

**In collaboration with ECAPAPA**



Eastern and Central Africa Programme  
for Agricultural Policy Analysis

## **ENHANCING PRO-POOR POLICY OUTCOMES**

**Report of an ILRI/ODI/ECAPAPA workshop held at ILRI,  
Nairobi, 27-28<sup>th</sup> March 2007**

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The joint ILRI/ODA/ECAPAPA workshop 'Enhancing pro-poor policy outcomes' was held near the end of the two-year 'Process and Partnership for Pro-Poor Policy Change' (PPPPPC) project. The workshop brought together more than 30 participants from the East African region and beyond, drawn from international and national research organizations, government agencies, civil society organizations (CSOs), the private sector, 'think tanks', knowledge brokers and donors.

The PPPPPC project was based on a series of case studies:

- Dairy marketing policy change in Kenya
- Urban agriculture policy change in Kampala, Uganda
- Communal natural resource management in Tigray
- Regional seed trade and dairy marketing policy changes.

A draft paper written and circulated ahead of the workshop contained 18 guiding principles for how researchers can achieve impact through policy change. These were drawn from an analysis of the case studies. The objective of the workshop was to build on this draft and for participants to derive a more comprehensive list of principles which was endorsed by the workshop participants.

The main outputs of the workshop were:

- Participants' stories illustrating how research evidence succeeded or failed to help bring about changes in policy or practice
- A revised set of guiding principles
- Suggestions as to why the guiding principles were not applied in practice and what could be done to overcome this situation
- Proposals for what the project should do during its last few weeks and what should be done beyond the lifetime of the project to mainstream evidence-based policy change.

The workshop participants developed a list of 21 guiding principles. There are:

1. Stakeholders involved in policy making process
2. Researchers and policy makers interact throughout
3. There are sufficient resources (human capacity, financial)
4. Stakeholder involvement in research process
5. Research programmes are planned for the long term
6. Evidence is relevant based on understanding of context (addressing current problems)
7. Researchers understand the policy making context
8. Research organisations are credible and trusted
9. Evidence is robust
10. Evidence is communicated in appropriate ways to relevant actors in process
11. Research is linked to advocacy
12. Evidence is fit for purpose (to convince key actors)
13. Timing of information provision to policy process
14. Champions are identified and used
15. It is possible to engage allies

16. There is political support
17. Both long and short term benefits are visible
18. Individuals who can block policy change are engaged
19. Beneficiaries (communities) are involved
20. Researchers have right incentives for policy-relevant researcher
21. Researchers provide useful options for policy makers

Workshop participants also suggested reasons why these principles were not applied and actions that could be taken by different actors to ensure they were more widely applied. Finally, participants suggested actions that could be taken during the last few weeks of the project and also actions that could be taken beyond the project's lifetime to enhance the impact of researchers and research organizations on pro-poor policy change.

## INTRODUCTION

The joint ILRI / ODI / ECAPAPA<sup>1</sup> workshop, 'Enhancing pro-poor policy outcomes', was held at the end of the two-year 'Process and Partnership for Pro-Poor Policy Change' (PPPPPC) project. Through case studies with national and international partners, the project seeks to identify and institutionalize research and development mechanisms and approaches that lead to pro-poor policy. The workshop brought together more than 30 participants from the East African region and beyond, drawn from international and national research organizations, government agencies, civil society organizations (CSOs), the private sector, 'think tanks', knowledge brokers and donors.

## WORKSHOP OBJECTIVE

The workshop's objective was to build on a draft paper, 'Guiding Principles for Achieving Impact through Policy Change: A resource for researchers' (see Appendix). This document, which was based on a series of case studies undertaken by the PPPPPC project, was made available ahead of the workshop.

The paper provided a preliminary list of 18 'Guiding Principles': the workshop process and activities were designed to allow participants to develop a more comprehensive list which was endorsed by the entire group.

The main challenge the workshop participants faced was to develop principles that were broad enough to be relevant across sectors whilst also being specific enough to be useful in individual cases.

## WORKSHOP PROCESS

### Review of project and case studies

The workshop began with an overview of the project (all the presentations and background papers are included in the Appendix to this report).

The PPPPPC project defines both policy and research very broadly:

**Policy** is regarded as '*a purposive course of action followed by an actor or set of actors*'.<sup>2</sup>

**Research** is defined as '*any systematic effort to increase the stock of knowledge*'.<sup>3</sup>

This was followed by presentations of the four case studies undertaken by the PPPPPC project. These were:

- Dairy marketing policy change in Kenya
- Urban agriculture policy change in Kampala, Uganda
- Communal natural resource management in Tigray, Ethiopia
- Regional seed trade and dairy marketing policy changes.

---

<sup>1</sup> International Livestock Research Institute, Nairobi; Overseas Development Institute, London; Eastern and Central Africa Programme for Agricultural Policy Analysis, Entebbe

<sup>2</sup> This definition acknowledges that policy is not restricted to written policy documents but includes issues of implementation and courses of action not based on written policy.

<sup>3</sup> This definition thus includes activities such as action research, and systematic learning from pilot projects, as well as more formal empirical research. The issue is that it should be systematic.

### **Participants' stories of evidence-based policy making**

Having set the scene with a rapid review of the project and the case studies, participants divided into five multi-sectoral break-out groups. Within the groups, participants worked in pairs; each member of the pair took it in turns to tell the other a story based on their personal experience of where research contributed or failed to contribute to changes in policy or practice. Having listened to the stories, the pairs then interviewed each other about their stories and completed a form that captured the story's basic information: the broad setting, the precise location, the characters, the challenge, the sequence of events before, during and after the 'change point' and the resolution including the lesson learned. Break-out groups then reconvened, retold their stories and chose the best story to share with all participants in a plenary session. The resulting five stories were sound recorded and transcripts are included in the Appendix. Also included in the Appendix is a list of all the stories told.

### **Guiding principles**

Next the break-out groups reformed. Based on the lessons drawn from the stories they had heard and informed by the draft 'Guiding Principles' paper, they developed their own guiding principles. Each principle was captured on a separate card. This process generated more than 40 cards. Overnight the workshop facilitators reviewed the cards and in some cases offered suggested revisions to the wording so that the statement on the card better completed the phrase '**Research impact on policy seems to be improved / highest if...**'.

At the start of day two of the workshop, the principles cards were arranged on the floor in columns with each column corresponding to one of the break-out groups. An additional column consisted of the 18 guiding principles taken from the draft 'Guiding Principles' paper. Participants then undertook a joint process of review, discussion, clustering and rewording, the result of which was a set of 21 guiding principles with which all workshop participants were happy.

Having agreed on a set of guiding principles, participants next split into one of four sectoral working groups: international research organizations, national research organizations, civil society organizations and government agencies.

Each group selected the principles they considered most important and for these considered:

- why this didn't happen
- what they could do to make it happen
- what others could do to make it happen.

Finally, workshop participants suggested actions that should be undertaken either by the present project (bearing in mind this would come to an end within a few weeks) or by others to facilitate the mainstreaming of evidence-based pro-poor policy processes.

## **WORKSHOP OUTPUTS**

### **Participants' stories of evidence-based policy making**

Table 1 below lists stories related during the session participants' experience of evidence-based policy making. Full transcripts of the five stories related in full on the second day are included in Appendix 3.

**Table 1: Stories of evidence-based policy making**

<b>Story-teller:</b>	<b>Country:</b>	<b>Title of story:</b>	<b>Contact for more info:</b>
Girma Aboma	Ethiopia	Civil society organisations' engagement in Ethiopian policy processes	<a href="mailto:girmaboma@yahoo.com">girmaboma@yahoo.com</a> or Tewodrose Abate of Poverty Action Network of Ethiopia (PANE)
Isaac K. Ngugi	Kenya	Impact of empirical evidence on safeguard period for wheat imports	Isaac K. Ngugi Tegemeo Institute P.O Box 20498, 00200 Nairobi. <a href="mailto:ikomo@tegemeo.org">ikomo@tegemeo.org</a>
Dannie Romney	Kenya	Changing mindsets to facilitate production and use of the infection and treatment method to control ECF.	Henry Kiara (ILRI)
Patrick Ngwediagi	Tanzania	Transferring technologies which are not farmers priorities/constraints	<a href="mailto:ngwedi@yahoo.com">ngwedi@yahoo.com</a>
Yemi Akinbamijo	Ghana	The Multi-Stakeholder Policy and Action Planning Process (MPAP) for urban agriculture in Accra	<a href="mailto:Yemi.akinbamijo@au-ibar.org">Yemi.akinbamijo@au-ibar.org</a> or <a href="mailto:o.cofie@cgiar.org">o.cofie@cgiar.org</a>
Jamie Watts	International	Influencing the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources	<a href="mailto:j.watts@cgiar.org">j.watts@cgiar.org</a>
Fitsum Hagos	Ethiopia	Developing guidelines for allocation of irrigated lands in Tigray	<a href="mailto:f.hagos@cgiar.org">f.hagos@cgiar.org</a>
Lusatu Kurwijila	Tanzania	Livestock policy relating to dairy goats in Tanzania	<a href="mailto:kurwiji@suanet.ac.tz">kurwiji@suanet.ac.tz</a>
Joseph Wekundah	Kenya	Development of Biotechnology Policy in Kenya	Joseph Wekunda <a href="mailto:bta@clubinternetk.com">bta@clubinternetk.com</a>
Michael Waithaka	Ethiopia	The improvement in indigenous innovation influencing extension policy in Ethiopia.	<a href="mailto:m.waithaka@asareca.org">m.waithaka@asareca.org</a>
Yeraswork Admassie	Ethiopia	Land leasehold policy in Ethiopia	<a href="mailto:yerawork@yahoo.com">yerawork@yahoo.com</a>
Lutta Muhammad	Kenya	Introduction and bulking of cassava planting material	<a href="mailto:LWMuhammad@kari.org">LWMuhammad@kari.org</a>

## Guiding principles

The following table shows the 21 guiding principles that emerged from the group work and plenary sessions. Under each principle is listed the individual cards that were clustered together and which informed the crafting of the overall guiding principle.

Each principle is designed to complete the phrase 'Research impact on policy seems to be improved/highest if...'

Number	Principle and individual cards
1	<p><b>Stakeholders involved in policy making process:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- beneficiaries are fully involved [avoid top-down approach]</li> <li>- stakeholder participation is very key in policy process</li> <li>- engagement of target group in policy process</li> <li>- multi-stakeholder approach in policy change process</li> <li>- policy processes are participatory [participatory policy making processes allow impact]</li> <li>- structures exist for community participation [building sustainable community structures for required intervention is essential]</li> <li>- key stakeholders are actively involved [key stakeholders not convinced until directly involved in evidence]</li> <li>- use appropriate linkage models with stakeholders</li> <li>- all stakeholders are engaged [stakeholder involvement: communication/shared learning]</li> </ul>
2	<p><b>Researchers and policy makers interact throughout:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- many (all) stakeholders are involved in research [many stakeholders bring many sets of eyes to view problems and increases ownership]</li> <li>- researchers work closely with all appropriate stakeholders</li> <li>- researchers involved in the national development agenda</li> <li>- researchers to participate directly in the policy process</li> <li>- long-term engagement in policy process by researchers</li> <li>- long-term commitment to participating in policy process</li> <li>- involving policy makers in the research process</li> <li>- constant engagement</li> <li>- researchers are committed to policy change (beyond technology) [researchers have a role beyond technology development]</li> <li>- researchers go beyond technology development [technology alone has no impact on change]</li> </ul>
3	<p><b>There are sufficient resources (human capacity, financial):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- invest resources (time, skills) in building and maintaining partnerships</li> <li>- resources are required for driving the policy process</li> </ul>
4	<p><b>Stakeholder involvement in research process:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- if stakeholders have necessary capacity [capacity of stakeholders to implement change is critical]</li> <li>- many (all) stakeholders are involved in research</li> <li>- have effective links with CSOs, etc</li> <li>- stakeholder involvement: communication/shared learning</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- key actors are identified and engaged</li> <li>- communities should be involved in the research and policy development process IC</li> <li>- researchers working with farmers to validate and improve local innovation</li> <li>- researchers engage with all appropriate levels [need to engage at different levels at appropriate time and manner]</li> </ul>
5	<p><b>Research programmes are planned for the long term:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- sufficient time is available [policy change is slow (partly because of vested interests)]</li> <li>- sufficient time is allowed for research (by policy makers) [policy makers are unrealistic about time it takes to do research]</li> <li>- researchers engage actively in the policy process (may take a long time)</li> </ul>
6	<p><b>Evidence is relevant based on understanding of context (addressing current problems):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- research focuses on and finds solutions to local problems [local needs must trigger the development of a policy] PURPLE</li> <li>- understand political and economic context</li> <li>- understand socio-economic context [socioeconomic context is an important driver (need)]</li> <li>- research is linked to real policy needs</li> <li>- there are visible benefits for stakeholders [needs to be personal incentives for change] BR</li> <li>- research provides practical solutions to real/current problems</li> <li>- link activities to on-going political strategies</li> </ul>
7	<p><b>Researchers understand the policy making context:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- researchers understand the policy making process (before they start)</li> <li>- thorough understanding of policy-making process in every different context</li> <li>- understand policy-makers constraints and incentives [policies are rigid and inflexible]</li> <li>- blockers are identified and engaged [important to identify key stakeholders and bottlenecks]</li> </ul>
8	<p><b>Research organisations are credible and trusted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- research organisations are credible and trusted [need for neutral credible research organizations who can be trusted]</li> <li>- credibility; research; researcher; policy process; communication mechanism</li> </ul>
9	<p><b>Evidence is robust:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- appropriate evidence is provided (action research is sometimes more useful than academic or empirical evidence)</li> <li>- researchers build credibility and profile with policy makers</li> <li>- research should be of quality and credible</li> <li>- evidence of need for policy change is paramount (facts and figures)</li> </ul>

	- credibility of evidence can raise profile of stakeholder
10	<b>Evidence is communicated in appropriate ways to relevant actors in process:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Appropriate means of communication are used</li> <li>- Information is delivered as appropriate</li> </ul>
11	<b>Research is linked to advocacy:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- alliances to drive policy process must be identified</li> <li>- research is linked with advocacy [advocacy capacity can be important in the process of influencing]</li> </ul>
12	<b>Evidence is fit for purpose (to convince key actors):</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- evidence is visible [demonstrating and sharing evidence effectively important, e.g. visual impact]</li> <li>- pilot projects 'look and learn'</li> <li>- engage farmers directly to demonstrate impact</li> </ul>
13	<b>Timing of information provision to policy process:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- proper timing of policy intervention is important</li> <li>- existing data is available to be presented when needed [our existing data has the potential to bring about change – given the right time]</li> </ul>
14	<b>Champions are identified and used:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- high level champions exist and are used [virtue of high profile champions to validate and promote ideas]</li> </ul>
15	<b>It is possible to engage allies</b>
16	<b>There is political support:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- political support is critical for the success of policy process</li> </ul>
17	<b>Both long and short term benefits are visible:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- they demonstrate both short and long-term benefits (complementary) [national policies should ensure both short and long term complementary benefits]</li> </ul>
18	<b>Individuals who can block policy change are engaged</b>
19	<b>Beneficiaries (communities) are involved:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it is linked to grass-roots pressure [pressure from the grassroots helps in advocacy]</li> <li>- is relevant to policy issue [relevance of the issue stimulates/catalyses policy change]</li> <li>- research is linked to grass-roots pressure</li> </ul>
20	<b>Researchers have right incentives for policy-relevant research DISC</b>
21	<b>Researchers provide useful options for policy makers DISC</b>

**Key:** Overall guiding principles, based on card clustering are in **bold**, numbered 1 - 21.

Where there is text in [square brackets] at the end, that text is the original text from working groups' cards. The text preceding this is the rewording synthesized by facilitators (based on the original text) so that it logically followed the statement "*Research impact on policy seems to be improved/highest if...*"

Individual groups' cards are colour-coded as follows:

- **Yellow** = Group "Sarah's group" from Conference room
- **Pink** = "Purple group" from Conference Room
- **Green** = "Boardroom group"
- **Red** = "Info Centre group";
- **Blue** = "Room 721 group"
- **Grey** = Arose during plenary discussion
- No highlight = Principle from the circulated "Guiding Principles" draft paper.

## **What needs to be done to apply the principles?**

Each of the four stakeholder groups - international research organizations, national research organizations, civil society organizations and government agencies – selected the principles they considered to be most important. For these they considered:

- why this didn't happen
- what they could do to make it happen
- what others could do to make it happen.

Their answers are presented below, by stakeholder group:

### ***International Research Organisations***

#### **Principle 2: Researchers and policymakers interact throughout**

##### **Why this is not happening:**

- Difficult to engage policymakers
- Researchers don't think it is their role
- Researchers don't know how to engage
- Researchers don't know how, who, how policies are made
- Researchers need intermediaries/networks to engage policymakers
- Researchers don't know what policies, policymakers to engage with
- Researchers don't have incentives (and vice versa)

##### **What we can do:**

- Establish incentives, e.g. Work Plan/Performance evaluation
- Create communities of practice
- Develop partnerships with CSOs, etc (advocacy)
- Seeking funds for long term engagements
- Bring in communicators at beginning

##### **What others can do:**

- Donors could make it clear this is part of their expectation, e.g. DFID: 10% of research budget for communication

#### **Principle 4: Stakeholder involvement in research process**

##### **Why this is not happening:**

- Expensive, lack of funds for stakeholder engagement processes
- Need better tools/processes
- Capacity lacking on both sides
- Incentives
- "we know better!" attitude of international organizations
- Letters of agreement etc tricky (researchers need help)
- We don't understand the 'who': their roles, how change / innovation happens
- Lack of commitment/their incentives

##### **What we can do:**

- Principle of co-creation (shared objectives, etc)
- Create better incentives, e.g. output-oriented agreements
- Stakeholder engagement process key (build capacity)

- How are you going to help them
- Be creative and flexible in engaging policymakers (build trust)
- Regular communications through small practical interventions

**What others can do:**

- Policymakers recognizing value of these processes
- Science Council / Standing Program on Impact Assessment (of CGIAR) should reconsider incentives they are imposing

**Principle 5: Research programmes are planned for the long term**

**Why this is not happening:**

- Project funded (short term, 3-5 years)
- Add policy at end
- Policy environment/policy makers dynamic

**What we can do:**

- Communication strategies for programmes
- Build on outputs for continuity
- Policy/information for development studies/tracking policy processes
- Mechanisms to respond to policy development of the moment
- Better knowledge management that permits more use/analysis of data to respond to policymakers needs

**Principle 6: Evidence is relevant / based on context**

**Why this is not happening:**

- Technology-based research
- Researcher priorities don't match others
- Focus on beneficiaries (non-system perspective)
- Contexts vary hugely!

**What we can do:**

- Take an innovation systems (value chain...) perspective
- Inter-disciplinary approach
- Get large grants!
- Prioritize projects where this approach is needed
- Researchers to understand policy context

**Principle 7: Researchers understand the policymaking context**

**Why this is not happening:**

- Lack of clarity of international organizations' role in national policy
- Lack of incentives

**Principle 10: Evidence is communicated appropriately**

**Why this is not happening:**

- We don't budget
- We don't know how, to whom
- We don't monitor, evaluate: no evidence of impact
- We focus on product not process

**What we can do:**

- Establish communication strategies/budget for it!

- Recruit specialists
- Set up indicators: measure the impact!

**Principle 21: Researchers provide useful options for policy makers**

**Why this is not happening:**

- Not problem-oriented
- No development studies
- Lack of inter-disciplinary approaches
- Capacity/limitations/roles unclear
- Lack of processes to develop options with policymakers and communities (know-how)

***Civil Society Organizations***

**Principle no. 1: Stakeholders involved in the policy making process**

**Why this is not happening:**

- Lack of information:
  - on an issue
  - process
- Lack of space/opportunity for engagement
- Lack of capacity to engage

**What we can do:**

- Information dissemination:
  - repackage information and media
  - leaflets
  - etc
- Organize policy fora, targeted meetings, dialogue etc
- Informal networking
- Commission research
- Capacity building on the policy process/policy issues
- Mobilization and awareness creation

**Principle no. 10: Evidence is communicated in appropriate ways to relevant actors in process**

**Why this is not happening:**

- Lack of appropriate communication skills
- Lack of availing/sharing information

**What we can do:**

- Capacity building in effective communication skills
- Encourage information sharing
- Repackaging information according to target group

## ***National Research Organizations***

### **Principle no. 6: Evidence is relevant based on understanding of context (addressing current problems)**

#### **Why this is not happening:**

- Impact studies not being done
- Needs assessment not being done
- Research not given priority in government funding
- Donors have different priorities
- Proposals face time to be approved (so context can have changed)

#### **What we can do:**

- Include impact studies in research design
- Include needs assessment in research design
- Show importance of impact of research for government to make it a priority
- Make donors accommodate 'your' priorities through clear negotiations

#### **What others can do:**

- Support impact studies in budgets for research
- Demand for impact studies
- Make needs assessment a prerequisite for funding
- Government allocates more funds for research
- CSOs advocate for more resources for research
- Governments must make its priorities clear to donors

### **Principle no. 3: There are sufficient resources (human capacity and financial)**

#### **Why this is not happening:**

- Human: inadequate incentives for researchers to remain in public sector research
- Ceiling for recruiting more people in research imposed by World Bank
- Limited capacity – human resource development (policy)
- Financial: limited budgetary allocation
- Limited capacity to attract funding
- Limited competitive research funding

#### **What we can do:**

- Lobby and advocate for improved terms of service for public sector researchers
- Demonstrate need for more staff
- Capacity building through short/post-graduate training and personnel exchange
- Keep pushing for increased funding ceiling (MTEF)
- Train researchers on proposal writing
- Establish agricultural research trust fund

#### **What others can do:**

- Government can improve terms of service for public sector researchers
- Create 'complementary institutions', i.e. undertake work outside conventional civil service structures and institutions
- Donors increase support to advance training
- Support need for public-private partnerships (PPPs)

- Establish PPPs
- Government provides for agricultural research trust funds

### **Government agencies**

#### **Principle no. 1: Stakeholders are involved in policy making process**

##### **Why this is not happening:**

- Lack of resources
- Emergency situation / time available / constraint
- Ineffective stakeholder selection process

##### **What we can do:**

- Lack of resources:
  - Mobilize sufficient resources through development plans/budgets
- Emergency situation / time constraint
  - Use local contact persons/leaders to get community opinions
  - Build stakeholders capacity to develop legislation/policy concepts which are responsive to emergency situations
  - Make a provision in legislation to handle emergency situation
  - Establish a guiding principle on quorums in emergency situations
- Selection of stakeholders:
  - Define who are stakeholders in each policy issue
  - Establish quorum of stakeholders

##### **What others can do:**

- Lack of resources
  - Contributions
  - Move closer to the community (reduce costs)
- Emergency situations
  - Commitment of legislators and councilors
- Selection of stakeholders
  - Active participation
  - Volunteer to participate as stakeholders

#### **Principle no. 3: There are sufficient resources (human capacity, financial)**

##### **Why this is not happening:**

- In some cases, may not be budgeted for/provided for
- Inadequately allocated
- Misappropriation of funds
- Poor motivation results in insufficient human resources
- Lack of sufficient human resource capacity

##### **What we can do:**

- Ensure sufficient allocation
- Stick to allocations
- Build capacity of government staff in planning, policy formulation and related disciplines
- Ensure staff motivated

##### **What others can do:**

- Increased lobbying for increased resources
- Participate in and facilitate staff training

**Principle no. 16: There is political support**

**Why this is not happening:**

- It is of low priority
- Politicians can have different opinions
- Inadequate sensitization
- Ideological differences

**What we can do:**

- Adequate sensitization of politicians on a particular subject

**What others can do:**

- Vigorous advocacy on particular issues

**FURTHER ACTIONS**

Participants suggested further actions to be taken in two categories:

- what this project should do
- what others should do.

These actions were as follows:

**What this project should do:**

- More information about programmes to promote research-policy linkages
- Complete and share / communicate the guidelines
- How far did the project succeed in its objective to institutionalise innovative R&D?
- What was learned about the methodology used? Did it stimulate learning and institutionalization?
- Identify areas for research in policy research processes
- Establish blog to further discuss and disseminate project outputs
- What evidence is available (and indicators) to judge institutionalization of innovative R&D
- Upscale the successful innovations
- Circulate proceedings of the two-day workshop to participants
- Communication of principles to policy makers
- To evaluate the processes of how research influenced the policies (extension of project)
- Build capacity of researchers in policy formulation process
- Extract more briefs 1-2 pp on policy formulation and guiding principles
- Make all products (report, manual, etc) available to all actors (physical & website)
- Succinct example case studies to illustrate value of dialogue to policy-makers
- Diagrammatic summary of principles paper
- ILAC brief of general principle summary

- Update website (post materials) so there for the record
- Prepare proposal to extract + deliver stakeholder specific messages
- All materials on CD ROM and on website.

**What others should do:**

- Feed in constraints to more effective research-policy processes to DFID's research strategy process
- Frame 'researchable questions' on communications and policy engagement into above
- ODI to support EASCOM to implement the harmonised seed policies and regulations in the region after the conclusion of the project (Who pays?)
- Request funds to share learning with policy makers (ECAPAPA)
- Capacity building on the principles to stakeholders
- Further e-mail and face-to-face discussions of this group
- On-line electronic discussion of these issues
- Broader dialogue between different stakeholders
- ILRI – Disseminate findings amongst staff and collaborators
- ILRI – Support incorporation of principles in research processes
- Governments – EASCOM/ASARECA member states to domesticate harmonised seed regulations and procedures
- Donors/NGOs/CBOs/CBOs: Assessment of impact on socio-economic status of the target group (one per two years)
- Other orgs (e.g. CABI Rep) shares findings with colleagues
- "We" establish network of policy research and research institutions
- Network e.g. establish website for sharing information on research impact on policy
- As CSOs, initiate documentation of similar processes
- Share the principles with the staff
- Share principles with wider advocacy networks --- adopt an agreement
- Government organisations to lobby for integration of policy initiatives in development plans
- Needs assessment for new cases within the network
- Collaborate in designing projects in the future
- Publish guidelines and methodology as ILAC brief
- Bring consultative process to DFID Research strategy to this community.

## **APPENDICES**

[N.B. Appendices sent as separate document]

**Appendix 1: Background paper: “*Guiding Principles for achieving impact through policy change: A resource for researchers*”**

**Appendix 2: Workshop Presentations and Case Study Briefs**

**Appendix 3: Transcripts of five narrated stories of evidence-based policy making**

**Appendix 4: Participant list and contacts**