This, in turn, will raise food and nutritional security. A key concept related to raising productivity is sustainable intensification.

- **Adaptation**: CSA aims to reduce the exposure of farmers to short-term risks, while also strengthening their resilience by building their capacity to adapt and prosper in the face of shocks and longer-term stresses. Special attention is given to protecting the ecosystem services which ecosystems provide to farmers and others. These services are essential for maintaining productivity and our ability to adapt to climate changes.

- **Mitigation**: Wherever and whenever possible, CSA should help to reduce and/or remove greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. This implies that we reduce emissions for each calorie or kilo of food, fibre and fuel that we produce. That we avoid deforestation from agriculture. And that we manage soils and trees in ways that maximize their potential to act as carbon sinks and absorb CO2 from the atmosphere.

Globally, policies developed for climate change, water resource management, and food security are incoherent. An enabling policy environment for CSA development is essential and should be the central focus for climate change negotiations. Africa and many agro-based economies strongly support the inclusion of agriculture in the implementation of the UNFCCC Climate Change Paris Agreement. This message needs to be amplified and substantiated by appropriate empirical evidence and championed by the very people that are affected by the calamities of climate change. African farmers, particularly women, are currently unable to produce enough to feed themselves. Their livelihood assets have been eroded by recurrent droughts and floods. Bringing the voice of the affected rural communities into the negotiation arena may help accentuate the urgency of the problem and the close linkage between climate change and food security.

Civil society organisations have a key role to play in advancing bottom-up and people-centric policies. Adaptation to climate change to ensure food security and rural development is already happening at local level. For best practices to be scaled up, there is a clear need for enabling global policies that empower farmers and respond to realities at grassroots level. Africa requires strong partnerships and a firm commitment of the development community to reinforce a global policy framework that will help Africa secure these gains and to move forward. Africa must now seize the opportunity to effectively communicate issues and advocate for climate change policies that consider CSA.

The Intervention and Implementation Strategy

To ensure that critical information on the effect of climate change on agriculture in Africa reaches all stakeholders, FANRPAN, in partnership with researchers, use the media to disseminate evidence of best practices on climate-proofing research through news bulletins, information brochures and advocacy materials with information on agriculture and climate change. This requires communicating the right messages and for the media to have the facts on climate science and its implications.

For a decade, FANRPAN has built the capacity for policy analysis in Africa and supported demand-driven policy research and analysis. With the multiplicity of actors and dynamics of the policy environment, and efforts to bridge the knowledge gap in communicating climate science and its effects, FANRPAN has explored opportunities of stimulating an interface between scientists, policy makers, development planners and farmers to improve communication between researchers and end users of research information.

FANRPAN embraces a three-pronged approach to strengthening the advocacy capacity for CSA. This involves (i) building of a knowledge repository that will be used as a primary resource base; (ii) training and branding interventions to firstly develop information dissemination capacity for CSA initiatives, but also to strategically enhance visibility of advocates and lead institutions, to position CSA initiatives appropriately; and (iii) engagement in multi-sectoral learning and policy advocacy platforms to ensure that knowledge dissemination and advocacy have an impact on both policy makers and community development.

Since 2009, FANRPAN has invested in a systematic process of developing African journalists’ capacities to understand agricultural issues and policy processes. The journalists’ role is to bring together researched case studies and promote a deepened public understanding of climate change. Updated climate science knowledge information must be disseminated to the public and policy makers. Through targeted training in different forms of media, FANRPAN has helped forge partnerships between journalists and researchers who provide the evidence from which media stories are then generated.

The journalist training is an ongoing FANRPAN activity alongside the network’s policy dialogues and other climate change platforms. Frequent refresher training courses and workshops are conducted to address areas where additional support and mentorship is required. The effect of journalist training on disseminating CSA issues to stakeholders and the public has been overwhelming. Key success components are the information entry points, or the initial provision of important information, that make appropriate knowledge and information available and accessible. One of the published stories from UNFCCC COP 18 in Doha was selected for the Green Pen Award, which honours environmental journalism from around the world. The award recognises the leadership of individuals in the field of environmental journalism.

The journalist training programme at FANRPAN anchors on strengthening knowledge communities and networks in agriculture and related fields. In recognition of transboundary information and knowledge support systems, FANRPAN is championing communities who are addressing food and nutrition security challenges. In light of food and nutrition security challenges facing Africa, FANRPAN launched the regional Excellence in Agricultural Journalism Award in 2011. The award is given to journalists with a proven record of reporting on agricultural issues through print, broadcast or online media. Traditionally, the media has not been regarded as a priority vehicle for disseminating policy messages, except in areas of major political releases.
Outcomes of the Intervention

To date, FANRPAN has run six journalist training sessions and coverage of the UNFCCC COP events (see Text box I below). In 2011, FANRPAN conducted a workshop for 11 journalists from six countries – Kenya, Malawi, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania and Uganda at the Regional Food Security Policy Dialogue held in Swaziland from 18-23 September. As these were not novice journalists, the training was pitched at a more strategic level. This included topics such as objective and ethical reporting, media and the law, off and on the record reporting, media freedom and the use of social media. It was an interactive training session with journalists sharing experiences from their individual countries. Participation was excellent, and journalists shared, among others, the status of the media in their countries and political influence on their operations.

Following the two-day training session, the workshop area was converted to a fully-fledged newsroom. News diary meetings were held twice daily with assignments allocated to individual or teams of journalists to cover presentations of the conference. Each had to compile news articles and submit for inclusion in the daily news release as well as for the conference newspaper. While fully aware of the independence of the journalists and the fact that they were filing articles for their media houses over which trainers had no control, the trainers explained the editorial style of the newspaper and that articles would be edited as per normal editorial policy were necessary.

A conference newspaper was printed and distributed; 300 copies at the close of the conference and 700 for mailing. The Conference newspaper was an excellent opportunity to showcase the participating journalists’ work.

The news releases were issued to print and electronic media Africa-wide. They were also translated into French and Portuguese for the website. On the Swazi TV morning live programme on Friday, 23 September three journalists spoke about their media training and media exposure – and the privilege of being part of this exercise, created by FANRPAN.

From the group of the 11 trained journalists, five were selected to participate at the UNFCCC CoP 17. Countries represented were: South Africa, Malawi, Tanzania, Kenya and Swaziland. All journalists acquired official UNFCCC accreditation as media personnel. These journalists covered topics emanating from COP17 as well as Agriculture and Rural Development Day (ARDD) and Forest Day. Articles were posted on the FANRPAN website. A newsletter was also published.

(http://www.africaclimatesolution.org/features/FANRPAN_COP17_Newsletter.pdf. See Annex 3.1.6).
Media training plays a critical role in educating journalists who can act as ambassadors, promoting and disseminating information. Some of these journalists have become FANRPAN champions and advocates for emerging agriculture policy issues. In this process, FANRPAN has recognised the role of intermediary stakeholders such as the media, as an important partner in amplifying the voices of the marginalised. The use of media has flagged key policy issues in the public domain, increasing information and knowledge coverage and further increasing responsiveness and stakeholder accountability.

Building and reinforcing media relationships has been a crucial point of FANRPAN’s outreach work. This should encourage

the generation and publication of appropriate, high-quality agricultural stories. As FANRPAN continues to promote CSA, agriculture and climate scientists must collaborate with the media to ensure that their messages reach the communities and influence their decision-making. Journalists are important partners in disseminating climate-science information. Therefore, journalist training, database development and relationship nurturing are critical. This continuous process will yield valuable returns on investment and will build on future initiatives.

**Capacity of Journalists to Report on CSA**

**a. UNFCCC COP21**

FANRPAN engaged one CSO Champion, Mantoe Phakathi, to advocate for the adoption of a Unified African Climate Change Position at the UNFCCC COP21. Mantoe is a Swazi journalist with experience spanning over ten years. She writes on politics, human rights, climate change, agriculture, health and other social issues. Below are some of Mantoe’s publications, which were shared online:

- ‘Be decisive, civil society organisations urge Ministers’
  http://africagreenmedia.co.za/be-decisive-civil-society-organisations-urge-ministers/
- ‘Big countries rally behind Africa on renewable energy’
  http://africagreenmedia.co.za/big-countries-rally-behind-africa-on-renewable-energy/
- ‘Farmers left in the cold as COP21 draft agreement ignores agriculture’
  http://africagreenmedia.co.za/farmers-left-in-the-cold-as-cop-21-draft-agreement-ignores-agriculture/
- ‘Green jobs: what’s in it for marginalised groups in Africa’
- ‘Africa needs coordination of energy initiatives’
  http://africagreenmedia.co.za/africa-needs-coordination-of-energy-initiatives/
- ‘Morocco hosts COP22’
  http://africagreenmedia.co.za/morocco-hosts-cop-22/
- ‘Activists pressure governments to deliver a climate change deal’
  http://africagreenmedia.co.za/activists-pressure-governments-to-deliver-a-climate-change-deal/

**b. UNFCCC COP20**

FANRPAN supported two African journalists, Mantoe Phakati and Fidelis Zvomuya, to interview delegates and develop a feature article on the African Position on Climate Change as it relates to the different stakeholders participating in the UNFCCC COP20 processes and on-going national and regional processes on the African continent.

**REFLECT**

Having read the above case study, answer the following questions:

1. What is the policy issue? What do you think can be done to address it?
2. Who are the key stakeholders? Who else should have participated in this intervention?
3. What could have been done differently?
4. In your country can you think of related initiatives, and how they have been implemented to influence policy?
5. In your country what are the policy gaps related to the issue?
CASE STUDY 3
NUTRITION SENSITIVE AGRICULTURE

The Challenge

In recent years, agricultural investment in Sub-Saharan Africa has increased, leading to an increase in food production. However, despite this increase in food production, malnutrition rates are still high. Agricultural programmes have traditionally focused on increasing the availability of food rather than promoting consumption and improving nutrition status.

Africa has the highest malnutrition rates in the world, with 17 countries having stunting rates above 40% and 36 countries above 30% (UNICEF, WHO & WB 2014). Sub-Saharan Africa carries a high burden of under-nutrition, with 33% of childhood deaths linked to under-nutrition. It is, therefore, vital that agricultural programmes start to take nutrition into consideration if they are to provide long-term nutrition security.

Stunting, or low height for age, is caused by long-term insufficient nutrient intake and frequent infections. Wasting, or low weight for height, is a strong predictor of mortality among children under five. It is usually the result of acute food shortage.

The barriers to good nutrition, amongst others, are a lack of knowledge about which food crops are nutrient-rich, insufficient harvesting, poor storage practices and farmers' lack of access to markets, all of which can prevent food reaching the people who need it most. Further, women's lack of empowerment partly contributes to the problem. It is generally agreed that when women can decide what to grow, what to consume and how household budgets are spent, nutrition at household level improves.

To address malnutrition in Sub-Saharan Africa, FANRPAN launched the Agriculture to Nutrition (ATONU) project in 2014 (also called the Improving Nutrition Outcomes Through Optimised Agricultural Investments Project). In general terms, the rationale for ATONU and related initiatives is to help Africa broaden its agricultural focus from aiming to attain food security, to incorporating nutritional security as well. Africans must gravitate from "eating for hunger" to "eating for health". Poor nutrition is the single most important threat to the world's health and development, with overall undernutrition representing the single largest killer of under-five children and costing the global economy up to USD$2.1 trillion per year. Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) is most affected and represents the world's highest rate of stunting among children, which is a common result of malnutrition during pregnancy. The paradox of malnutrition in Sub-Saharan Africa is that three-quarters of all hungry people live in rural areas where they are overwhelmingly dependent on agriculture for their food. Of these, women are the primary food producers, yet are among the most malnourished.

Hunger, malnutrition and stunting, cost the Sub-Saharan African economy at least US$2.5 billion annually. Although the African continent finds itself in a time when agricultural investments and productivity of food staples are finally increasing, the rate of stunting is also on the increase - from 47 million in 1990 to 59 million by 2016. Africa is the only region that has seen an increase in the number of children stunted despite a decrease in global prevalence. It is estimated that African economies lose values equivalent to between 1.9 and 16.5% of GDP annually to undernutrition due to increased mortality, chronic illnesses and associated costs, and lost productivity. To ensure that the continent benefits from the positive trends in agricultural investment and productivity, the disconnect between agriculture and nutrition must end, hence the ATONU intervention. This project, and related agricultural development initiatives that incorporate nutrition-sensitive interventions, promote consumption of diverse diets with essential proteins, minerals and vitamins and sufficient caloric intake as an integral part of the continent's solution to reducing poverty, hunger and malnutrition.

The Intervention and Implementation Strategy

To address malnutrition in Sub-Saharan Africa, FANRPAN launched the Agriculture to Nutrition (ATONU) project in 2014 (also called the Improving Nutrition Outcomes Through Optimised Agricultural Investments Project). In general terms, the rationale for ATONU and related initiatives is to help Africa broaden its agricultural focus from aiming to attain food security, to incorporating nutritional security as well. Africans must gravitate from "eating for hunger" to "eating for health". Poor nutrition is the single most important threat to the world's health and development, with overall undernutrition representing the single largest killer of under-five children and costing the global economy up to USD$2.1 trillion per year. Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) is most affected and represents the world's highest rate of stunting among children, which is a common result of malnutrition during pregnancy. The paradox of malnutrition in Sub-Saharan Africa is that three-quarters of all hungry people live in rural areas where they are overwhelmingly dependent on agriculture for their food. Of these, women are the primary food producers, yet are among the most malnourished.

Hunger, malnutrition and stunting, cost the Sub-Saharan African economy at least US$2.5 billion annually. Although the African continent finds itself in a time when agricultural investments and productivity of food staples are finally increasing, the rate of stunting is also on the increase - from 47 million in 1990 to 59 million by 2016. Africa is the only region that has seen an increase in the number of children stunted despite a decrease in global prevalence. It is estimated that African economies lose values equivalent to between 1.9 and 16.5% of GDP annually to undernutrition due to increased mortality, chronic illnesses and associated costs, and lost productivity. To ensure that the continent benefits from the positive trends in agricultural investment and productivity, the disconnect between agriculture and nutrition must end, hence the ATONU intervention. This project, and related agricultural development initiatives that incorporate nutrition-sensitive interventions, promote consumption of diverse diets with essential proteins, minerals and vitamins and sufficient caloric intake as an integral part of the continent's solution to reducing poverty, hunger and malnutrition.

How does ATONU work to achieve its objectives?

ATONU has a deliberate focus on society's most vulnerable in terms of nutrition. To this end, the initiative has a specific focus on women of child-bearing age and young children in the first one thousand days of life (i.e. from conception to two years, being the most critical development period of infancy), where the high nutritional demands of pregnancy, development and early childhood must largely be met through own farm food production. ATONU promotes women's empowerment and their access to income and knowledge on the need to purchase nutrient-dense foods and the consumption of a diversified diet.
ATONU focused on improving the nutrition of smallholder farm families by growing and buying the right type and amount of food needed to be healthy to break the intergenerational cycle of undernutrition in poor households in Sub-Saharan Africa. ATONU’s approach was to work with existing agriculture development projects to integrate nutrition sensitive initiatives (NSI), implement the interventions, evaluate their impact and provide evidence of what agriculture can do to deliver positive nutrition outcomes. ATONU selected two pilot countries, Ethiopia and Tanzania, and one pilot programme: African Chicken Genetic Gains (ACGG), implemented by the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) in the two countries (see Text box below for more details on ACGG).

The ACGG Programme

African Chicken Genetic Gains (ACGG) is an Africa-wide livestock collaboration project led by ILRI. It started in November 2014 and is aimed at providing improved and tropically adapted chickens to smallholder farmers in Africa for two reasons: first, for income generation and second, for producing meat and eggs for household consumption. This project is part of the wider “LiveGene” initiative, which ACGG is piloting to make available high-producing, farmer-preferred genotypes that will help to increase smallholder chicken productivity in Africa. The programme intends to use new genetics to improve chicken productivity and production, combined with enhanced delivery systems such as provision of vaccines. In Africa and Tanzania in particular, chicken production is an integral component of the farming system in nearly all rural smallholder households. Chickens produce meat and eggs for home consumption and they are a good source of income. In Tanzania, ACGG is implementing in five sub-national Zones: Central Semi-arid, Eastern Sub-humid, Southern Highlands, Lake, and Southern Humid Zones. The programme is testing at least five breeds in Tanzania: Black Australorp, Koekoek, Kuroiler, Sasso and local breeds. A total of 20 districts, 80 villages and 3,200 households are targeted by ACGG in Tanzania.
Low dietary diversity was observed in both countries. Almost all households consumed cereal staple and vegetables or legumes. There was limited knowledge of food preparation for nutrient retention. Knowledge on dietary diversity and food preparation methods should be included in planning of interventions, especially for interventions that will address the issue of information and knowledge/skills in food preparation.

The main source of nutrition information was health care providers at the clinic/hospitals; but the information shared was predominantly about breastfeeding and grossly limited in all other aspects of food consumption, hygiene, sanitation and health care. Generally, there is limited knowledge on nutrition and ways to reduce malnutrition. There is a need to impart food and nutrition knowledge to the personnel of Reproductive and Child Health Clinics (RCHC) as these interact most with mothers/caretakers during pregnancy, delivery and postpartum. They are well positioned to impart consistent knowledge in a sustainable manner. Nutrition information and/or education to ameliorate malpractices in communities and households should be provided using various channels and platforms through working with religious leaders, political leaders, influential persons, nutrition experts, media practitioners and mobile technology companies.

It was found that budgeting for household expenditure was important to most of the households. Joint planning of expenditure was common practice in many households and this needs to be strengthened even more. Women empowerment and involvement in decision-making in the household is an important aspect in improving the nutrition status of households. Many women participate in farming and income generation at household level and therefore they should be involved in planning, budgeting and decisions on food expenditure, as well as the use of household income and other resources.

The nutritional status of children below five years of age across zones and means of treatment were sub-optimal. Prevalence of stunting was very high, and, in some areas, it exceeded the regional and national averages. Prevalence of wasting needs to be monitored closely, especially in some areas where the prevalence is unacceptably high.

Children and adolescents

The nutritional status of this group of children is also suboptimal and much more needs to be done to reach them. Many of the nutrition initiatives/interventions in most developing countries have focused on children and women, neglecting adolescent boys and girls and adult males. Addressing the nutrition needs of adolescents could be an important step towards breaking the vicious cycle of intergenerational malnutrition, chronic disease and poverty.

Adults

In rural Sub-Saharan Africa the nutritional status of both male and female adults has shown a significant shift from a tendency towards underweight to that of overweight and obesity, due to incorrect diets. This clearly shows the double burden of malnutrition, where in the same household there could be an underweight child/adult and an overweight child/adult. This trend must be reversed by informing people of the health consequences and advising them about the advantages of physical exercise as well as promoting consumption of diversified diets.

Outcomes of the Intervention

The Big Five Actions that ATONU Implemented

1. Integrating nutrition-sensitive interventions into a chicken value chain project – African Chicken Genetic Gains
2. Convening group counselling sessions to transfer essential knowledge on nutrition, health and WASH to households with women of child-bearing age and children under the age of five years and their communities, leading to pro-nutrition behaviours
3. Promoting home gardens to improve accessibility and choice of a wide variety of culturally acceptable and popular micro-nutrient-rich vegetable cultivars
4. Inclusion of men in interventions to improve gender relations and women’s empowerment for maternal and child nutrition
5. Introducing home visits for observation and on-site counselling and community theatre to reinforce positive nutrition, WASH and health-seeking behaviours
Household Budgeting Simplified
Posted on 21 November 2017
By Bertha Munthali, Boloso Sore District, Gidohoma Kebele, Southern Ethiopia

One of the observations made during preliminary surveys conducted before the launch of the ATONU pilot project was the absence of dietary diversity in rural Ethiopia and Tanzania. With this in mind, one of the focus areas of the ATONU intervention was social and behaviour change communication (SBCC) aimed at influencing income expenditure from the sale of chickens and eggs to purchase other nutritious foods to improve household diets. This meant the need to train community members on budgeting and dietary diversity.

In August, five months into project implementation, I accompanied Zemen Zekeriyas, the ATONU Field Assistant to Bosolo Sore District to visit Gigo Homba village that was participating in the ATONU project. All along the 30-kilometre drive, the streets were filled with farmers carrying all sorts of produce to the market. At that time of the year, the place was all green with the smell of freshness filling the air. The donkeys trudged slowly down the muddy and slippery road burdened with green bananas, mangoes, potatoes, and various food items with their owners behind them. The variety of food items would give one the impression that the people of this area enjoyed a diversified diet contrary to the baseline results for Ethiopia. I wondered why, with so much food, the average dietary diversity score was so low and noted it down as a point of follow up with the community. I needed to understand how they made choices and decisions on the food they consumed. I also noted that this place had all the foodstuffs required for a healthy plate.

The Field Assistant’s presentation
On the day in question Zemen had planned a session on financial planning and budgeting. This was a critical component of the ATONU intervention because dietary diversity is a function of communities’ understanding of financial planning and household budgeting.

The attendance was good, 18 men and 36 women, five of which are the group leaders. Half of the participants have come as couples, a feature that the project is encouraging – to ensure higher male participation. It has not been possible to have both husband and wife in one session; they swap attendance, with one attending the project events, while the other attends to household chores. Zemen’s delivery for today was very basic but effective. He started with a recap of the previous session which, I gather, had been on dietary diversity, and focusing on the six food groups of Ethiopia. He asked the participants to mention the foods within the six food groups in their area; what they had eaten the previous day, and for breakfast. Zemen also sought to establish the participants’ challenges in diversifying their diet during the previous week.

The attendance was good, 18 men and 36 women
From the responses, staples and legumes topped the list of foods consumed; vegetables, eggs and milk came second; chicken was not mentioned. Upon further probing, we learned that chicken remains a food item reserved largely for festivals. The community had a variety of fruits and vegetables, legumes, tubers and roots. They had livestock. I quickly established that the farmers in attendance had adequate knowledge of the diverse foods but had consumed mainly staples and legumes the previous night and that morning, with a little from other sources not consumed on a daily basis. There were two pregnant women in the group and two breastfeeding mothers. I planned to have an in-depth chat with them at the end of the session, to get a clearer picture of their diet during and after pregnancy.

Zekeriyas Household Budgeting Tool
After the food, Zemen enquired about the farmers’ sources of income. Farming topped the list. He also asked questions to establish the prevailing household decision making processes, especially who decided on what to buy, or how to use the household income; how they arrived at the financial decisions they made. Having introduced categories for basic priorities, to include: loans, food, farm inputs, clothing/festivals and savings, the Field Assistant used a simple locally-made teaching and learning tool that allowed farmers to establish priority lists.

Zemen relied on gender-based breakaway sessions with groups consisting of up to six farmers to debate and discuss their priority lists in view of their projected income and providing justification for their decisions. The same sex group work was meant to understand the differences on how men and women prioritised the use of their income and how that affected household nutrition.

Feedback Session
It was interesting to note that different people had different priorities for income use at household level. From the feedback sessions after the debates, food emerged as the top priority; followed by paying back the loan; inputs, clothes and savings, in that order. There were some differences of opinion on the priority list, with farmers expressing their views. Some farmers insist that loan repayment should be top because “a person who owes others has no respect and dignity in the community”. Others believed food is the top priority, highlighting that families cannot be productive with it. There was a lot of debate which the Field Assistant allowed, with farmers trying to win their colleagues over on how to compile their priority lists. In closing, the Field Assistant emphasised the need for making a proper decision on finances, making sure that households were able to purchase nutritious food to supplement what they grew at home.

The session ended with the Field Assistant giving assignments to the farmers to try to make simple budgets for different food items. For example, farmers were tasked to allocate funds against food items from the six food groups that they did not grow but needed to buy from the market.
A leader is a person who influences a group of people towards the achievement of a goal. If this definition is anything to go by, then ATONU’s group of exceptionally performing farmers, appointed as champions to support other farmers on a path towards achieving good nutrition, are true leaders. Unlike many projects that start out appointing volunteers to work in the village, ATONU took a different approach. The project had initially planned to work with existing volunteers in the village who are mostly identified under government projects. However, the plan did not work as these volunteers had competing duties from other projects. At the same time, the understanding of ‘volunteer’ in the case of ATONU was slightly different from the conventional understanding, considering that the project needed people who can live by the principles advocated in the ATONU project. It would have been premature to appoint volunteers to motivate other farmers while they themselves did not walk the walk.

ATONU Champions during a half-day session on their role as champions (Lipangalala village in Central Zone, Tanzania)

Six months after the start of project implementation, ATONU field assistants (FAs), with the help of farmers, identified from among the targeted farmers, those who demonstrated meaningful adoption of promoted behaviours (early adopters). These farmers started out just like everyone else, attending sessions and practicing some of the promoted behaviours. They did not have advantages or preferential treatment but showed commitment to learn and live the ATONU way. ATONU as a project needed these ambassadors, the Baloozi, as they are called in KiSwahili. These farmers, who may be considered as ‘positive deviants’, are the right volunteers to carry the message: “If I can do it, so can you!” Their primary role is to live by the ATONU principles on nutrition, hygiene and sanitation and empowerment, thereby getting other farmers motivated to do likewise. Not only is this their role, they are also the voice of ATONU on behalf of others during village meetings. They support ATONU field staff to engage other farmers during home visits. One lesson learnt in the ATONU project is that farmers are more receptive to the voice of their own, someone they know and interact with daily.

For an ordinary farmer, taking on this role means understanding the objectives of the ATONU project, and like every leader who influences a group of people towards certain objectives, the ATONU Baloozi are an asset every village needs to have. Development practitioners have argued and proved that social capital is an asset for developing local communities, and in the case of ATONU, engaging champions/ambassadors is building strong social capital for achieving nutrition and health outcomes. Similarly, for policy makers, considering local level social capital for any development goals will be key.

By Bertha Lilian Mkandawire Munthali, FANRPAN Nutrition Specialist.
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Online Resources and Tools


Advocacy Procedures and Sign-Offs in CARE International http://minerva.care.ca/Livelink1/livelink.exe?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=1879025


CARE Twitter Training Module for Emergency and CO Staff http://minerva.care.ca/Livelink1/livelink.exe?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=2851038

Development of an Advocacy Strategy: Nine Key Questions http://www.cieh.org/assets/0/72998/1022/1046/1086/c739046-8f2a-4ee7-a381-d6fb90a0c37.pdf

VS0’s Participatory Advocacy Toolkit http://www.vsointernational.org/images/advocacy-toolkit_tcm76-25498.pdf


Advocacy Building Skills for NGO leaders, CEDPA (1999)


REFLECT

Having read the above case study, answer the following questions:

1. What is the policy issue/challenge?
2. Who are the key stakeholders? Who else should have participated in this intervention?
3. What could have been done differently?
4. What are the key nutrition challenges in your country? Can you think of related initiatives, and, if at all, how they have been implemented to influence policy?
5. In your country what are the policy gaps related to the issue?
Rate your knowledge on the topics on a scale of 1 to 5 by circling the corresponding number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can you define policy and give examples of policies that you have encountered?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you define policy and give examples of policies that you have encountered?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How confident are you in your ability to explain how policies are made?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you describe the policy context, policy processes and policy change management?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How confident are you in your ability to identify policy issues?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How confident are you in your ability to identify the policy stakeholders?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you define policy advocacy?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How confident are you in your ability to explain the difference between policy advocacy and lobbying?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you describe and give examples of policy advocacy engagement platforms and tools?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How confident are you in your ability to define advocacy goals and objectives and develop advocacy messages?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you identify advocacy campaign messengers and policy champions?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you describe what a policy dialogue is?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How comfortable are you in your ability to know which platform to use to get your message across?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### List of Selected Organisations Promoting Agricultural and Policy Engagement for Youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academy for Educational Development (AED)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.aed.org">www.aed.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Development Bank</td>
<td><a href="http://www.afdb.org">www.afdb.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Youth Initiative Network (AYINET)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.africanyouthinitiative.org/">www.africanyouthinitiative.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocates for Youth</td>
<td><a href="http://www.advocatesforyouth.org">www.advocatesforyouth.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARE International</td>
<td><a href="http://www.care.org">www.care.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Smart Agriculture Youth Network (CSAYN)</td>
<td><a href="http://csayn.org/">http://csayn.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FANRPAN</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fanrpan.org">www.fanrpan.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food, Agriculture Organisation</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fao.org">www.fao.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.gainhealth.org/">www.gainhealth.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guttmacher Institute</td>
<td><a href="http://www.guttmacher.org">www.guttmacher.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.iita.org/">www.iita.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Youth Foundation</td>
<td><a href="http://www.iyf.org">www.iyf.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastercard Foundation</td>
<td><a href="https://mastercardfdn.org/">https://mastercardfdn.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Action International</td>
<td><a href="http://www.populationaction.org">www.populationaction.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Reference Bureau</td>
<td><a href="http://www.prb.org">www.prb.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restless Development</td>
<td><a href="http://www.restlesdevelopment.org">www.restlesdevelopment.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Centre for Development and Population Activities (CEDPA)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cedpa.org">www.cedpa.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Global Youth Coalition on AIDS</td>
<td><a href="http://www.youthaidscoalition.org">www.youthaidscoalition.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Policy Project</td>
<td><a href="http://www.policyproject.com">www.policyproject.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nation Population Fund</td>
<td><a href="http://www.unfpa.org">www.unfpa.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID-Health Policy Initiative site</td>
<td><a href="http://www.youth-policy.com">www.youth-policy.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Alliance for Leadership and Development in Africa (YALDA)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.yaldafrica.org">www.yaldafrica.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Coalition</td>
<td><a href="http://www.youthcoalition.org">www.youthcoalition.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Village</td>
<td><a href="http://www.youthvillage.co.za">www.youthvillage.co.za</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPARD</td>
<td>Young Professionals for Agricultural Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
About FANRPAN

The Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Analysis Network (FANRPAN) is an autonomous regional stakeholder driven policy research, analysis and implementation network that was formally established by Ministers of Agriculture from Eastern and Southern Africa in 1997. FANRPAN was borne out of the need for comprehensive policies and strategies required to resuscitate agriculture. FANRPAN is mandated to work in all African countries and currently has activities in 17 countries namely Angola, Benin, Botswana, Democratic Republic of Congo, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

About the Mastercard Foundation

The Mastercard Foundation seeks a world where everyone has the opportunity to learn and prosper. The Foundation’s work is guided by its mission to advance learning and promote financial inclusion for people living in poverty. One of the largest foundations in the world, it works almost exclusively in Africa. It was created in 2006 by Mastercard International and operates independently under the governance of its own Board of Directors. The Foundation is based in Toronto, Canada. For more information and to sign up for the Foundation’s newsletter, please visit www.mastercardfdn.org.

Follow the Foundation at @MastercardFdn on Twitter.