

PROLINNOVA Working Paper 35

Challenges, constraints and opportunities in influencing policy to become more favourable for farmer-led participatory approaches

Discussion paper based on
policy-influencing experiences in four eastern African countries¹

PROLINNOVA International Support Team

July 2013

1 Introduction

The “Combining Local Innovative Capacities with Scientific Research (CLIC–SR)” project aims to strengthen community resilience to change by facilitating farmer-led joint innovation that builds on the creativity of local people. An important component of CLIC–SR is mainstreaming “Participatory Innovation Development” (PID) as an approach within targeted national and international policies and programmes related to agricultural research and development (ARD), natural resource management (NRM) and climate change adaptation (CCA). The rationale is that an enabling policy environment is essential for bolstering resilience to change among smallholder farmers and their communities. Policymakers need to recognise that building local adaptive capacity leads to resilience, which in turn enables communities to respond effectively to new challenges and opportunities. CLIC–SR aims to generate evidence on the ground as a basis for addressing these policy issues. CLIC–SR will engage in focused policy-dialogue activities at national and international level. The activities “on the ground” are being carried out in two districts vulnerable to diverse forms of externally subjected change in each of four countries in eastern Africa: Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda.

This working paper examines past policy-influencing experiences related to PID in these countries, and includes a review of: i) the challenges and opportunities faced by people trying to influence policy; and ii) the internal constraints faced by policymakers themselves in trying to draw up, gain approval for and implement policies that are supportive of PID². This document is a working paper in progress, and insights gained in influencing policy processes will be incorporated throughout the lifetime of the project.

Knowing the challenges and constraints already experienced in the four countries in influencing policy will help each of the PROLINNOVA Country Platforms (CPs) to identify the most appropriate means and targets for policy work in CLIC–SR and to deliver relevant messages in an effective

¹ Produced with funding from The Rockefeller Foundation as part of the project “Combining Local Innovative Capacities with Scientific Research: Enhancing Community Resilience to Change” (CLIC–SR). The opinions expressed herein are the sole responsibility of PROLINNOVA.

² This assumes that the CPs looked for policymakers who are already convinced of PID and have worked on integrating participatory approaches into agricultural policies. In some of the CPs, policymakers and people close to policymakers are part of the National Steering Committee (NSC). In other CPs, some NSC members have good connections with policymakers.

way to national-level policymakers and research and extension managers. Based on the insights gained, each CP will then develop a policy-influencing strategy for CLIC–SR, outlining how the CP will provide inputs into policy development and planning processes related to ARD, NRM and CCA.

The CP partners in Ethiopia, Kenya and Tanzania reviewed experiences in influencing policies to become more favourable for farmer-led participatory approaches and identified major challenges, constraints and opportunities by means of desk reviews and interviews with a variety of relevant stakeholders. In Uganda, in drafting the paper, Environmental Alert (EA) focused more on their own experiences with policy influencing at district level and less at national level. The PROLINNOVA International Support Team made an analysis and synthesis of these country papers and categorised the mentioned challenges, constraints and opportunities faced by people in influencing policies into seven major groups: 1) Enhancing buy-in from policymakers: provision of information and evidence; 2) Attitudes towards smallholders, participatory processes and local innovation; 3) Multi-stakeholder platforms: creation of mutual understanding and commitment; 4) Capacity to engage and representation; 5) Leadership, accountability and transparency; 6) Time and timing; and 7) Resources. Of course, in many instances, the groups and issues described are interlinked and related.

2 Opportunities and challenges faced by people trying to influence policy

Prior to starting the process of influencing policy, there is a need to review if policy change is required to overcome the issue. Not all problems need necessarily a policy solution, and vice versa a policy might not solve the problem. For a new policy to be formulated, there is a need to evaluate the implementation of the previous policy but, in most cases, monitoring and evaluation of existing policy does not take place.

The process of influencing policy never really ends and, even if written policy is modified, there is still a need to work on getting it into acted policy. In many cases, it is more effective to focus on changing "acted policy" and policy implementation rather than what is written. Once it has been established that a change in policy is required, there are a number of opportunities and challenges in influencing policy to become more favourable for farmer-led participatory approaches. These are described below.

2.1 Enhancing buy-in from policymakers: provision of information and evidence

Foremost, policymakers need to be aware of emerging issues and the current policies that require policy influence and change. These issues and their (foreseen) impacts need to be well framed and articulated with reliable information. Therefore, collection of information that substantiates and emphasises the issues at hand is essential. Apart from recognising the problems, policymakers and other relevant stakeholders also need information on potential solutions for the formulation of evidence-

Box 1: Importance of reliable information: case from Tanzania

An agenda for endorsement of GMOs by the Tanzanian Parliament was successfully stopped in 2005 by civil society organisations (CSOs) when research findings became available showing that GMOs were not resistant to drought, pests or diseases. Instead, farmers would need high levels of external inputs to cope with these, including dependence on multinational seed companies.

CSOs blamed the multinational companies for withholding or providing incomplete information. They shared research findings with smallholder farmers, published leaflets and policy briefs, and raised awareness of community members, decision-makers and Members of Parliament. Finally, the agenda was removed from the meeting through a joint advocacy campaign by the CSOs.

based policies. Action-learning research informed by field studies can help generate the required reliable information and evidence for this process, but must address community needs and priorities. Pilots and models, if well documented, can also be used as demonstration to showcase potential and locally adapted solutions. Evidence can come from individual farmers or communities can be technical or can focus on the process (e.g. working modalities between researchers, extension officers and farmers). Evidence should be of a scale that attracts the interest of decision-makers and other relevant stakeholders as an input to policy-influencing processes. Evidence for policy change needs to be carefully documented, but also simple flyers, brochures and policy briefs can help to capture the interest of policymakers (see Box 1 with an example from Tanzania).

Bringing information to the attention of policy- or decision-makers with the aim of policy change can be initiated at any level from the farmers in the field to the decision-makers at ministerial level. It might be more effective to gain interest from local decision-makers at county or sub-county level as an entry point for policy dialogue and influence. Lobbying is an important instrument to make policymakers and others aware of problems and potential solutions that require policy change. The messages and communication channels used to provide information and lobby have to be adjusted to the different target audiences. For policy change, intense lobbying with parliamentarians is required. Chances for successful policy influence can be enhanced by showing linkages and complementarities to existing national or international policies, strategies and programmes.

Table 1: Summary of challenges and opportunities for enhanced buy-in from policymakers

| Challenges | Opportunities |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of interest of decision-/ policymakers in policy issues • Limited information and evidence available to engage in policy process • Limited detailed information/ documentation of innovation (e.g. costs and benefits of technical innovations) • Limited sharing on local innovation for fear of being taken by other players (lack of interest of innovators to scale out their innovation) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of comprehensive and reliable information • Demonstration of evidence-based findings • Frequent visits to local government offices and engaging them in awareness fora to enhance buy-in from decision-makers at lower administrative levels (county and sub-county) for policy dialogue • Showing linkages and/or complementarities to the government’s priorities, policies and/or programmes • Inclusion of decision-makers in multi-stakeholder platforms • Inviting decision-makers to visit successful outcomes (evidence) in-country and across the border for information exchange • Technocrats from government institutions have knowledge on policy formulation process |

2.2 Attitudes towards smallholder farmers, participatory processes and local innovation

Some national-level stakeholders have negative perceptions towards smallholder farmers and their local innovations. This originates from the widespread belief of decision-makers that modernisation and growth is equated with importing and transferring technologies, and that local innovation is non-scientific and slow in having scalable impact. These perceptions limit the chances of CP partners to influence policies for better accommodation of local innovation and also limit the smallholder farmers’ chances to influence and change policy.

Furthermore, decision-makers might not be open to participatory processes. Most policies have been formulated in a top-down manner without proper consultation of stakeholders. In many cases, decision-makers do not see the need for wide consultation processes and participatory approaches, which are not clearly visible to policymakers and therefore do not attract their attention. Moreover, people in state organisations sometimes regard participatory approaches as a

threat that undermines centralised decision-making processes and hierarchies.

To be able to make policy more favourable for farmer-led participatory approaches, it is essential that decision-makers believe in participatory processes, in smallholder farmers' inherent innovativeness and in the possibilities to strengthen local adaptive capacity and resilience to respond effectively to new challenges and opportunities. Often, it is easier to target decision-makers at lower administrative levels, as is illustrated by a case from Uganda (see Box 2).

Box 2: Influencing policy at district or sub-county level: case from Uganda

In Uganda, the key mandate of the District Council is to ensure pro-poor policies related to agriculture and NRM. Environmental Alert (EA) engaged in a policy dialogue process on food security ordinance in late 2010 in Yumbe and Moyo Districts. A number of activities were implemented to ensure farmer participation in the process of policy formulation, including community mobilisation on the proposed ordinance formulation process and community consultations on the agenda setting. As the district-level food security ordinance could not be dealt with during District Council General Meetings and was postponed, EA shifted the focus to formulation of bylaws on stray animals and bush burning *at sub-county levels*. These practices were contributing to food insecurity for households. Communities contributed to the agenda setting, the formulation of the bylaws (including penalty clause) and their enforcement. Together with massive popularisation of the bylaws (through local FM radio stations), this led to more support for the policy in terms of enforcement.

If attitudes of decision-makers are unfavourable for or even adverse to smallholder farmers, participatory processes and local innovation, first and foremost efforts have to concentrate on changing these attitudes and perceptions. This is directly linked with the above section on creating buy-in from decision-makers by providing relevant information and showcasing evidence. If perceptions and mindsets are not changed, there will be slim chances to influence policies to embrace farmer-led participatory innovation processes.

Table 2: Summary of challenges and innovations on attitudes towards smallholder farmers, participatory processes and local innovation

| Challenges | Opportunities |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negative perceptions of decision-makers and others towards local innovations • Local leaders are often not aware of local innovations • Government understands participation as mass mobilisation through campaigns • Participatory approaches are often invisible and therefore do not attract attention of policymakers • Participatory processes are sometimes considered as a threat, undermining centralised decision-making and hierarchies • Limited support from internal and external partners | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of comprehensive and reliable information • Demonstration of evidence-based findings • Frequent visits to local government offices and engaging them in awareness fora to enhance buy-in from decision-makers at lower administrative levels (county and sub-county) for policy dialogue • Existing information / policy briefs supporting local innovation • Existing information, methodologies & tools available on participatory processes • Bottom-up development of projects and programmes |

2.3 Multi-stakeholder platforms: creation of mutual understanding and commitment

Policy change will impact a wide range of stakeholders in different ways. Therefore, there is a need for platforms comprised of multiple stakeholders to articulate and reach consensus on policy issues and recommendations that balance the sometimes conflicting interests of different stakeholder groups. Proper facilitation of multi-stakeholder processes is crucial to ensure that all relevant stakeholder groups are on board and circumvent situations where some groups feel bypassed, ignored or downplayed and the most powerful carry the day, and also to reduce the chances that conflicts arise at the end of the policy-formulation process because some stakeholders disown the content.

Another major function of multi-stakeholder platforms is to develop alliances for innovation development, and for out- and upscaling of innovations with the aim of generating sufficient evidence for influencing policy.

Multi-stakeholder platforms for policy influence can be organised in many ways: consultation meetings, workshops, social media, internet platforms, e-discussions etc to capture views and perceptions of a wide range of stakeholders and to create a critical mass for policy change. These platforms can be both formal and informal. Festivals and public campaigns can also be organised where community members and other stakeholders come together for information exchange and information sharing. It is recommended to inform, involve and/or invite decision-makers in these multi-stakeholder platforms to instil interest in and commitment to participatory approaches in ARD.

Table 3: Summary of challenges and opportunities for multi-stakeholder platforms

| Challenges | Opportunities |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflicting interest of different organisations • Lack of sufficient stakeholder consultations/ participation of all social categories to ensure that their interests, preferences and priorities are taken into account • Management and sustainability of multi-stakeholder platforms • Inability to solicit commitment to sustain and complete the policy-influencing process • Lack of forum for discussing policy-influencing strategies • Most of the policies are presented to stakeholders for confirmation rather than genuine consultation • Most policies have been formulated in a top-down way without consulting stakeholders | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involving decision-makers in workshops, evaluation and publications • Setting up a taskforce and working group including representatives of NGOs • Organising consultation meetings and public-awareness meetings (e.g. public campaigns, festivals) including at local level • Closely working with farmers in a multi-stakeholder platform setting • Linkages to interested donors on policy issues • Potential to draw from wide range of knowledge, experience and skills of participating stakeholders • Growing democracy in Africa will open doors to local people and policymakers |

2.4 Capacities to engage and representation

Although the participation of different types of organisations in influencing policy processes is essential for the formulation of policy issues and recommendations for change as described above, not all relevant stakeholders have adequate capacities to be engaged and/or to be represented. Especially local innovators are under-represented, as most government organisations/institutes lack mechanisms and capacities to collaborate effectively with them. Furthermore, mechanisms to support local innovation processes and effective networks to support innovators and innovation

processes are often not institutionalised.

Smallholder farmers/local innovators need to be aware of their civic rights, while capacity building is required for smallholder farmers/local innovators on better representing themselves and articulation of policy issues and recommendations. They should be aware of the policy issues and or agendas for policy change. In some instances, agendas are proposed in a top-down manner without sharing of information on the recommendations for changes in policy with the public that might be affected (e.g. GMO agenda in the case of Tanzania; burning ban on grazing land in Ethiopia) and in some countries, such as Uganda, official policy processes are not open to CSO engagement.

A first prerequisite to be engaged in policy-influencing processes is access to information. This could be through setting up networks for information sharing and supporting smallholder farmers to express their views and by bringing local evidence to the attention of decision-makers. Such networks may help to increase the voice of smallholder farmers and local innovators. Also capacities of decision-makers in participatory processes may need enhancement in policy formulation, analysis, monitoring and evaluation.

A policy-influencing strategy builds on the capacity and credibility of various organisations to frame policy issues from the realities on the ground. For example, in Uganda, EA is in a good position to “frame” the policy issues and articulate the problems facing smallholder farmers, based on their practical experience in working with smallholder farmers. A key issue for EA was how to “package” the understanding of the issues and how to communicate effectively in order to promote engagement and gain momentum.

Table 4: Summary of challenges and opportunities: capacities to engage and representation

| Challenges | Opportunities |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of mechanisms and capacity within institutions to accommodate working with innovators and influencing policies • Lack of supportive systems within institutions to support local innovation • Lack of capacity, knowledge, skills and information to influence policy • Packaging, framing and articulating problems faced by smallholders into policy issues • Rural population is regarded by the government as homogenous with common needs and a common political outlook • Lack/limited understanding on policy formulation process and policy analysis among farmers and stakeholders • Representatives are sometimes more concerned about the monetary benefits than about the policy process • Assumed representation (FAO was not representing interests of smallholder farmers) • Engaging policymakers in process requires resources | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formation of an advocacy group and training of the group in campaigns, lobbying and advocacy • Training and capacity building on policies, civic rights, good governance, advocacy, policy analysis, formulation, M&E etc • Development of partnership and networking at federal and regional level/ establishing partnerships with influential government institutions • Establishment of interdisciplinary and multi-sectoral screening committee for reviewing new policies • Use of existing networks • Use of existing linkages between research institutions and smallholders (farmer research groups, farmer field schools etc) • Partners/ NGOs have constant contact with smallholders at grassroots level and can provide support in translating problems into policy issues and strengthen engagement in policy processes • Mainstreaming PID concepts in (curricula and other means) in higher learning institutions |

2.5 Leadership, accountability and transparency

Influencing policy calls for good leadership, accountable representatives and transparent processes. Policy-influencing processes generally take a number of years and require long-term commitment from the stakeholders involved. Therefore, institutions and organisations should be consistent in attending relevant meetings and other events and keep themselves up to date on the policy processes in which they are involved to avoid disconnections and major interruptions in policy discussions due to high turnover of representatives from various organisations. Good and accountable leadership also implies that the representatives are genuinely concerned and interested in the policy issues at hand and not merely participating in the policy-influencing processes for personal monetary benefits and/or status. Policy-influencing processes have been more successful if the process is driven by champions, e.g. insiders or drivers from within the target institutions (see Box 3 for an example from Ethiopia).

Box 3: Partnering with powerful state institutions as driver for policy influence: case from Ethiopia

The NGO Institute for Sustainable Development (ISD) piloted organic farming in Ethiopia. As a result, some farmers became more inclined toward organic farming and gave less attention to “modern” inputs (introduced seed, artificial fertilizer and chemical pesticides). This stimulated debates with the Ministry of Agriculture, which considered the promotion of organic farming to be in conflict with the Ethiopian Government’s Growth and Transformation Policy. ISD was discouraged from continuing the organic farming pilots. It then worked directly with the national Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), regional Bureaus of Agriculture and their development agents in promoting low-external-input farming (but not completely excluding the use of external inputs) and was successful in integrating this into the agricultural policy framework.

This is an example of successful policy change: low-external-input agriculture was included as an option in the Government’s extension package in Tigray. ISD staff attributed the success of this policy influence in working in partnership with the powerful government institution (EPA) as a driver of policy influence in combination with a number of other factors, including: addressing community needs and priorities (revolving around decline of soil fertility, shortage of livestock for ploughing and manure, frequency of drought and high price of introduced inputs and the risks of using them under erratic rainfall), complementing the Government’s food security and NRM policy, and sharing experiences through demonstrations, workshops and publications.

Documentation of the policy-influencing process helps to increase transparency and accountability. Therefore, policy documents need to be translated into local languages and made available to local communities and smallholder farmers who otherwise could remain ignorant until it is too late. Information on the policy-influencing process such as declarations, minutes of meetings, policy briefs, policy discussion papers etc could be made available to the wider public on the Internet.

Table 5: Summary of challenges & opportunities: leadership, accountability & transparency

| Challenges | Opportunities |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High turnover of representatives/ frequent institutional restructuring • Inconsistency of attendance in meetings/ representatives do not keep themselves up to date on the policy process in which they are involved • Representatives are sometimes more | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carefully identify champions/ lead organisations with higher policy-influencing capacity to drive the policy-influencing process • Identify and include competent persons in taskforces and working groups • Constant documentation of the policy-influencing process |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>concerned about the monetary benefits than about the policy process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of policy documents in user-friendly language for farming communities • Resources required for engaging policymakers in process • Conflicts of interest | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy documents need to be translated and made available to local communities • Inclusion of policy influencing in performance contracts • Many stakeholders (partners/ CSOs) have demonstrated good accountability, leadership and transparency |
|---|---|

2.6 Time and timing

Influencing policy is a time-consuming process because it involves numerous rounds of stakeholder consultations and reflections. Therefore, before starting, the people involved should assure that they can allocate sufficient time to the process. On the other hand, it is also important to be able to act in a very quick and timely manner when the opportunity arises.

In many instances, there are only short open windows for actual policy change, when policymakers are interested and motivated to address a policy issue, especially after a change of government, international agreements and conventions etc. It is important to make use of these moments to time policy-influencing activities: to prepare an overall workplan to outline the policy-influencing trajectory yet, at the same time, remain flexible to adjust the plan when an unexpected policy window opens up.

Table 6: Summary of challenges and opportunities: time and timing

| Challenges | Opportunities |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocation of sufficient time • NGOs are working in short project cycles • Process of policy formulation can take too long and might be overtaken by other events • Timing: avoid coming out with new policies during times of government change; the new might not be the priority of the new government | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow and allocate sufficient time for policy-influencing processes • Plan policy-influencing process carefully |

2.7 Resources

As described above, policy-influencing processes take time, require commitment from organisations and therefore cost money. It is thus important to allocate sufficient budget for the policy-influencing process. In case donors provide funding for policy change, their interest, criteria, conditions and agenda need to be clear from the start of the policy-influencing process. Furthermore, the policy recommendations should be realistic in terms of available funding because financing local innovation processes is a challenge and many organisations do not have the capacities to invest.

Table 7: Summary of challenges and opportunities: resources

| Challenges | Opportunities |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocation of sufficient budget • Limited resources to undertake policy influence • Resources often come from donors with some ties | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devolved government funds could ease access for policy influence emerging from farmers • Mainstream policy influencing in government programmes • Targeting and accessing special group funds i.e. women/ youth |

3. Remaining questions

This is a working paper that describes work in progress. There are a number of questions remaining that need to be addressed to increase insights in existing policy-influencing experiences in PID. These questions revolve around the following main topics:

- Differences in constraints and opportunities faced by people trying to influence policy and internal constraints and opportunities faced by decision-makers designing and formulating policy
- Systems to support local innovation processes and effective networks to strengthen innovators and innovation processes (strengths and weaknesses of establishing linkages between research institutions and smallholders through farmer research groups, farmer field schools, farmer participatory research, participation of farmers in advisory committees etc)
- Investments in policy influence and financing local farmer-led innovation processes (e.g. experiences with Local Innovation Support Funds, funding needed for decentralised research, funding needed for development organisations and farmer organisations to support farmer-led participatory innovation processes).

These issues will be taken into account during the CLIC–SR project and will be incorporated into the working paper, which will be updated as new insights emerge from the project.

Appendix 1: Analysis of country-specific experiences on policy influence

| | Kenya | Ethiopia | Tanzania | Uganda |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| General | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There may be a policy in place but this might not solve the problem • Not all problems necessarily need a policy solution | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For a new policy to be formulated, there is a need to evaluate the performance of the previous policy; in most cases, M&E of previous policy is skipped. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successfully influencing the formulation of bylaws at sub-county levels can be easier and more effective than influencing policy at district level. |
| Enhancing buy-in from policymakers: provision of information and evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of enthusiasm by those in authority on the policy issues • Realised that they needed policies/strategic plans of institutions to ensure coherence between what is already written and what they are advocating for • There is need to continuously create awareness about the policy issue • Importance of political support and media to create awareness • Importance of information and research for development of evidence-based policies • Have good communicating skills based on target • Need for intense lobbying with parliamentarians • Need to repackage your lobbying message based on the target group • Policy advocacy can start at any level • Not all innovations may need patenting, as they may not then benefit the innovator • Provision of data and information to generate interest of policymakers • Frequent visits to local government offices and engaging them in awareness fora on the need to re-look at the policies in place | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addressing community needs and priorities • Intervention complementary to the government policy • Demonstration of evidence-based findings to decision-makers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide/share realistic information to policymakers that can help them make correct decisions and not easily accept broken promises • Share with them live cases that are happening in the community that can influence policy • Invite them to some interventions such as field days on farmer innovation • Collection of information and data on the best-bet innovations • Identify community activists on innovations who will identify policy change issues for advocacy and implement them | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of evidence, especially at the agenda-setting stage, helped EA put food security issues on the policy agenda • Generation of evidence through pilot projects provided facts on the issues • Through the use of evidence to influence policy, EA was able to establish a positive reputation and maintain credibility with the local communities and the policymakers • Farmer innovators were supported to participate in meetings and made presentations on the need to support farmer innovators in water and environment • Make use of partners in the coalition to document case studies and stories towards consolidated CSO position papers • However, production of “soft” evidence (e.g. stories and case studies) tends to be ignored by policymakers |

| | Kenya | Ethiopia | Tanzania | Uganda |
|--|---|---|-----------------|---|
| Attitudes towards smallholders, participatory processes and local innovation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Innovations are viewed from the classical point of view, hindering the development and promotion of the innovation • Negative perceptions towards local innovations; it is easier to convince people about technologies introduced from abroad • There may be external influences e.g. conventional standards, and there is need to customise to local circumstances • Limited deliberate efforts to support local innovators • Most policies have been made top-down and not given much room for consultation of stakeholders; some of these have been influenced even by external forces • Lack of involvement of stakeholders, use of top-down approach • Low capacity within the institutions to influence policy | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addressing community needs and priorities • Modernisation and growth is equated with importing and transferring technologies • Widespread belief among decision-makers that local innovation is non-scientific and slow in having wide impact • Inadequate knowledge and capacity gaps among the decision-makers • Top-down decision-making that is highly centralised and politicised • Conflict between transfer-of-technology approach that creates dependency and participatory approaches to develop self-reliance • Participatory approaches are invisible to attract policymakers • Participatory approach is a threat to centralised and top-down approach • Inadequate knowledge and capacity gaps among the decision-makers | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dialogue between policymakers and the citizens (known as awareness-consensus interface conferences) were held, open to the public and the media • Consultative processes provided an opportunity for smallholder farmers to be informed about the proposed provisions of the draft food security bylaws, identify gaps and to propose policy options for incorporation in to the final bylaw • Media played an influential role especially during the agenda-setting stage by highlighting and amplifying the food security issues that needed to be addressed • This enabled easy community mobilisation to define the food-security issues to be addressed, identify priorities to be tackled, evaluate alternative policy proposals and participate in the development of a draft policy document |

| | Kenya | Ethiopia | Tanzania | Uganda |
|-----------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| Multi-stakeholder platforms | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflicting interest of different organisations • Conflict coming at the end of the policy-formulation process as a result of stakeholders disowning the content; there was lack of sufficient stakeholder consultation • Lack of forum for discussing policy-influencing strategies • Process required major consultations with stakeholders to ensure issues were well articulated • Involved in identifying the issues and also in the development of the policy recommendations • Ensuring all stakeholders were involved throughout the process was critical • Getting the right stakeholders involved right from the start to minimise opposition • Need to take into account the concerns of the stakeholders in order to enhance ownership • Ownership and involvement is necessary to ensure all are on board • Need for wide stakeholder consultations for consensus • Find ways of balancing conflicting interests/ideas from farmers or stakeholders • The most powerful carry the day | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involving decision-makers in workshops, evaluation and publications | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitate formation of advocacy groups and equip them with campaigning, lobbying and advocacy knowledge and skills (joint advocacy campaign) • There was enough public awareness in sharing the idea and smallholder farmers participated • In the taskforce and working group, NGOs were represented, which is a rare practice • Enough district consultation was made so all stakeholders and even farmer groups were visited to seek their opinions • There should be adequate participation of all social categories to ensure that their interests, preferences and priorities are taken into consideration • Holding festivals and public campaigns where community members and other stakeholders come together for both formal and informal gatherings • Agenda was sent to the Parliament before seeking public opinion: a top-down approach • Unwillingness of government official to give data and information to people who are not civil servants • There was enough public awareness in sharing the idea and smallholder farmers participated | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong networks with a range of partners, such as CSOs, the media, religious institutions and cultural and community leaders, can lead to an advocacy team having a collective voice • There is limited space for CSO engagement in the policy processes; as a result, in most cases the spaces must be sought for participation • A key constraint is when likeminded CSOs and researchers have weak links; thus, their wealth of information and practical experience will not be used to leverage evidence |

| | Kenya | Ethiopia | Tanzania | Uganda |
|----------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Capacities to engage | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had challenges in tapping into the expertise of other organisations • Realised that they needed support from the other organisations that would impact on the policies • Lack of mechanisms and capacity within institutions to accommodate working with innovators and influencing policies concerning innovations • Lack of supportive systems within institutions to support local innovation • Lack of creation of synergies by institutions to support innovators and innovation processes • Lack of capacity building for the local innovators • Lack of capacity/ knowledge to influence policy • Collaboration among the technical teams facilitated the policy-drafting process | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training and capacity building • Inadequate knowledge, capacity gaps among the decision-makers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct training on analysing the policy and related ones • Facilitate formation of advocacy groups and equip them with campaigning, lobbying and advocacy knowledge and skills • Many community members and their respective leaders are not aware of their civic right/roles and responsibilities to demand their right or influence a change • Community members unaware of policies; lack of policy documents in community user-friendly language (policy documents need to be translated and made available to local communities) • Limited knowledge and skills on campaigning, lobbying and advocacy among community members and development workers • There should be enough awareness creation to public on the agenda or need for policy change • Capacity strengthening of communities on civic rights, good governance and advocacy • Capacity strengthening of policymakers on policy formulation, analysis and M&E • Capacity strengthening in policy analysis, formulation, implementation and M&E for institutions and community members • FAO was not representing interests of smallholder farmers and was speaking on behalf of farmers generally | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical and financial capacities have limited the ability to engage with policy processes; especially effective policy influence through research and evidence is substantially limited because of limited capacity to use and adapt evidence in policy processes • Capacity for agricultural policy analysis within networks is often limited |

| | Kenya | Ethiopia | Tanzania | Uganda |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| Leadership, accountability, transparency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representatives are sometimes more concerned about the monetary benefits above the policy process • Disconnect in discussions due to high turnover of representatives from various organisations • Lack of genuine interest during policy formulation; stakeholders will only lobby for policies which are favourable to their interests and not for the common good • There needs to be constant documentation of process • Institutions should consider consistency in attendance and in updating themselves on the policy processes in which they are involved • Apathy among stakeholders who should influence policy • Ability of the lead institution to be persistent in pursuing the course • Process was led by the Permanent Secretary of MoA; this provided good will for other PSs in the respective ministries to participate in and support the whole process • Start policy-influencing process from the top to get buy-in from all stakeholders | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership with influential government institutions to trigger ownership • Establishment of long-term vision and commitment • Frequency of institutional restructuring and manpower turnover • The need for champions to drive the process (target insiders or drivers from within the target institutions) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify lead organisations in policy influencing • A special department was formed under the MoA to deal with the ASDP programme • Competent personnel were included in the taskforce and working groups • Policy documents need to be translated and made available to local communities • The agenda come from donors (basket fund, FAO included); it was not possible to know at the beginning if it was a grant or loan • At some point, a consultant seemed to be more powerful than the rest of the team members | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M&E of the policy formulation was equally important to determine the extent to which the policy options proposed were considered by the policymakers to design a people-centred food security bylaw • M&E also provided the necessary inputs for learning and eventual adaptation during the engagement process and, over the longer term, became the basis for improving subsequent policy influence in other districts |

| | Kenya | Ethiopia | Tanzania | Uganda |
|-----------------|--|--|--|--|
| Time and timing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is need to try and shorten the time taken in the process of policy formulation • The process of policy formulation took a long time and, as a result, some policies were overtaken by events • Policy is just coming out when the new government is coming in and this might not be its priority | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocation of sufficient time and budget | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A well-planned campaign involving politicians and decision-makers was launched • Enough time was given for the activity • Time is required to formulate a policy, but the exercise is usually taken in a rush such that interests of some players are not taken into considerations at the expense of a minority who has a stake in the policy change | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A key constraint is to make policy advice and evidence accessible, digestible and in time for policy; this is sometimes due to failure to appreciate the time constraints and schedules facing policymakers |
| Resources | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy Influencing and implementation requires resources both financial and human • Funding is a challenge for development of these innovations; the cost of developing some innovations is also high and organisations are not willing to invest in such • Donor support (external) for meetings and stakeholder support in the policy development process • Process very expensive as it was needed to bring in high-level government officials | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocation of sufficient time and budget | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasis should be given to exploit local available resources, skills and innovations before thinking of external resources that normally increase the country's debts • Limited resources to undertake policy influence • There should be enough resources to support all necessary steps of policy formulation • A well-planned campaign involving politicians and decision-makers was launched • Adequate resources and materials • Resource for policy formulation and change is a limiting factor and, in most cases, comes from donors with some ties | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generation of rigorous evidence, information repackaging for different audiences and engagement in network and communication with a range of partners require financial investments and a wide range of technical capacities |