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Summary

Including Smallholders in Agricultural Research for Development (INSARD) is a three-year EC-funded project that aims to facilitate a broad range of African and European civil society organisations (CSOs), including non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and farmer organisations (FOs), to be actively involved in influencing the formulation and implementation of agricultural research systems in Africa.

This paper outlines a policy influencing strategy for the project and provides stakeholder engagement plans for policy-related activities undertaken by the INSARD partners.

The strategy builds on work already undertaken by the INSARD project. Key informants from a range of ARD organisations were consulted and the INSARD partners agreed on issues and policy influencing priorities, and drew up detailed stakeholder engagement plans.

ARD system and major issues

An overview of the ARD system relevant to Africa, from global institutions down to local levels, reveals a system that still remains top-down in nature: there is no coordinated feedback from smallholder farmers at local levels via national ARD agendas to regional and global institutions and donors, despite a desire by many ARD institutions and donors for a better alignment of research with smallholder farmers’ priorities. There are problems with effective CSO engagement with researchers and policymakers in ARD agenda setting. The issues can be grouped under five main areas:

- **Attitudes to smallholder farmers**: Some smallholder farmers are “more equal” than others, with preference often given to smallholders with better access to markets and resources, while those in remote and fragile areas may be considered as “unviable”. For some policymakers, a focus on smallholder farming is still seen as irrelevant to future economic development;

- **Capacity for engagement**: CSOs are often not coordinated or know enough about ARD processes to realise its importance for their work or to engage effectively with research issues. On the other hand, researchers may be unwilling or unable to respond to farmers’ requirements for research that contributes to their livelihoods as a whole;

- **Representation and accountability**: CSOs who do participate in ARD fora are not necessarily representative of a wide range of smallholder farmers. They may have limited legitimacy and accountability to smallholders or only represent a narrow section of interests – often the more elite farmers. Researchers are accountable to donors but there are few mechanisms to encourage them to be accountable to the smallholder farmers who are supposed to benefit from their research;

- **Mechanisms to scale up smallholder farmer-driven ARD**: There is a large gap in coordination and linkages at the national level. There are many small, field-based projects involving smallholders and researchers but, with a few notable exceptions, very rarely a coordinated way of using these experiences to influence national ARD agendas. The linkages between national ARD agendas and sub-regional and regional agendas are also patchy. National ARD agendas are

---

1 The project is funded by the EC under the FP7-KBBE-2010-4-02 arrangement.
rarely influencing sub-regional and regional agendas, nor are they necessarily reflecting smallholders’ priorities; and

- **Resources required to facilitate engagement in ARD processes:** If CSOs are to contribute effectively to ARD fora, they require resources to gather views from their constituent farmers; to coordinate with each other; to build their knowledge of research processes and to continue to dialogue and report back after meetings. *Ad hoc* participation in ARD meetings is not sufficient.

**INSARD approaches to policy influencing**

INSARD’s policy objective is to influence the agricultural research agenda (themes and approaches) and resource allocation processes and actors to include smallholders’ participation, needs and interests. This is designed to be done through engaging in constructive policy dialogue with key African and European research organisations and donors involved in ARD.

The project resources do not allow for major policy initiatives, and the policy influencing work will be closely interwoven with INSARD’s work on research brokerage, using the findings from that work and building on the linkages established with stakeholders in selected pilot countries.

The INSARD project seeks to be a catalyst: it will focus on positive messages based around successful models of farmer-driven research agendas in seeking to persuade and influence others to continue to push for pro-smallholder changes in ARD policy and practice.

There are two main strands to influencing ARD policy:

- to achieve a change in **attitude** towards recognising the importance of a more demand-driven and smallholder-focused ARD – this is particularly relevant to stakeholders who are unconvinced of the need to include smallholders in ARD;
- to achieve a change in **behaviour**, procedures and practice to enable effective engagement between smallholder farmers, CSOs and researchers on development of research priorities and approaches backed by resource flows to allow this to happen. Influencing messages need to be specific, based on practice and findings from the work of INSARD and its partners and the work of like-minded people and organisations.

**Principles underlying INSARD’s influencing strategy**

INSARD will adopt a constructive approach to influencing and will seek to work with others who are also trying to influence and promote smallholder-driven ARD systems. There are some fundamental principles that underlie all the policy influencing messages. These include:

- Smallholder farmers are vital for future food security: researchers have a role in supporting and enabling smallholder farmers to continue to produce nutritious food into the future, whilst not undermining the environmental base.
- There should be a focus on all smallholder farmers, not just those in areas with high external market potential – with special attention on the more marginalised farmers in fragile ecosystems.
- Agricultural systems are multi-functional, providing not just crop/animal production and income, but a whole range of social, economic and environmental services. A holistic view of research is
needed to effectively address problems facing farmers and the wider communities and align the research agenda with development needs.

- Agricultural research contributes to a sustainable and pro-poor development approach, in which people have a voice in their own development. INSARD does not speak “for” smallholder farmers, but aims to facilitate a bottom-up approach to enable smallholders to voice their own concerns.
- Innovation in agriculture comes not only from formal research or via market-led technology development. Farmers are also innovators. An ARD system that recognises, works with and enables farmer innovation is more likely to deliver effective and relevant outputs than a system that continues trying to transfer research outputs and technologies without awareness of local innovation.

**Key policy messages**
Potential policy-influencing objectives and associated risks and opportunities were identified for five groups of stakeholders. The objectives were as follows:

**European ARD donors and policymakers**
- Ensuring that the importance of smallholder-driven research agenda is fully recognised within the new EU funding policies;
- Recognising the diversity of smallholder farmers and the need to ensure that EU funding recipients have mechanisms in place to promote and widen the involvement of CSOs who work with all types of smallholder farmers in ARD;
- Allocating resources to allow for effective CSO engagement in ARD, including preparation, coordination and feedback on ARD issues, support for national platforms on ARD with strong CSO representation and support for more smallholder farmer-led research and development.

**International and regional research organisations**
- Recognising the diversity of smallholder farming and widening the number and types of CSOs so that more smallholder farmers are represented in ARD (the CSM\(^2\) approach provides a model of this), i.e. making the system more democratic and more accountable;
- Providing resources to support mechanisms for CSOs to learn more about research processes, and to convene meetings before and provide feedback afterwards to their constituents;
- Providing resources for researchers to learn more about smallholder farmers’ innovations and priorities and to engage in joint research processes.

**Sub-regional research organisations (SROs)**
- Recognising the need to ensure their research is responsive to smallholder needs, and that smallholder priorities should influence agenda setting, not just be confined to project-level field work;
- Reviewing representation on advisory boards and inviting greater involvement of CSOs working with all types of smallholder farmers;

\(^2\) Civil Society Mechanism of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) ([http://www.csm4cfs.org](http://www.csm4cfs.org))
Increasing strategic linkages, support and feedback to national-level platforms, as well as channelling national research issues (identified together with smallholder farmers) up to regional bodies.

**National-level policymakers and research organisations**
- An essential first step: raising awareness of ARD and its impact on future agricultural systems in order to persuade national-level organisations (including government ministries) to increase their interest in engaging with ARD;
- Raising awareness of the need to involve smallholder farmers in ARD in order to achieve the most effective outcomes in terms of innovation, scaling up of adaptive capacities and achieving long-term food security;
- Lobbying for a national platform with strong CSO presence interacting with researchers and other stakeholders to influence national-level ARD priorities.

**CSOs – including NGOs and FOs**
- Raising awareness of the potential benefits of ARD for smallholder farmers if the ARD agenda were responsive to their needs;
- Encouraging CSOs to increase their knowledge and understanding of formal research processes in order to engage more effectively with researchers;
- Urging CSOs to collaborate with each other, and come together with researchers and policymakers to participate in national-level fora on ARD agenda.

For those NGOs who already work closely with farmers and research institutes on field-level projects, the key influencing objective would be:
- Persuading these practice-oriented NGOs of the need to use their knowledge for greater impact, and engage with long-term ARD agenda setting, in addition to their local field work;
- Collaborating with other practice- and policy-oriented NGOs and participating with researchers and policymakers in national-level fora on ARD.

For all CSOs, but for FOs especially, an additional influencing objective would focus on representation:
- Promoting better representation of and accountability to smallholder farmers from diverse backgrounds and ecosystems, so that their research needs and their own innovations are recognised in the research agenda.

**Choices and priorities**
Taking into account the policy-influencing objectives, plus the risks of and opportunities for engagement with different stakeholder groups, INSARD partners decided to focus on the following:

**Bottom-up approach:** Influencing priorities will focus primarily on encouraging and facilitating smallholder farmers via CSOs to coordinate and push for a more demand-driven ARD agenda in their countries. This will take precedence over a more top-down strategy aimed at influencing the existing international ARD system. It is hoped that, by encouraging increased engagement in national ARD agendas, CSOs and researchers will continue to interact and push for further changes after the end of the project.
Prioritise national-level influencing: This is where the greatest gap in policy influencing exists and where INSARD can build on its research brokerage work and use its links with national stakeholders. Key decisions are made by national governments on research funding and there is more potential to mobilise national stakeholders to engage than by working at international levels where resource scarcity would limit engagement. A focus on national-level influencing would embrace government policymakers, research institutes, NGOs and FOs.

Take opportunities for influencing the SROs: Although this is not the priority area for allocating scarce INSARD resources, if opportunities arise to present INSARD findings or take part in policy dialogue with SROs, then this will be done, if resources allow.

Focus on raising awareness of the need for smallholder-driven ARD in Europe: Through disseminating findings from INSARD to EU policymakers, research initiatives and NGOs. Wherever possible, INSARD partners will work with NGO partners or EU-supported initiatives to increase coverage and impact.

Focus on the agricultural and natural resource management research system: Rather than extending influencing to organisations concerned with wider food security issues.

Look for quick wins and work with existing institutions and processes: Given the short time span of the project, the aim should be to raise awareness and demonstrate some positive messages through examples in order to encourage further developments after the project ends. The project should avoid promoting new initiatives that might not be sustainable if it is possible to work with existing structures in influencing ARD.

Look for key influencers with potential to lead change: Prioritise these over other stakeholders that are undergoing funding or organisational issues that may inhibit change.

Maintain some flexibility: Alongside the plan for engaging key stakeholders, opportunities for influencing other important stakeholders should be identified and taken up, if resources permit.

Stakeholder engagement plans
Stakeholder engagement plans were drawn up for each of the target countries where INSARD activities are ongoing: Zambia, Tanzania, Senegal, plus a Europe-based plan. The plans focus on national-level influencing, working with CSOs, researchers, government and private sector. Potential activities for influencing the SROs are also included, if resources allow. The plans identify specific target organisations and the desired outcomes from influencing. They detail potential allies, specific activities, timetable and the resources required to support the activities. Each plan was based on the partner’s local knowledge of organisations, supplemented by knowledge from key informants.

Zambia
The influencing strategy has three main components: firstly, working with selected CSOs to build their awareness, interest and knowledge of ARD, as part of forming a working group to undertake joint research proposals; secondly, engaging with ZNFU (Zambia National Farmers’ Union) in order to lobby for more active inclusion of smallholder farmers’ interests; thirdly, engaging with MACO (Ministry of Agriculture and Co-operatives) to lobby for support for a national forum on ARD with effective CSO involvement and prioritisation of demand-driven ARD, i.e. funding research institutions
and activities that promote farmer-led research. The project will seek to link with an existing multi-stakeholder forum, the ACF (Agricultural Consultative Forum) to evolve an ARD agenda.

Opportunities to influence other stakeholders will be taken if resources permit, in particular with the sub-regional organisation CCARDESA (Centre for Coordination of Agricultural Research and Development for Southern Africa).

**Tanzania**
The policy-influencing strategy has three main components, but places more emphasis on using the media to bring discussions on the importance of ARD and its responsiveness to smallholder farmers to a wider public – and therefore as a means of influencing government.

One strand of influencing will focus on bringing local Agricultural Research Institutes and surrounding smallholder farmers together, facilitated by CSOs, with the aim of building mutual awareness and knowledge of ARD. In addition, the Ministry of Agriculture will be lobbied through meetings backed by messages disseminated via the media, to increase support for ARD and for greater responsiveness to smallholder farmers. Lastly, a national workshop which brings together farmers, CSOs, government and international organisations is planned to promote formation of a national platform and a more positive attitude to smallholder farmers and ARD.

Opportunities will be taken to engage with regional and sub-regional bodies, particularly ASARECA (Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa), the Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Directorate (FANR) of SADC (Southern Africa Development Community) and the Africa-wide Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Analysis Network (FARNPAN), in order to influence policy inputs to CAADP (Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Programme) Pillar IV.

**Senegal**
The policy influencing strategy will follow the research brokerage process closely and target the same NGOs and FOs. The project will initiate discussions on the future of ARD and involvement of smallholder farmers. As part of this, a forum is planned to bring together CSOs in order to discuss issues around ARD: what it is, what processes are involved and how CSOs can engage with researchers on ARD agendas. This will include defining a plan to follow up with CSOs on their engagement with ARD processes. This will be accompanied by media coverage. In particular, a TV debate is planned to raise wider awareness of ARD issues amongst the general public.

The team will also follow up opportunities to initiate a dialogue with the sub-regional organisation, CORAF (Conseil ouest et centre africain pour la recherche et le développement agricoles), particularly on how to strengthen support for farmer-driven ARD, building on their existing initiatives.

**Europe**
The European strategy will aim to support initiatives in the African countries through providing policy materials such as presentations and briefings geared for different audiences (CSOs, researchers, policymakers).

A second objective is to ensure that the INSARD experiences and policy messages from the countries are disseminated to a wide audience through international and European CSO networks involved in
agriculture and to research and policy networks, as well as major European funders of ARD in Africa. The team will aim to mobilise European-based CSOs to promote smallholder farmer-driven ARD through organising a meeting on ARD targeting a wide range of stakeholders, proceeded by discussions with CSOs to plan strategy for the meeting and beyond.

In addition, INSARD will seek to use experiences from the project to influence the formulation of the new EU funding programmes through DG DEVCO (EU Directorate General – EuropeAid and Development Cooperation) – the new food security thematic area – and through DG Research and Innovation – the new Horizon 2020 initiative.
Introduction – background to INSARD

Including Smallholders in Agricultural Research for Development (INSARD) is a three-year EC-funded project that aims to facilitate a broad range of African and European civil society organisations (CSOs), including non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and farmer organisations (FOs), to be actively involved in influencing the formulation and implementation of agricultural research systems in Africa.

The project was developed to address the need to have better-functioning systems for involving CSOs in agricultural research for development (ARD). Effective involvement by CSOs who represent smallholder farmers can provide opportunities for smallholder farmers’ voices to be heard, and their own needs, research priorities and innovations to inform and shape scientists’ ARD priorities, resulting in greater positive impacts for smallholder farming and long-term development outcomes.

Although multi-stakeholder platforms, including some form of farmer representation, have been promoted by many involved in ARD in recent years, the influence of CSOs has been very limited. Their efforts to influence the wider research agenda have not been well coordinated or supported by the research establishment.

INSARD works through a partnership of African and European-based NGOs. The project interventions are organised around the following three main work packages:

1. Designing a structure for coordination and communication between European and African CSOs (FOs and NGOs) involved in influencing policy and practices around ARD;
2. Research brokerage: bringing together national CSO platforms and research scientists to work on jointly-developed research outlines, based on farmers’ own demands;
3. Putting policy dialogue into practice: engaging in constructive dialogue with key African and European organisations in order to influence agricultural research agenda and resource allocation processes and actors to include smallholders’ participation, needs and interests;

This paper relates to the third component of the project: putting a policy dialogue into practice. It outlines a policy influencing strategy and provides stakeholder engagement plans for policy-related activities undertaken by the INSARD partners.

The development of the policy influencing strategy builds on work already undertaken by the INSARD project and the policy priorities agreed in previous internal meetings, particularly the Management Team meeting of May 2012. The methodology used in developing the policy influencing strategy is described in the section below. This is followed by an overview of the ARD system and an analysis of the major issues with CSO engagement. Policy influencing objectives are identified for the key stakeholders and the rationale behind policy influencing approaches and choices is described. Lastly, detailed stakeholder engagement plans are presented.

3 The project is funded by the EC under the FP7-KBBE-2010-4-02 arrangement.
4 The term “smallholder farmers” is used to include all small-scale food producers including livestock keepers and fisherfolk.
5 ETC Foundation (lead organisation), Participatory Ecological Land Use Management Association (PELUM), Eastern and Southern Africa small scale Farmers’ Forum (ESAFF), Réseau des Plates-formes nationales d’ONG d’Afrique de l’Ouest et du Centre (REPAOC) and Professionals for fair development (GRET)
Methodology

The study for the policy-influencing strategy was undertaken from October to December 2012, but also incorporates work already undertaken by the INSARD project and the policy priorities agreed at previous internal meetings and the INSARD Advisory Group meeting (May 2012, Brussels). In addition to email and phone meetings with the team and key informants, the consultant joined the team at its management meeting in Tanzania in November 2012. This enabled the team to agree on the key policy issues and to work together on the policy influencing plans.

Development of the policy influencing strategy drew on several sources, including the Overseas Development Institute’s Research and Policy in Development (ODI RAPID) programme, 3ie Policy Influence Plan and BOND UK advocacy work.

There were three main parts to the study:

Clarifying the main policy issues that INSARD wants to address
- All INSARD documentation was reviewed, plus selected recent outputs from GCARD II (Second Global Conference on Agricultural Research for Development), CSO-GARD (Civil Society Organisation Group on Agricultural Research and Development) and PAEPARD (Platform for African-European Partnership on Agricultural Research for Development) in order to pull out and synthesise the main policy issues. These are listed in the references.
- Key informant interviews: 12 people who work in ARD were contacted with a short semi-structured questionnaire to elicit their views on the main policy issues and policy processes.
- Individual discussions with six lead members of the INSARD team to elicit their views on the main policy issues and processes.

Drawing up a policy-influencing approach
- A policy-influencing framework was constructed to guide development of policy actions
- Discussions were held with the INSARD team on how to approach advocacy and policy influencing (at the Management Team meeting in Tanzania).

Construction of the stakeholder engagement plans
- Team development of country-level stakeholder engagement plans (started at the Management Team meeting in Tanzania);
- Discussions with further key informants to follow up on stakeholders and policy processes;
- Synthesis and development of the overall policy influencing plan.

Scope and limitations

The responses by key informants to the initial questionnaire were incomplete (8/12), mainly due to the timing of the requests, as this was during the preparation and proceedings of the GCARD II conference. Those who did respond had substantial views on the policy issues, but were less sure about the actual policy processes that INSARD might engage with, particularly at regional and global levels.

Advocacy and policy influencing is a long-term process, whereas INSARD has a fixed term and a small budget\(^6\) for influencing. Therefore, plans for policy influencing had to be designed to meet these limitations and to focus on where the project could make the greatest impact with resources available, and could add value to other initiatives.

\(^6\) Operational budget of 36,000 euros across 3 years and 5 partners
As the policy context is dynamic, INSARD’s policy-influencing strategy needs some flexibility in order to respond to emerging opportunities for engagement. The strategy does identify a number of stakeholders or processes that the INSARD team may engage with, if productive opportunities arise.

**Policy Context**

**Agricultural policy and smallholder farmers**
The issues of CSO engagement in Agricultural Research for Development (ARD) need to be seen in the light of the wider challenges facing ARD and the changing policies related to agriculture. These have been discussed elsewhere in INSARD papers (INSARD 2012c) and are summarised here.

Agricultural research and development are facing major challenges. Over 70% of the world’s poor and hungry live in rural settings and depend directly on agriculture, with 2.1 billion of them living on less than US$2 per day (IAASTD 2008). The natural resources on which agriculture depends (land, water, genetic resources) are threatened by conflicts, poverty, population pressure and climate change, particularly in the more marginal areas.

Smallholder farmers make up the majority of food producers and supply the majority of global food; there are approximately 400 million small farms (less than 2 ha) compared with about 20 million large mechanised, market-oriented farms in development countries. Despite ongoing predictions that small farms will disappear, they prove to be remarkably resilient and the total area of arable land occupied by small farms continues to grow (Van der Ploeg 2008). However, most small-scale producers live in relative poverty and their livelihoods are frequently threatened.

Despite the importance of smallholder farming to food production, many governments in developing countries have reduced their support for agriculture in recent decades, while often neglecting small-scale farmers. Many bilateral donors stopped ARD or focused mainly on ARD for larger-scale export-oriented agriculture. Only 6% of the ARD investments worldwide were spent in 80 mostly low-income countries (IAASTD 2008).

Since 2008, the combination of growing instability in food markets (sudden food price hikes) and climate patterns, emerging trends such as competition for land (e.g. from foreign interests and new markets such as biofuels), and publication of reports reiterating the importance of agriculture for development and growth (such as WDR 2008) have prompted international policymakers to shift attention back to agriculture. Northern donors are once more prepared to fund ARD but with greater emphasis on its effectiveness.

In Africa, governments signed up to the Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) in 2003 with a commitment to spend 10% of national budgets on agriculture and double their annual spending on research within 10 years. However, these commitments are unlikely to be met. In fact, the declining trend in public research funding by African governments

---

7 Estimates of 70% global food from smallholder food producers (ETCgroup 2009)
8 In a study of 30 countries, 10 had declining research budgets; 10 had steady or fluctuating budgets; 10 have increased budgets (1998–2008). Curtis M (2012)
has meant that African research institutions are increasingly reliant on the Northern donors who provide bilateral or multi-trust funding.

The whole organisation and approach of ARD is being challenged to increase its effectiveness. Much of the global policy interest is focused on widening out ARD from a public research-led sector to include multiple stakeholder interests, in particular those of the private sector. This can be seen within the wider development policy trends of promoting private-sector engagement within development\(^9\), on the assumption that it will deliver more efficiently and sustainably through private control and market mechanisms than through the public sector. In ARD this has manifested itself as a desire to widen ARD from a sole concentration on publically funded and owned research to promotion of multi-stakeholder platforms including the farmers and all levels of private sector. Public-private partnerships and market-led technology generation have been promoted, along with greater emphasis given to research on demand factors (via value chains) as well as supply (production).

There has also been a growing recognition amongst donors of the importance of smallholder farmers, although there are diverse views over what type of smallholder farming is important. Some focus mainly on smallholders in “high-potential” areas\(^10\) who can more easily engage in markets for inputs (including new technologies) and outputs; they regard other smallholder farmers in more fragile or remote ecosystems as “unviable” with less potential for research investment, but supported through safety net programmes instead.

From the research organisations’ point of view, there has been a realisation that, although they specialise in generating new knowledge/technologies, they often operate in relative isolation from smallholder farmers’ realities. Researchers may know little about farmers’ own knowledge and about their socio-economic and cultural contexts and dynamics; this limits the usefulness and uptake of their outputs. Critical questions about why existing knowledge had not benefited smallholder farmers more, or why many apparently effective technologies had not been adopted have been raised at international conferences such as GCARD II (Second Global Conference on Agricultural Research for Development). There are increasing calls to replace or complement current research approaches with an innovation system perspective on ARD in which farmers and their organisations are not mere recipients of new knowledge but also potential sources and/or partners in its generation. This was a key recommendation of the International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development (IAASTD 2008) and entails a reorientation in ARD with implications for ARD systems, staff mindsets, tools and methods. Organisations such as the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) and the Global Forum for Agricultural Research (GFAR) have responded to some extent, and stress the importance of small-scale food production supported by a more field-oriented ARD. At the regional African level, the Forum for Agricultural Research for Africa (FARA) has recognised the importance of a greater focus on smallholder farmers and a multi-stakeholder approach to ARD as part of their mandate under the Common African Agricultural Development Plan (CAADP) Pillar IV.


“High-potential” is a term sometimes used to describe areas with favourable rainfall and soils, subject to few natural hazards, and sometimes used for areas with high external market potential. (Some of these areas are also known as “breadbaskets” – see World Economic Forum 2010). The term ignores human potential.
Standing apart from the main western policy agenda is the growing movement for Food Sovereignty. This global coalition of grassroots organisations puts small-scale food producers at the heart of its agenda and pushes for a fairer and more locally-based food production system. It fully recognises the importance of smallholders’ knowledge and innovation, and campaigns for a change in policy including agricultural research towards agro-ecological approaches. Although seen as a critical outsider by many policymakers, this movement is increasingly influential in many countries with its vision of an alternative, locally-controlled future for agriculture in contrast to an industrialised modernisation model. It is inclusive of all types of smallholder farmers and their issues including long-term environmental sustainability, and access and control over resources. As such, it is in line with the IAASTD report, which called for a “fundamental shift” in ARD to ensure that policies are “directed primarily at those who had been served least by previous AKST (Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology) approaches, i.e. resource-poor farmers, women and ethnic minorities”.

Overall, the last five-year period has seen western development policy move towards greater support for agriculture and agricultural research, albeit with diverse and conflicting views over the type of research. For the INSARD project, the growing recognition by key donor and research organisations of the importance of smallholder farmers and the need for a reorientation of ARD provides potential entry points for influencing policy and practice.

However, it is important to remember that, for policymakers outside agriculture and ARD, many remain unpersuaded of the need to focus on agriculture, particularly on smallholder agriculture. Amongst some African policymakers, the feeling remains that support to smallholder farming is a backward step not relevant to a modern, emerging economy. In addition, the growing influence of investment by China and other eastern countries in African agriculture should be noted, as these investors do not usually engage directly with the international ARD systems, but more on a bilateral basis with national governments.

The ARD system
INSARD studies (in particular, Mukute and Marange 2011, Kakinda 2012) have analysed in detail the key stakeholders involved in African ARD. The following section highlights some of the features of, and linkages within, the current system.

Global

Key organisations and programmes
- The Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR)
- Global Forum for Agricultural Research (GFAR)

At the global level, northern donors (private and public) provide much of the funding for ARD, in particular for the CGIAR with its 15 International Agricultural Research Institutes and for GFAR, as well as for African initiatives such as the Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa (FARA). They channel funds to support sub-regional bodies (e.g. multi-donor trust funds via the World Bank (WB))

---

11 Six countries have incorporated food sovereignty principles into national constitutions or law: Ecuador, Venezuela, Bolivia, Nepal, Mali, Senegal.
to support organisations such as the Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa (ASARECA)).

In addition, many African-focused ARD projects have been initiated via bilateral agreements with northern-based research institutes, universities or NGOs, or with eastern governments. These projects are usually independent of wider research coordination mechanisms promoted by CGIAR, GFAR and their major donors (such as USAID, WB, EU, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation/BMGF).

**Continental / regional – Europe**

*Key organisations and programmes*

- European Initiative on Agricultural Research for Development (EIARD)
- European Forum for Agricultural Research for Development (EFARD)
- Platform for African-European Partnership on Agricultural Research for Development (PAEPARD)
- European NGOs working on agricultural and rural development

In the European Commission (EC), the budget for ARD comes mainly from the International Aid directorate (DEVCO), under the Food Security Thematic Programme, but with linkages to the Research and Innovation and to the Agriculture Directorates\(^\text{12}\). The EIARD facilitates coordination of EU policy and support for ARD, including coordination with, and support to, the CGIAR and support for regional institutions and networks, including FARA and sub-regional organisations. There are also European-based initiatives such as EFARD (European Forum on Agricultural Research for Development), which promotes research partnerships between European and Southern research communities, and the EC-funded PAEPARD (Platform for African-European Partnership on Agricultural Research for Development). PAEPARD aims to consolidate cooperation and broker partnerships between different stakeholders in Africa and Europe\(^\text{13}\).

Many European-based NGOs working in Africa are primarily concerned with livelihoods and development; they are not concerned primarily with agricultural research. Their interests often lie more with food security issues than the details of ARD processes. Those that do engage with agricultural research tend to fall into two categories: practice-oriented or policy-oriented (see INSARD 2012b).

The practice-oriented NGOs tend to focus on facilitating uptake of new technologies and changes to local agricultural systems, often working closely with local NGO partners in Africa. They tend to be more conformist in nature – looking for partnerships with research organisations and universities in both Europe and Africa, and seeking project funding. They are less likely to challenge the status quo including the longer-term research agenda priorities. However, there are a few NGOs\(^\text{14}\) who cover both practice and policy, and who partner with other ARD organisations on farmer-led innovation processes and do seek to challenge the status quo.

---

12 Directorate General for EuropeAid and Development Cooperation (DEVCO); Directorate General for Research and Innovation; Directorate General for Agriculture

13 The current PAEPARD programme finishes at the end of 2013. A further extension (PAEPARD III) has been proposed

14 Examples include GRET and ETC Foundation
Some policy-oriented NGOs are concerned with the future direction of agriculture and with the wider research agenda. They often take a more rights-based view concerned with equity and justice, and voice environmental concerns. They challenge existing power structures and vested interests in food and agriculture which are detrimental to the poor. They are perceived by some researchers and policymakers as confrontational, especially when campaigning on contentious issues such as GM (genetic modification) research. These NGOs link with wider social movements and networks of CSOs, including African CSOs.

Continental / regional – Africa

Key organisations and programmes
- The Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Plan (CAADP) Pillar IV
- Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa (FARA)
- Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA)

At the Africa regional level, CAADP is the major African-led initiative. It is a programme under the New Economic Partnership for Africa Development (NEPAD), and has four major components. CAADP Pillar IV is the component concerned with agricultural research, technology dissemination and adoption. FARA has been given the mandate to implement CAADP Pillar IV, and has its own research programmes as well as objectives of promoting exchange of knowledge and learning.

FARA is designed as the apex organisation for African agricultural research, and there is a hierarchy of linkages reaching down via the donors to FARA then to the sub-regional organisations (SROs) and on to the national agricultural research institutes (NARIs). However, the links are mostly one-way, mainly consisting of funding for projects at the sub-regional level.

AGRA is a predominantly US-funded initiative (founded by Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and Rockefeller Foundation) aimed at developing smallholder farming productivity through access to new technologies and markets, focusing mainly on high-potential, breadbasket areas. It is an influential stakeholder with financial backing and has partnership agreements with CAADP and the CGIAR.

Sub-regional level

Key organisations

Sub-regional research bodies:
- ASARECA: Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa
- CORAF/WECARD: Conseil ouest et centre africain pour la recherche et le développement agricoles / West and Central African Council for Agricultural Research and Development
- CCARDESA: Centre for Coordination of Agricultural Research and Development for Southern Africa

Other regional research-related bodies: extension and education
- AFAAS: African Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services
- RUFORUM: Regional Universities Forum for Capacity Building in Agriculture
At sub-regional level, there are three bodies with a mandate to coordinate research issues for their regions and to link with FARA, so that key research issues reflect regional priorities. These are ASARECA, CORAF and CCARDESA. These SROs do not yet have clear mechanisms to link with other researchers, CSOs or policymakers outside their own research agendas. They do have advisory boards, but the mode of selecting candidates is unclear. Representatives from national agricultural research institutes (NARIs) and from national farmers’ organisations are included on the boards, but this does not necessarily mean that research agendas are co-ordinated or that there are clear mechanisms for them to integrate with relevant national processes. Attempts by the SROs to strengthen links with national governments can be hindered if ARD is low on the national governments’ list of priorities. In some cases, the SROs have tried to take a more participatory, inclusive approach to ARD but have met with some reluctance from national governments.

The SROs do provide some funding to the NARIs through competitive research calls. However, because the SROs have a project-driven funding model, they can sometimes be in competition with NARIs in their own regions, rather than having collaborative relations.

The selection of FOs and NGOs to participate at any level is limited. For example, FOs affiliated to EAFF (East Africa Farmers’ Federation) are included in ASARECA, but other, unaffiliated FOs are not.

There is a lack of mechanisms to include smallholder farmer interests in any strategic way in research agenda setting. Engagements with farmers are mostly confined to collaboration in field research in specific projects. Although this field-level collaboration has led to successful results, there are no incentives from the governing body to increase strategic participation, and little feedback to national stakeholders.

AFAAS and RUFORUM are both Africa-wide organisations. AFAAS is an autonomous organisation, but has a mandate from FARA to implement the agricultural advisory services components of CAADP Pillar IV. It views extension and research as closely intertwined; RUFORUM is a consortium of 30 African universities aiming to foster innovation relevant to smallholder farmers’ needs. Both organisations are closely linked to regional and global research bodies such as FARA and GFAR and receive funds from northern donors including the EC.

**National level**

**Key organisations**
- Government ministries: agriculture, science and technology
- NARIs – National Agricultural Research Institutes
- Universities
- National Farmers' Organisations

---

15 CCARDESA is most recently established in 2011 in Botswana, under the Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources programme (FANR) of the Southern Africa Development Community (SADC).
16 For example, the Crop Crisis Control Project, managed by Catholic Relief Services under a grant from COMESA in partnership with ASARECA (Kakinda 2012, p20).
At national government level, agriculture-related ministries are often more concerned with agricultural development and competing with other ministries to make a case for funds for agriculture. Agricultural research often comes lower in their priorities.

The National Agricultural Research Institutes (NARIs) and universities undertake most of the agricultural research, under the control of the Ministry of Agriculture or Ministry of Science and Technology. Representatives from the NARIs may be invited to participate in the governing bodies of the SROs, but, as noted above, the national ARD agendas are not necessarily linked to sub-regional or regional ARD agendas. Instead, national research programmes are developed independently, and may be heavily influenced by external donors’ interests, including western and eastern governments and large-scale private-sector actors who provide the funds for research.

The NARIs and universities do conduct some field-level participatory research with farmers. However, there is little strategic involvement of smallholder farmers in long-term research agenda setting.

The national farmers’ unions/associations often do have links with government policymakers or NARIs and may be invited to participate in agricultural policy fora. Representatives from national FOs may also be invited to join international and regional ARD discussions such as the Global Conference on Agricultural Research for Development (GCARD). However, the linkages between national FOs and local FOs are very patchy; many local FOs are not affiliated and do not necessarily share the same views or priorities on agriculture. There is a tendency for the national-level FOs to represent the interests of “elite” and/or more commercial export-oriented farmers. Many smallholder farmers, particularly those from the marginalised, remote and “low-potential” areas are not members of these FOs.

Linkages between NGOs and national-level ARD are limited, on an informal, ad hoc basis. Overall there is a lack of national-level mechanisms in place for discussions on national ARD priorities outside the government/researcher sphere.

Local level

Key organisations

- African CSOs involved in agriculture (NGOs, FOs, CBOs (Community-based Organisations))

As with the European NGOs, many African NGOs are primarily concerned with agricultural development and livelihoods rather than research. As a result, many do not fully understand ARD processes or the importance of ARD for their own work. There is also a similar distinction between those NGOs focusing on practice, for example, undertaking participatory research with groups of farmers at field level in partnership with research institutes, and the more policy-oriented NGOs who push for changes in agricultural policies.

Competition for resources and profile is an issue, particularly for the African-based CSOs, who often struggle for funding. This hampers networking and collaboration, as CSOs tend to go it alone rather than involve others.
There are numerous NGOs and FOs working with farmers, all with varying objectives, constituencies and approaches. There are many examples of field-level, sometimes participatory, work led by researchers from organisations ranging from the international CGIAR centres, the SROs and the NARIs working directly with farmers at the local level – sometimes through a local NGO. These are mainly consultations or validations by farmers of research outputs rather than farmers or CSOs co-leading the process. There are few clear mechanisms for these disparate engagements between researchers and farmers to evolve into something where farmers could start to influence wider research agendas, beyond the particular project they are working on. There are also few mechanisms to allow farmers’ local innovations to be supported by the national ARD processes.

A notable exception to this is the Prolinnova network. This aims to promote local innovation systems and tries to influence the way ARD is done through supporting farmer-led initiatives and linking these through a network of multi-stakeholder country platforms. It is important in demonstrating the potential of practical and successful farmer-led research, and how this might feed into national level platforms.

Another important initiative that has encouraged local people to get involved in ‘upstream’ ARD choices as well as ‘downstream’ implementation is the “Democratising the Governance of Food Systems” initiative started in Mali in 2009. This involved smallholder farmers assessing the work of research organisations (international and national research institutes), using their own criteria and making recommendations. This was followed by two regional citizen’s juries comprising of 40 to 45 smallholder farmers, who interrogated specialists from Africa and Europe, and finally a high level regional policy dialogue with AGRA in 2012, where farmers made recommendations on governance, organisation and priorities for agricultural research. It is too early to know whether this initiative will have long-term impacts on ARD processes, but it clearly demonstrates the interest and capability of smallholder farmers to engage with researchers and policymakers, if they have the opportunity to do so.

**Linkages, research alignment and the Dublin Process**

There are close links between many of the donors and international research organisations. World Bank staff members are on advisory boards and oversee multi-donor trust funds, the EC is a major funder of the CGIAR, plus funding FARA, GFAR and sub-regional bodies. FARA, for example, is a partner in GFAR and PAEPARD; EFARD is part of the GFAR fora. Not surprisingly, they share many common approaches to ARD. All endorse the need for multi-stakeholder consultations and have taken steps to involve farmers and CSOs in discussions, but with limited results. Reasons for this are discussed below. There is confusion over how farmers should be involved, and at what stages of research agenda setting and implementation. The research alignment between these bodies is likely to become tighter, following an agreement in 2011 between CGIAR, CAADP and other development partners to align priorities and processes. This process, known as the “Dublin process”, is designed to be comprehensive, incorporating national, regional and continental levels. It involves the development of a science agenda for African agriculture and agreement over the areas of research.

---

17 See [www.prolinnova.net](http://www.prolinnova.net)
18 See Pimbert (2012)
19 “Dublin Process” Aligning Agendas for Agricultural Transformation in Africa. Steering committee is co-chaired by USAID and WB, with other members from AU, NEPAD, CGIAR, FARA and major donors such as EC.
within identified broad topics. An aim is to harmonise funding and avoid duplication in order to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of funding research. During 2013, CGIAR and CAADP institutions at regional and sub-regional levels will be working towards formulating objectives for new research programmes.

As illustrated in Figure 1, the linkages between the research organisations remain mostly top-down, with close links amongst global, regional and sub-regional levels, but far fewer at national level. The links between farmers, local NGOs and FOs and the other levels tend to be localised, based on multiple, but separate arrangements between the research organisations and the farmers. Influence of farmers and CSOs on the tightly-knit group of research organisations is dispersed and not coordinated.
Linkages between major stakeholders involved in Agricultural Research for Development

Regional
- AU-NEPAD
- AGRA
- CAADP
- Pillar IV
- FARA
- ASARECA
- CORAF
- CCARDESA
- AFAAS RUFORUM

Sub-regional
- Government
  - Ministry of Agriculture, Ministries of science & technology
- National Farmers' organisations
- Universities
- Agricultural Research Institutes (NARIs)

National
- NGOs
- local FOs
- Rural Citizens
  - Farmers and small-scale food producers, smallholders, labourers, traders, other professions, larger-scale farmers

Local
- Other government interests, eg China
- International Private Sector Agro-business
- Other Donors eg Gates, Rockefeller
- Donors/Policy makers USAID, EC, World Bank
- Other food security initiatives, eg CFS
- Other food security initiatives, eg CFS

Global
- International Private Sector Agro-business
- Other Donors eg Gates, Rockefeller
- Donors/Policy makers USAID, EC, World Bank
- Other food security initiatives, eg CFS

Consultation/collaboration link
- Strong
- Weak

Field level research
- AU-NEPAD
- AFAAS RUFORUM

Funding link
- International
- Regional
- National

Figure 1: ARD links
Problems with CSO engagement

Amongst the international research organisations and donors that do want ARD to respond more to the needs of smallholder farmers, there is acceptance that the inputs and involvement of CSOs (NGOs, FOs and CBOs) will be crucial in order to achieve this (see GCARD II^20). Many CSOs are close to smallholder realities on the ground and can help in identifying and presenting key interests and concerns. Efforts have been made to involve CSOs in ARD policy and programme development (examples are provided in INSARD’s Strategy for a CSO communication and coordination mechanism for ARD, 2012). However, the effectiveness of the current forms of CSO consultation and involvement has been limited. There are fundamental flaws related to organisation and coordination of CSO involvement, which have at times led to frustration and misunderstandings between agricultural researchers, CSOs and smallholder farmers. There are differing views of the causes of the problems, leading to different recommendations and policy prescriptions.

Major issues

Within the African ARD context, the issues can be grouped under five main areas: attitudes to smallholder farmers; the capacity for engagement; representation and accountability; mechanisms to scale up smallholder farmer-driven ARD; and resources required to facilitate engagement in ARD processes.

Attitudes to smallholder farming

Although there is a willingness amongst most researchers and policymakers to align the research agenda with the development needs of the poor, including smallholder farmers, there are still differing views on the types of smallholder to include within this scope. Despite the persistence of smallholder farming described above, some researchers regard smallholder farmers in the more remote, hazard-prone and fragile ecosystems as “unviable” in the long term; attitudes towards these farmers often remain dismissive with little recognition of their needs or their own knowledge and innovations. This can also be true amongst national-level stakeholders, some of whom may regard smallholder farming as “unprogressive” and prefer to focus on larger farming businesses that are perceived as more relevant to the country’s economic development.

This has an impact on ARD, as some farmers are seen as “more equal” than others, and concerns of the more marginalised farmers, which may include access to resources, low-external-input systems and local food markets suited to their own ecosystems, take a lower priority than the concerns of other farmers.

Capacity for researchers and CSOs to engage

An issue frequently raised by researchers was the extent to which CSOs have the capacity to engage with ARD, even if there are invitations and discussion spaces made available to them. Many CSOs working on agriculture are more concerned with development than research; they do not see the need or understand the importance of engaging with ARD issues. Few have programmes that focus on ARD. They often have limited knowledge of research processes and cannot articulate farmers’ problems as researchable questions. They therefore struggle to design research projects and their system of monitoring and evaluation is often weak.

---

^20 Global Conference on Agricultural Research for Development 2012
CSOs often have competing interests and may not agree amongst themselves. They do not coordinate their responses or organise themselves sufficiently to convey common messages from farmers, making it difficult for researchers to identify an unambiguous “farmers’ voice”. When CSOs do get involved in ARD policy issues, they are often unable to provide the evidence to back their views that appears credible to researchers.

From the CSO point of view, there is a feeling that their views are not taken seriously and they are usually by-passed in meetings: research issues raised by CSOs have been ignored or down-played. Their presence appears more about the need for research organisations to demonstrate that there is CSO participation, rather than a genuine desire to open up discussions on influencing ARD agendas. There is a lack of support to CSOs to prepare for ARD meetings and to feedback afterwards to their constituencies; there is no continuity of engagement with researchers. Although some researchers have a deep understanding of the realities of smallholder farmers’ lives through local participatory field work, when it comes to the higher-level ARD agenda setting, policymakers and researchers often show little idea or interest in the concerns of smallholders. They tend to pursue research agendas of interest to other, more powerful stakeholders.

The lack of mutual understanding between CSOs and researchers points to a capacity need on both sides. CSOs do need to build capacity to understand more about what research can do and how research processes work, so that they can engage more effectively with formal researchers and other ARD stakeholders. This would entail additional resources, stronger partnerships and shared projects. This approach retains the current form and processes of ARD, and tries to enable smallholder farmers and CSOs to fit better within the current ARD mould. It fits with a project-driven research agenda where researchers and CSOs work together and need resources and skills to access funds and deliver acceptable results for donors.

However, there is also a need for researchers to recognise that the ARD mould does need to change if they really want a more smallholder farmer-driven ARD. Researchers need to understand more about how smallholder farmers view their problems and how farmers develop their own innovations, and how research can add value to ongoing innovation processes.

**Democracy, representation and accountability**

Smallholder farmers are a diverse group with differing concerns; they also overlap with wider communities of rural populations and poor consumers (urban and rural) – all of which have legitimate interests in the future of agriculture and therefore of ARD. Current representation in ARD processes by a handful of CSOs or farmers is simply not sufficient to allow for real influence and equitable engagement. Farmers are often treated as one homogenous group, with CSOs expected to articulate one “farmers’ voice”. The needs of marginalised farmers in remote, fragile ecosystems are obviously very different from those of small-scale farmers in “high-potential” areas close to urban centres. With no clear mechanisms over how individual farmers or CSOs are selected to attend the ARD-related meetings, it is not obvious whose interests they are representing. Some NGOs may speak on behalf of farmers, but their legitimacy with, and their accountability to, farmers may be questionable. There are also concerns that national FOs represent only a narrow constituency of larger-scale farmers; they do not adequately represent the concerns of smallholder farmers.

The problem with CSO engagement can be seen as an issue primarily with lack of democracy. The corresponding solution therefore focuses less on capacity building and more on widening the
number of different voices within the ARD processes, and ensuring there is accountability back to smallholder farmers. There are two elements to this: first, for researchers and policymakers to develop more transparent ways of inviting CSOs who do represent a range of smallholder farmers; and second, for CSOs to be clearer about whom they represent and are accountable to, in particular to ensure that smallholder farmers – especially in FOs – are included.

There is also a problem of a lack of accountability of researchers towards farmers, rural people and poor consumers. Rather than farmers and CSOs building their capacity to speak the language of researchers, the research organisations have a responsibility to consult and account for their work in ways that make sense for farmers. This means recognising that CSOs have legitimate interests in long-term prioritisation of ARD as well as specific field-based projects. This means more openness to communicating, fostering innovative mechanisms for discussions with farmers (e.g. farmers’ juries), and recognising that formal research forms part of much wider agricultural innovation systems. It also requires recognition that farmers do not tend to separate ARD out from other livelihood and development issues; they are concerned with impacts on the farm as a whole. If researchers want to support farmers and CSOs, they need to be prepared to try new processes and to look for entry points on issues of concern to farmers.

One model of increased representation and CSO involvement is provided by the Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) established under the Committee on World Food Security (CFS)\(^\text{21}\). As part of the CSM, the number of representatives has been widened to include different constituencies (e.g. women farmers, pastoralists) and regions. It deliberately seeks to bring the unheard voices of the more marginalised smallholder farmers and others into the discussion, and may help shift the balance of power between the ARD stakeholders (CFS 2012).

Gaps in scaling up
There are examples of good practice and productive partnerships between farmers and researchers at local field levels. At the regional and global levels, there are well-established ARD structures where multiple farmers’ voices struggle to be heard. But, although there are initiatives such as the Prolinnova multi-stakeholder country platforms and the Malian farmers’ juries described above, there is still a huge gap between the local and the regional and international levels. In order to scale up local successes and address the lack of democracy and accountability at the higher levels, there needs to be more co-ordination processes to fill this gap. National-level processes are some of the key missing elements: this is where there is an identified lack of coordination between researchers, CSOs and other stakeholders. Some national multi-stakeholder fora have been started, e.g. the Agricultural Consultative Forum (ACF) in Zambia, but linkages to local or regional levels and inclusion of CSOs are still weak.

ARD resource allocation processes
There are two main issues here. Firstly, CSOs require resources in order to mobilise, co-ordinate with each other, consult with their wider constituencies and prepare for ARD-related meetings. They need also to provide feedback afterwards. Without this, most are limited to merely attending the meetings, but with no preparation, follow-up or long-term engagement. This limits their legitimacy and their effectiveness.

\(^{21}\) For more information see website [http://www.csm4cfs.org/](http://www.csm4cfs.org/)
Secondly, the project-funding model behind most ARD initiatives can inhibit co-operation. CSOs may not have much knowledge of donor funding mechanisms for ARD. The model can also encourage competition rather than co-operation, both between CSOs and also at other levels, such as between SROs and NARI.

INSARD approach to policy influencing

INSARD’s policy objective is to influence the agricultural research agenda and resource allocation processes and actors to include smallholders’ participation, needs and interests. This is designed to be done through engaging in constructive policy dialogue with key African and European research organisations and donors involved in ARD. It would build on and utilise the findings from the coordination and research brokerage work done by the project (Work Packages 1 and 2) to lobby key stakeholders and advocate for further pro-smallholder farmer mechanisms to be put in place.

Including smallholders’ interests in ARD means more than lobbying for increased smallholder participation in specific research implementation or consultation within research programmes. It means smallholders having a voice in how research problems are identified and prioritised; how research is carried out and whose criteria are used to assess research outputs. It includes how smallholders and rural citizens influence the long-term direction of agricultural research and its governance to ensure that it is relevant to their needs and priorities.

The project resources do not allow for major policy initiatives, and the policy influencing work will be closely interwoven with work on the research brokerage, using the findings from that work and building on the linkages established with stakeholders in selected pilot countries.

The INSARD project seeks to be a catalyst: it will focus on positive messages based around successful models of farmer-driven research agendas in seeking to persuade and influence others to continue to push for pro-smallholder changes in ARD policy and practice. This is where INSARD can add most value.

There are two main strands to influencing ARD policy:

- to achieve a change in attitude towards recognising the importance of a more demand-driven and smallholder-focused ARD – this is particularly relevant to stakeholders who are unconvinced of the need to include smallholders in ARD;
- to achieve a change in behaviour, procedures and practice to enable effective engagement between smallholder farmers, CSOs and researchers on development of research priorities and approaches backed by resource flows to allow this to happen. Influencing messages need to be specific, based on practice and findings from the work of INSARD and its partners and also that of other like-minded organisations.

Consistent with this and given INSARD’s limited resources, the influencing strategy will adopt an “insider” track approach, using lobbying and use of evidence to influence key stakeholders (see

22 See Annex 1 for outline of the Work packages
This “reformist” approach\textsuperscript{23} requires advocacy with detailed knowledge of practice and cooperation with stakeholders. INSARD will seek to work with others who are also trying to influence and promote smallholder-driven ARD systems.

**Figure 2: Policy influencing approaches**

**Principles underlying INSARD’s influencing strategy**

Although INSARD will adopt a constructive, reformist approach, there are some fundamental principles that underlie all the policy influencing messages. These include:

- Smallholder farmers are vital for future food security: researchers have a role in supporting and enabling smallholder farmers to continue to produce nutritious food into the future, whilst not undermining the environmental base. Researchers have a responsibility to consult and account for their work in ways that make sense to farmers.

- There should be a focus on all smallholder farmers, not just those in areas with high external market potential (“high potential” areas) – with special attention to the more marginalised farmers in fragile ecosystems, who are likely to be producing food for people in areas at greater risk of food insecurity.

- Agricultural systems are multi-functional, providing not just crop/animal production and income, but a whole range of social, economic and environmental services. A holistic view of research is

\textsuperscript{23} Reformist approach targets technical (implementing) levels of institutions and tries to influence specific programmes or practices. It contrasts with an “abolitionist” approach which targets political levels of institutions and attempts to influence global processes, structures and ideologies (BOND Guidance Notes on Advocacy).
needed to effectively address problems facing farmers and the wider communities and align the research agenda with development needs. Research into issues such as access and control of resources, coping with complex hazards or environmental degradation may be among farmers’ priorities and should not be dismissed because they do not fit so easily into research frameworks geared around increasing productivity or value addition.

- **Agricultural research contributes to a sustainable and pro-poor development approach, in which people have a voice in their own development.** INSARD does not speak “for” smallholder farmers, but aims to facilitate a bottom-up approach to enable smallholders to voice their own concerns.

- **Innovation in agriculture comes not only from formal research or via market-led technology development.** Farmers – including those in market-remote areas – are also innovators. An ARD system that recognises, works with and enables farmer innovation is more likely to deliver effective and relevant outputs than a system that continues trying to transfer research outputs and technologies without awareness of local innovation.

**Key policy messages**
Potential policy-influencing objectives and associated risks were identified for five groups of stakeholders:

1. European ARD donors and policymakers
2. International and Regional research organisations
3. Sub-regional research organisations
4. National-level policymakers and research organisations
5. CSOs – including NGOs and FOs

This categorisation provided a framework for deciding where to prioritise, before developing the detailed stakeholder engagement plans.

1. **European ARD donors and policymakers**

**Potential policy influencing objectives**
EU policy has supported the alignment of agricultural research with development objectives, and ARD issues cut across two Directorates: DG Research and Innovation, and DG DEVCO (under Food Security). With a new research funding programme under development (“EU Horizon 2020”) and pressures from member states to support European-based research and to promote short-term growth, there is a risk that the needs of smallholder farmers for relevant research and their importance to long-term food security will be overlooked. The policy-influencing objectives would therefore focus on:

- Ensuring that the importance of smallholder-driven research agenda is fully recognised within the new EU funding policies;

- Recognising the diversity of smallholder farmers and the need to ensure that EU funding recipients have mechanisms in place to promote and widen the involvement of CSOs who work with all types of smallholder farmers in ARD;
Allocating resources to allow for effective CSO engagement in ARD, including preparation, coordination and feedback on ARD issues, support for national platforms on ARD with strong CSO representation and support for more smallholder farmer-led research and development.

**Risks**

Member states’ individual objectives may prioritise their own research and growth objectives above development objectives. Although the advent of new EU programmes provides an opportunity for consultation and influence, the pressure to start the new programmes quickly may make it difficult for policymakers to consider smallholder-driven ARD.

**Opportunities**

Influencing at EU level is limited by the time and resources of the project, especially as INSARD would be one amongst a crowded field of organisations lobbying European ARD policymakers. With the new “Horizon 2020” research funding strategy, there is not yet a clear published timeline for events in 2013 that INSARD could engage with, although some may emerge later in the year.

INSARD partners do have links with EU ARD groups such as EFARD and programmes such as PAEPARD, and with other NGOs, so there are opportunities for joint advocacy and dissemination of findings and policy recommendations from the project.

2. **International and regional research organisations**

**Potential policy influencing objectives**

These organisations are agreed on the need for smallholder involvement in ARD, so the policy influencing objectives would focus on changes to practices in order that these institutions move to fully support effective participation by CSOs. This would include:

- Recognising the diversity of smallholder farming and widening the number and types of CSOs so that more smallholder farmers are represented in ARD (the CSM approach provides a model of this), i.e. making the system more democratic and more accountable;

- Providing resources to support mechanisms for CSOs to learn more about research processes, and to convene meetings before and provide feedback afterwards to their constituents;

- Providing resources for researchers to learn more about smallholder farmers’ priorities and to engage in joint research processes (using examples from the research brokerage work in INSARD and elsewhere to provide policymakers with examples of how NGOs working with smallholder farmers on the ground have managed to operationalise the theories of farmer-led participatory innovation processes being discussed at international level.)

**Risks**

Researchers may be comfortable with the idea of CSOs learning more about research processes and fitting better into the current ARD system, but find it more difficult to accept that there is a need for researchers to move more towards farmers. Making ARD more democratic and accountable to smallholders might be resisted, as it would lessen the control over ARD agendas by research organisations themselves.
The ongoing “Dublin process” means that research organisations are already undergoing changes and developing new objectives. To some extent, the overall research themes have been already set and the ongoing process is not so open to those outside the international research system. It is difficult in practice for a project such as INSARD to influence the process directly.

**Opportunities**

INSARD has already raised issues around smallholder involvement in ARD with the international research organisations, for example, at GCARD II. Opportunities for effective influence during the coming year are limited, partly due to the changes taking place under the “Dublin process”. There is greater potential for INSARD partners to link with the CAADP processes through FARPA, SROs and national levels than with the CGIAR organisations. It is noted that some new CGIAR Research Programmes (CRPs) are proposing to take an innovation-systems approach, and there may be a possibility to engage with these to some extent.

3. **Sub-regional organisations**

**Potential policy-influencing objectives**

The SROs’ current role in coordination and linkage between national-level and regional ARD agendas is limited. They are more effective at transmitting funds and research topics downwards to the NARIs, then transmitting local, smallholder-influenced research needs upwards. They could widen the diversity of representation on their advisory boards and governing bodies to include more CSOs to help address this. Policy influencing objectives include:

- Recognising the need to ensure their research is responsive to smallholder needs, and that smallholder priorities should influence agenda setting, not just be confined to project-level field work;
- Reviewing representation on advisory boards and inviting greater involvement of CSOs working with smallholder farmers or in smallholder farmer organisations on their governing bodies;
- Increasing strategic linkages, support and feedback to national-level platforms, as well as channelling national research issues (identified together with smallholder farmers) up to regional bodies.

**Risks**

The SROs may lack incentives to spend time on involving CSOs unless their project donors are also pushing for more smallholder-responsive work. They may also lack resources to spend on networking and linking with national agendas, and find it difficult if national governments do not reciprocate with interest in discussing research priorities or have their own differing objectives that do not align with those of the SROs. As part of the Dublin process, they will be involved in revising objectives and programmes. In theory, a more programmatic approach with development outcomes might enable them to strengthen a decentralised approach to research with strategic linkages with CSOs and national research agendas. However, in practice, the closer harmonisation between the research organisations may have the opposite effect of reducing local flexibility in agenda setting in order to align with international objectives.
**Opportunities**

There are likely to be opportunities for dialogue with the SROs, as INSARD partners have some linkages with them. There may be potential to influence practices, for example, around representation on advisory boards, especially with the recently-formed CCARDESA. However, these SROs remain under the control of the regional bodies, so they may have limited scope to make changes.

4. **National stakeholders**

**Potential policy-influencing objectives**

The lack of inclusive national-level platforms to bring together stakeholders on ARD is a major gap in scaling up smallholder farmers’ engagement in ARD. However, while ARD remains low on the priorities of national stakeholders (other than research institutes), there will be little support for engagement with national platforms. Therefore, policy-influencing objectives include:

- An essential first step: raising awareness of ARD and its impact on future agricultural systems in order to persuade national-level organisations to increase their interest in engaging in it;
- Raising awareness of the need to involve smallholder farmers in ARD in order to achieve the most effective outcomes in terms of innovations, scaling up adaptive capacities and achieving long-term food security;
- Lobbying for a national platform with strong CSO presence interacting with researchers and other stakeholders to influence national-level ARD priorities.

**Risks**

National-level institutions often lack funds to support a platform and the associated resources to bring stakeholders together. It may be difficult to find a “neutral” space where one organisation is not perceived to dominate.

**Opportunities**

The national level is where there is a gap in effective mechanisms to allow local smallholder farmer priorities to be included in national ARD agendas, and to link up to sub-regional and regional research agendas (identified in previous sections). There are opportunities at national level for policy engagement. INSARD partners have knowledge of, and links with local and national stakeholders. Policy influencing would build directly on the research brokerage work (under Work Package 2), and use the results to influence other national organisations. Where there are already national ARD fora in existence, INSARD would seek to influence these to adopt smallholder-driven agendas and to involve CSOs more effectively.

5. **CSOs – including NGOs and FOs**

**Potential policy influencing objectives**

Policy influencing objectives depend on the type of CSO. For CSOs that are working on rural and agricultural issues in Africa but are not involved in ARD, an essential first step is to encourage them to get involved. The main policy influencing objectives would be:

- Raising awareness of the potential benefits of ARD for smallholder farmers if the ARD agenda were responsive to their needs;
- Encouraging CSOs to increase their knowledge and understanding of formal research processes in order to engage more effectively with researchers;
- Urging CSOs to collaborate with each other, and to come together with researchers and policymakers to participate in national-level fora on ARD agenda.

For those NGOs that already work closely with farmers and research institutes on field-level projects, the key policy influencing objectives would be:

- Persuading these practice-oriented NGOs of the need to use their knowledge for greater impact, and engage with long-term ARD agenda setting, in addition to their local fieldwork;
- Collaborating with other practice- and policy-oriented NGOs and participate with researchers and policymakers in national-level fora on ARD.

For all CSOs, but for FOs especially, an additional policy influencing objective would focus on representation:

- Promoting better representation of and accountability to smallholder farmers from diverse backgrounds and ecosystems, so that their research needs and their own innovations are recognised in the research agenda.

**Risks**
Some FOs and NGOs may be reluctant to widen out their roles to include smallholder farmers or to share dialogue space with a greater range of CSOs representing smallholder farmer interests, perceiving it to be a potential threat to their own privileged positions.

**Opportunities**
As part of the research brokerage work, there are ongoing opportunities to influence CSOs through working together and through facilitating interactions with researchers and other stakeholders.

**Choices and priorities**
Taking into account the policy influencing objectives, plus the risks of, and opportunities for, engagement with different stakeholder groups, INSARD partners decided to focus on the following:

**Bottom-up approach:** Influencing priorities will focus primarily on encouraging and facilitating smallholder farmers via CSOs to coordinate and push for a more demand-driven ARD agenda in their countries. This will take precedence over a more top-down strategy aimed at influencing the existing international ARD system to change. It is hoped that, by encouraging increased engagement in national ARD agendas, CSOs and researchers will continue to interact and push for further changes after the end of the project.

**Prioritise national-level influencing:** This is where the greatest gap in policy influencing exists and where INSARD can build on its research brokerage work and use its links with national stakeholders. Key decisions are made by national governments on research funding and there is more potential to mobilise national stakeholders to engage than by working at international levels where resource scarcity would limit engagement. A focus on national-level influencing would embrace government policymakers, research institutes, NGOs and FOs.
Take opportunities for influencing the SROs: Although this is not the priority area for allocation of scarce INSARD resources, if opportunities arise to present INSARD findings or take part in policy dialogues with SROs, then this will be done, if resources allow.

Focus on raising awareness in Europe of the need for smallholder-driven ARD: Through disseminating findings from INSARD to EU policymakers, research initiatives and NGOs. Wherever possible, INSARD partners will work with NGO partners or EU-supported initiatives to increase coverage and impact.

Focus on the agricultural and natural resource management research system: Rather than extending influencing to organisations concerned with wider food security issues.

Look for quick wins and work with existing institutions and processes: Given the short time span of the project, the aim should be to raise awareness and demonstrate some positive messages through examples in order to encourage further developments after the project ends. The project should avoid promoting new initiatives that might not be sustainable if it is possible to work with existing structures in influencing ARD.

Look for key influencers with potential to lead change: Prioritise these over other stakeholders that are undergoing funding or organisational issues that may inhibit change.

Maintain some flexibility: Alongside the plan for engaging key stakeholders, opportunities for influencing other important stakeholders should be identified and taken up, if resources permit.
Stakeholder engagement plans

Stakeholder engagement plans were initially drawn up during the November 2012 workshop for each of the target countries where INSARD activities are ongoing: Zambia, Tanzania and Senegal, plus an international plan, using a guide sheet (in annex). The plans identify specific target organisations and the desired outcomes from influencing. They detail potential allies, specific activities, timetable and the resources required to support the activities. Each plan was based on the partner’s local knowledge of organisations, supplemented by knowledge from key informants.

Zambia
At the national level, the ruling party does have a large research agenda and the Ministry of Agriculture and Co-operatives (MACO) has strong links with the CAADP processes. There are substantial research funds in the region, and most come through FARA – as implementers or CAADP Pillar IV on research. Therefore, the CAADP focal person at the MACO is a crucial stakeholder for influencing.

The Zambia Agriculture Research Institute (ZARI) is the research arm of the government, so it plans and undertakes government research. However, if ZARI’s research agenda is to be more demand-driven by smallholder farmers, then this will need support from MACO to prioritise ARD in its plans and in the CAADP investment plan. Hence the importance of targeting MACO.

The National Institute for Scientific and Industrial Research (NISIR) also plays a role in influencing research agendas. This is a research forum mainly for researchers, but has links with PELUM Zambia.

The Zambian National Farmers Union (ZNFU) does engage with the government and other research institutes, and is a highly recognised voice for farmers by government and other stakeholders. However, its constituency and messages at national level appears biased towards the larger, wealthier farmers so effectively excluding the majority of smallholder farmers that it purports to represent. This is a key influencing target, given its position and linkages to ARD.

CSOs working on rural and agricultural issues have not worked together on ARD issues, and the main influencing approach will be through the setting up of a working group (under Work Package 2) to bring CSOs together with other stakeholders to discuss and develop mechanisms for engagement in ARD processes. The working group will build on an already existing forum, the Agriculture Consultative Forum (ACF), through which INSARD partners will seek to raise the importance of developing an ARD agenda as part of its core focus areas. The ACF is a multi-stakeholder forum including government, researchers, agri-business, NGOs and farmers which promotes private-public dialogue and consultation on agricultural policies and programmes. The forum is considered a key partner to government and its advice is taken seriously. This has potential to provide a platform to bring in a wider range of voices to influence policy, especially if CSOs can fully participate and strengthen the forum’s grassroots link to smallholder farmers whom agriculture development is intended to benefit.
As part of that process, INSARD partners will raise awareness of the importance of ARD with CSOs that are not yet involved in ARD, and lobby them to participate with researchers and research agendas through the ACF.

Opportunities to influence other stakeholders will be taken, if resources permit. In particular, the INSARD team will check on opportunities to engage with sub-regional organisations, particularly CCARDESA, in order to exert influence on promoting a smallholder farmer-driven research agenda under CAADP.

The policy-influencing strategy has three main components: firstly, working with selected CSOs to build their awareness, interest and knowledge of ARD, as part of forming a working group to undertake joint research proposals and linked with ACF; secondly, engaging with ZNFU in order to lobby for more active inclusion of smallholder farmers’ interests; thirdly, engaging with MACO to lobby for support for a national forum on ARD with effective CSO involvement and prioritisation of demand-driven ARD, i.e. funding research institutions and activities that promote farmer-led research. Details are shown in the table below.
## Zambia Stakeholder Engagement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/Region</th>
<th>Target stakeholders</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Policy Engagement Activities</th>
<th>Resources required</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Influencing Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>NGOs working on agriculture issues: PELUM Zambia, Concern, World Vision, Caritas, Women for change, ESAFF Zambia, KATC, ACF (Agriculture Consultative Forum)</td>
<td>NGOs in Zambia become active in ARD (they take up available spaces for engagement on ARD e.g. NAIP &amp; other consultations working with ACF; use the ground evidence and experience which to feed into any consultations)</td>
<td>Understand the organisations’ working areas</td>
<td>Telephone, website reviews. Costs covered under WP2</td>
<td>Feb - May</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organise one on one meetings targeting their staff meetings. Make presentation about INSARD, and why they should get involved in ARD</td>
<td>INSARD publications, Policy presentation on importance of NGOs to be involved in ARD, Financial resources transport. 100 euro</td>
<td>Feb-March</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Involve them in national level working group (under WP 2) (agreeing on action plan being part of the agenda)</td>
<td>as above, 500 euro</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>CSOs agree to join national level working group. CSOs contribute to action plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>National level FO: Zambia National farmers Union</td>
<td>Improve representation from a diverse groups of your constituencies- farmers particularly smallholder and marginalised farmers</td>
<td>Set up meetings to present alternative models such as the Civil Society Mechanism of CFS to ZNFU</td>
<td>Policy Presentation &amp; briefing on importance of diverse representation and CFS model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lobby ZNFU through followup meetings to get the right representative into the RD Working Group</td>
<td>as above</td>
<td>ZNFU implement actions to include more smallholder farmers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identify and influence their funding partners to support the agenda of effective representation Set up meetings with donors as required</td>
<td>as above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>National government: Ministry of Agriculture and Co-operatives (MACO)</td>
<td>Adopt ARD processes that are inclusive and provide mechanisms for diverse group representation</td>
<td>Meetings with Ministry of MACO to increase awareness on ARD for inclusiveness in ARD and increase budget to ARD including the National Agricultural Investment Plan (NAIP)</td>
<td>200 euro</td>
<td>May-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preparatory work with the Smallholder farmers before workshop</td>
<td>800 euro</td>
<td>May-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 day Workshop targeting MACO, Ministry of science, FOs, ARD donors to share emerging issues outcomes and influence them for bottom-up approach in ARD processes (Will include bringing SSFs who participated in WP 2 to share their experience)</td>
<td>2,500 euro</td>
<td>Jun-13</td>
<td>Stakeholders agree to make changes to include CSOs in ARD agenda setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy presentation and briefing on benefits for wider representation and a model of CFS</td>
<td>Only when opportunity arise - in Botswana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Sub-Regional Organisation: CCARDESA</td>
<td>promote participatory research and allocate funding to it</td>
<td>Policy presentation and briefing on benefits for wider representation and a model of CFS</td>
<td>Only when opportunity arise - in Botswana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other** put in place a mechanism for inclusive representation

**CCARDESA invites more CSOs to join advisory board**
Tanzania
The policy-influencing strategy also has three main components, but places more emphasis on using the media to bring discussions on the importance of ARD and its responsiveness to smallholders farmers to a wider public – and therefore as a means of influencing government.

One strand of influencing will focus on relations between farmers and researchers by bringing local Agricultural Research Institutes and surrounding smallholder farmers together, facilitated by CSOs with the aim of building mutual awareness and knowledge of ARD. In addition, the Ministry of Agriculture will be lobbied through meetings backed by messages disseminated via the media, to increase support for ARD and for greater responsiveness to smallholder farmers. A national workshop which brings together farmers, CSOs, government and some international bodies is planned to promote formation of a national platform and a more positive attitude to smallholder farmers and ARD.

Engagement with regional and sub-regional bodies such as ASARECA, Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Directorate (FANR) of SADC and Africa-wide networks such as the Food, Agriculture, Natural Resources Policy Analysis Network (FARNPAN) are planned in order to influence policy inputs to initiatives such as CAADP Pillar IV.
## Tanzania Stakeholder Engagement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets stakeholders</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Collaborating with / allies</th>
<th>What</th>
<th>Resources &amp; budget</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Influencing Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania Agricultural Research Institutes (Ilonga and Hombolo) and Farmer Communities around ARIs. CSOs include ESAFF, PELUM, MVIWATA</td>
<td>All understand the reasons for involving smallholders in ARD. ARIs focus on Smallholder farmers &amp; recognise their obligations to &amp; delivery of research to smallholders Farmers understand the role and obligation of ARIs towards them. Major advocacy issues are identified.</td>
<td>ESAFF, MVIWATA, PELUM Tanzania, Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA)</td>
<td>Core group meeting. Dialogue between researchers and farmers about Smallholder farmers research oriented on crops and livestocks. Activities include meetings with research institutes; facilitation of meetings with farmers and researchers. Agreed roadmap, refined TORs</td>
<td>Preparation of farmers community for a breakfast talk with researchers, appointment with RI, Facilitator, Conference logistics, transport, lunches. Resources person</td>
<td>Feb/March</td>
<td>Farmers and researchers plan meetings and activities together, outside the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; international level stakeholders: Farmers, CSOs, private sector, researchers, government officials</td>
<td>Formation of national consultative forum on involving smallholders in ARD. Stakeholders support forum.</td>
<td>ESAFF, Farmer groups, MVIWATA, PELUM Tanzania, SWISSAID, Agriculture Non-State Actor Forum (ANSAF), Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA), Tanzania Biodiversity Organisation (TABIO), Tanzania Organic Association Movement (TOAM), Tanzania Chamber of Commerce, Industry and Agriculture (TCCIA), ActionAid, ENVIROCARE, Ministry of Agriculture, Agriculture Research Institutes – Ilonga- Morogoro and Hombolo - Dodoma</td>
<td>Conduct breakfast talks on ARD in Tanzania: the trend and the future. Add an additional day to the National Multistakeholders consultative workshop planned for WP2 for this</td>
<td>Facilitation/logistics, transport refund, lunches, video documentation and editing. 1,500 euro</td>
<td>May/June</td>
<td>Debate in media on ARD continues after the media coverage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Public and Government: (MoA, MoF, ARIs and General Public)</td>
<td>General public and policymakers aware of role of ARD and Smallholder farmers. They support ARD responsive to smallholder farmers.</td>
<td>Cartoonist and Major Media houses in Tanzania like (TV and Radio) TBC1, ITV, Channel 10, Star TV (Newspapers), The Guardian, The Citizen, Mwananchi, Daily News, Habari Leo, Mtanzania, Majira and Nipashe</td>
<td>Media Advocacy: Put ARD in the public arena through involving media in INSARD activities and disseminating information. Policy positions on financing AR in Tanzania</td>
<td>Policy position paper on the trend of financing ARD and recommendations from farmers and researchers. 2,000 euro</td>
<td>Jan - June</td>
<td>Government openly supports pro-smallholder research agendas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional &amp; sub-regional organisations: FANR, FANRPAN and ASARECA and the EAC Directorate of Agriculture</td>
<td>Increased farmers visibility, voices and recognition by SROs</td>
<td>ESAFF Members and PELUM Officials</td>
<td>Establish linkages between ESAFF / PELUM and the SROs. Joint discussions on policy positions on AR trends in Tanzania, CAADP Compact on pillar 4 for EAC, SADC RAP</td>
<td>Travel cost and perdiems to FANRPAN and ASARECA/EAC</td>
<td>Jan - June if resources allow.</td>
<td>Meetings set up between organisations independently of the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Senegal
The policy-influencing strategy will follow the research brokerage process closely and target the same NGOs and FOs defined in the Tanzanian scoping study. However, it will seek to extend the debate from the particular example used for the research process (on land tenure) to initiate discussions on the future of ARD and involvement of smallholder farmers. As part of this, a forum is planned to bring together CSOs in order to discuss issues around ARD: what it is, what processes are involved and how CSOs can engage with researchers on ARD agendas. This will include defining a plan to follow up with CSOs on their engagement with ARD processes.

To raise wider awareness of ARD issues amongst the general public, a TV roundtable debate is planned where INSARD partners can disseminate key messages on ARD during debate with journalists.

The team will also follow up opportunities to work with the sub-regional organisation, CORAF, particularly on ways of enhancing smallholder farmer-driven research. There are FOs and NGOs in the General Assembly within the Administration Committee of CORAF, but no clear mechanisms for them to integrate with relevant national processes. There is potential for constructive dialogue in providing examples of how to strengthen support for farmer-driven ARD, building on their existing initiatives.
## Senegal Stakeholder Engagement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/Region</th>
<th>Target stakeholders</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Policy Engagement Activities</th>
<th>Resources required &amp; budget</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Influencing indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>Raise awareness of the importance of ARD and of smallholder farmer-driven research</td>
<td>Round table with television media (debate with journalist and some INSARD team members)</td>
<td>Media coverage, dissemination of key messages on ARD. 1,000 euro</td>
<td>Juin 2012, during MT meeting</td>
<td>Continued public debate on ARD following Round table debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>CSOs (NGOs and FOs)</td>
<td>CSOs have increased knowledge of and interest in ARD. CSOs commit to increase their involvement in ARD</td>
<td>ARD sensitisation and advocacy forum (1 day, 50 persons)</td>
<td>Presentations on INSARD approach and key messages 4,000 euro</td>
<td></td>
<td>At least 3 CSOs agree to engage with researchers on ARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explaining what is ARD? Why ARD is important for small scale holders? How can FOs and CSOs involve themselves to improve their involvement in ARD?</td>
<td>Meeting report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Defining a plan to follow up on FOs and CSOs on how they will involve more in ARD</td>
<td>Policy brief note</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan for a national forum on ARD formulated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>SRO: CORAF</td>
<td>Influence CORAF to promote smallholder farmer-driven research and involve CSOs in research agenda</td>
<td>Keep a check on CORAF potential events to which Insard can attend. Offer to present at a CORAF meeting</td>
<td>Presentations on INSARD approach and key messages</td>
<td>All time</td>
<td>CORAF invite CSOs to join advisory board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Europe

With the main emphasis on influencing policy at national level in Africa, the European strategy will aim first and foremost to support initiatives in the African countries through providing policy materials such as presentations geared for different audiences (CSOs, researchers, policymakers).

A second strand is to ensure that the INSARD experiences and policy messages from the countries are disseminated to a wide audience through international and European CSO networks involved in agriculture. These will include CSO-GARD\(^ {24}\) plus national networks such as the UK Food Group. Wider development networks such as the new CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE) may also be included. Research networks will include GFAR, EFARD and the PAEPARD blogs.

INSARD will aim to support a process of mobilising European-based CSOs to promote smallholder farmer-driven ARD in Africa. Key players will include CONCORD (European Confederation of Relief and Development NGOs), along with other NGOs concerned with ARD such as APRODEV. This will be done through organising a meeting on ARD during the fourth quarter of 2013 targeting a wide range of stakeholders, preceded by discussions with CSOs to plan strategy for the meeting and beyond. A meeting outline will be prepared and CSOs invited to collaborate. INSARD will draw on the expertise of its partner, GRET, in organising the meeting.

In addition, INSARD will seek to use experiences from the project to influence the formulation of the new EU funding programmes through DG DEVCO – the new food security thematic area – and through DG Research and Innovation – the new Horizon 2020 initiative. This requires long-term engagement well beyond the means of INSARD, but an attempt will be made to initiate the process by working with partners and using existing meetings and processes where possible. A number of possible opportunities have been identified and will be followed up including:

- Linking with Agrinatura\(^ {25}\), and working with the EC-funded PAEPARD project to develop inputs on ways of continuing to support effective CSO involvement in ARD, to seek opportunities for joint meetings with DEVCO staff working on the new EU Food Security Thematic Programme;
- Linking with EIARD to present INSARD experiences and to push for smallholder-driven ARD agendas to be given priority within Horizon 2020;
- Linking with CTA\(^ {26}\) to organise a Brussels Briefing on smallholder-driven ARD.

INSARD partners have already taken opportunities to debate or present on INSARD at European or international meetings, for example, at the “Tracking Investment in ARD” workshop hosted by GFAR, EIARD and the Global Donor Platform for Rural Development (GDPRD) in January 2012. Further opportunities will be sought, but without use of additional project resources.

---

\(^{24}\) CSO-GARD (CSO Group on Agricultural Research and Development) is a global e-network open to all CSOs and individuals with an interest in ARD.


## Europe Stakeholder Engagement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/Region</th>
<th>Target stakeholders</th>
<th>Outcome desired</th>
<th>Policy Engagement Activities</th>
<th>Resources required &amp; budget</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Influencing Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>Country/Regional stakeholders: Zambia, Tanzania, Senegal</td>
<td>Support provided to facilitate country/regional influencing plans</td>
<td>Provide examples of advocacy approaches and meetings. Tailored policy presentations for different audiences: CSOs, researchers, policymakers</td>
<td>Development of policy presentations and briefings</td>
<td>Feb-12</td>
<td>Materials used by all country teams by end July 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>European &amp; worldwide CSOs: Networks including CSO-GARD, CONCORD, CPDE, UK food group and related EC-funded projects PAEPARD and EFARD</td>
<td>Raise awareness of ARD and smallholder issues &amp; the need for CSOs to engage</td>
<td>Disseminate INSARD policy messages. Take opportunities to present on INSARD eg. Presentation at “Tracking investment in ARD” GFAR, EIARD, GDPRD workshop, Jan 2012.</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>INSARD messages forwarded to new networks or organisations by other stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>EC, EC-funded initiatives, DEVCO food security, Research &amp; Innovation - Horizon2020, EIARD</td>
<td>Influence new EC funding programmes: Food Security Thematic Programme and Horizon 2020 to support smallholder farmer-driven ARD</td>
<td>Meetings with PAEPARD and CTA: joint opportunities for meetings with EC Food Security and CONCORD</td>
<td>May - Nov2013</td>
<td>EC policy papers include references to smallholder demand-driven ARD. EC prepared to allocate funding for CSO involvement in ARD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>European CSOs</td>
<td>Initiate mobilisation of European CSOs for longer-term engagement with policymakers and researchers on ARD</td>
<td>Invitations to pre-seminar meetings with CSOs to plan strategy for seminar with researchers and policymakers</td>
<td>July - Oct 2013</td>
<td>CSOs agree to participate and to continue to engage in ARD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOs, EU, EFARD, PAEPARD,</td>
<td>Lessons from INSARD experience used to inform debate on ARD</td>
<td>Seminar with researchers, policymakers and CSOs</td>
<td>Meeting costs, preparation of materials from INSARD project</td>
<td>Oct - Dec 2013</td>
<td>Agreement to continue to engage with CSOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monitoring and Evaluation

The policy-influencing plans will be reviewed at the Management Team meeting in June 2013. In addition to checking completion of activities, output indicators have been included within the plans. These are specific outputs which can be monitored by the INSARD team and included in the project reports.

In terms of impact of the project, an important indicator of success will be evidence of any independent initiatives by one or more stakeholders to modify their practices to improve CSO engagement. The following are examples of relevant indicators of impact or outcome:

- Increases in the diversity of CSOs included in ARD discussions and on ARD advisory boards;
- Development of joint research plans involving CSOs and researchers;
- Articulation of the need for smallholder-driven research agenda in new national and sub-regional policy documents;
- Agreement and development of a national-level forum including both researchers and CSOs; and
- Resources allocated by donors to facilitate CSOs’ engagement in ARD agenda setting.

Within the remaining year of the project and given the complexity of policy processes, it is unlikely that these impact indicators will be achieved by the end of the project. However, the INSARD team will make initial contributions to some of these indicators of change. The project will monitor and report on any observed changes within selected stakeholder organisations as described in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome indicator</th>
<th>Stakeholder monitored</th>
<th>Responsibility to monitor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Increase is diversity of CSOs at ARD meetings | Government-led ARD discussions  
SRO advisory boards | INSARD country teams |
| Joint CSO/researcher-led research plans | CSOs | INSARD country teams |
| Smallholder-driven research agenda in policy documents | National agricultural research policy | INSARD country teams |
| Development of national forum including CSOs and researchers | National ARD forum | INSARD country teams |
| Resource allocation by donors for CSO engagement | EU food security programme  
EU research and innovation programme | INSARD European team |
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**List of Acronyms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACF</td>
<td>Agriculture Consultative Forum (Zambia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFAAS</td>
<td>African Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRA</td>
<td>Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKST</td>
<td>Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARD</td>
<td>Agricultural Research for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASARECA</td>
<td>Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU/NEPAD</td>
<td>African Union/New Partnership for Africa’s Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAADP</td>
<td>Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community Based Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCARDESA</td>
<td>Centre for Coordination of Agricultural Research and Development for Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGIAR</td>
<td>Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMESA</td>
<td>Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCORD</td>
<td>European Confederation of Relief and Development NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORAF/WECARD</td>
<td>Conseil ouest et centre africain pour la recherche et le développement agricoles / West and Central African Council for Agricultural Research and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRS</td>
<td>Catholic Relief Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>Collectif Stratégies Alimentaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO-GARD</td>
<td>Civil Society Organisation Group on Agricultural Research and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTA</td>
<td>Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVCO</td>
<td>EU Directorate General – EuropeAid and Development Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAFF</td>
<td>East African Farmers’ Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFARD</td>
<td>European Forum for Agricultural Research for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIARD</td>
<td>European Initiative for Agricultural Research for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESAFF</td>
<td>Eastern and Southern Africa small scale Farmers’ Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FANR</td>
<td>Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources programme of SADC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARA</td>
<td>Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARNPAN</td>
<td>Food, Agriculture, Natural Resources Policy Analysis Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOs</td>
<td>Farmers’ Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMO</td>
<td>Genetically Modified Organism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRET</td>
<td>Professionals for fair development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAASTD</td>
<td>International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSARD</td>
<td>Including Smallholders in Agricultural Research for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACO</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture and Co-Operatives, Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDTF</td>
<td>Multi-Donor Trust Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARI</td>
<td>National Agricultural Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARS</td>
<td>National Agricultural Research System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSARD</td>
<td>Policy Influencing Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NISIR</td>
<td>National Institute for Scientific and Industrial Research, Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODI</td>
<td>Overseas Development Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAEPARD</td>
<td>Platform for African-European Partnership on Agricultural Research for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PELUM</td>
<td>Participatory Ecological Land Use Management Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAPID</td>
<td>ODI’s Research and Policy in Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPAOC</td>
<td>Réseau des Plates-formes nationales d’ONG d’Afrique de l’Ouest et du Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUFORUM</td>
<td>Regional Universities Forum for Capacity Building in Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SADC</td>
<td>Southern Africa Development Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZARI</td>
<td>Zambia Agriculture Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZNFU</td>
<td>Zambian National Farmers Union</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 1: INSARD Work Packages

INSARD interventions are organised around four Work Packages (WPs). These are shown in the table below, with the associated main tasks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Package</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP1: Design and agree on a system for coordination and communication between European and SSA CSOs</td>
<td>1.1 Formalising linkages and coordination with existing initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Setting up (and operationalising) an INSARD Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Conduct a mapping study on existing CSO coordination and communication mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 Holding an international meeting to discuss the results of the mapping exercise and come up with a joint document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 Revising the document produced under 1.4 following recommendations from the Advisory group and internal evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP2: Jointly develop (with FOs especially) research outlines</td>
<td>2.1 Carrying out consultations on approaches to jointly develop research outlines and produce an appropriate approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Providing on-the-job backstopping to prioritisation processes, development of researchable questions and related processes among FOs and NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Identifying and approaching agricultural research organisations that are willing and able to jointly develop research proposals aligned to identified priorities (in three SSA countries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 Organising ‘brokerage services’ between research organisations and FOs/NGOs (in three SSA countries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 Developing and maintaining an INSARD website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP3: Influence agricultural research agenda and resource allocation processes and actors to include smallholders participation, needs and interests</td>
<td>3.1 Conduct a study that provides the necessary intelligence to produce a policy influence strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Developing a policy influencing action plan based on study findings and recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 Making presentations (of the policy influencing strategy) at international, regional and national workshops;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Intensifying participation in key committees and groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4: Ensure that the consortium operates in a smooth, effective and efficient manner and that the project deliverables are produced within the time schedule and with the available budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Ensuring smooth coordination and communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Ensuring a democratic governance system (within INSARD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Providing administrative and financial support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Monitoring and evaluation (of the INSARD coordination mechanisms and structure, and of implementation results)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2: Key Informants
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Thierry Lassalle  Consultant
Tim Chancellor  NRI, Univ. of Greenwich, PAEPARD

INSARD Consortium members
Agnes Yawe  PELUM, Zambia
Aho Tete Benissan (Guy)  REPOAC, Senegal
Ann Waters-Bayer  ETC, Netherlands
Joe Mzinga  EASFF, Tanzania
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Annex 3: Questions for key informants

Including Smallholders in Agricultural Research for Development (INSARD) is an EU-funded project that seeks to make it easier for civil society organisations (CSOs) – both non-governmental organisations and farmers’ organisations – to be actively involved in influencing agricultural research systems in Africa.

Questions for Key Informants

Objective: to ask key informants who are knowledgeable about smallholder agriculture and agricultural research for development (ARD) processes to give their opinions on potential ways forward in policy influencing, relevant to the INSARD project.

Challenges

1. In your opinion, what are the major, specific challenges to the effective involvement of smallholders in ARD?

Initiatives on involvement of smallholder in ARD

2. What global, regional or national initiatives are you aware of that have an objective of increasing effective smallholder representation in ARD (in addition to GCARD, PAEPARD)?

3. What policy processes or approaches do you think have been most successful and why?

4. What policy processes or approaches do you think have been least successful and why?

Choices over what policy processes to engage with

5. In your view, what are the specific policy processes / meetings etc. coming up over the next 18 months where INSARD would have most potential to engage with and achieve most impact? Why? Who should INSARD work with (if any other organisation)? These might be global, regional or national (African) policy processes

Other comments on approaches

6. Do you have any comments about the approaches adopted to include the voices of smallholders in ARD? Is it useful to try and involve smallholders in established ARD processes? Are there alternative approaches that would be more useful?
Annex 4: Policy Influencing Questionnaire for INSARD partners

1. **Targets to influence** *(please complete a separate page for each of the targets that you want to influence)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who (name &amp; job)</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Main agenda of institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Why? What outcome or change do you hope to make?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What is the key policy message from the INSARD project for this individual?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **How to influence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will you work together with other allies or on your own?</th>
<th>Yes (please specify allies)</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please list actions proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eg. organise 1:1 meeting, invite to joint meeting with NGOs &amp; FOs; Organise field visit to meet farmers directly; Give presentation at meeting organised by the institution; Lobby person at meeting organised by another party Etc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What resources or materials are required for the actions above?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eg. Organising meeting venue, logistics, invitations etc; One-page INSARD overview leaflets printed; Short video in local language – put on youtube Powerpoint presentation; Invite local press; Video meeting to show later on;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What follow up activities will you do to ensure your message has got across?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Public Awareness plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What activities can you do to raise public awareness about INSARD policy messages?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eg. Talking to media – radio, press etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Social media – twitter, youtube, facebook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Action Plan**

Please can you fill in the calendar below with any activities or events occurring in your country (or region) that either a) you already intend to participate in, or b) are considering as part of your influencing strategy. (Activities specified in the target influencing tables above should be included here)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>January 2013</td>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>