

LESSONS LEARNED WORKSHOP
FARMER ADVOCACY CONSULTATION TOOL (FACT)
Bali, May 3-5 2015 at Hotel Santika Siligita Nusa Dua

Day 1

Saturday, 3rd May 2013

SESSION 1A
INTRODUCTION

Opening remarks by the General Secretary of API:

Welcome to the General Secretary of AFA, facilitators from Agriterra, and leaders of farmers' organizations throughout Southeast Asia and Mongolia. It is a great honor for API to conduct the second workshop. It must be difficult for you to leave your families for three days, to learn and get more knowledge for your organizations.

The four FACT pillars are guide for us to understand consistently how to push policy implementation from the grass root. Advocacy is not easy but we could do it systematically. FACT is not sophisticated but simple and useful in countries developing their agriculture.

I hope that this workshop could be useful for all of us, that sharing between us could enrich and strengthen us all, and that it can be implemented and internalized within your organization in the process of advocating policies.

Apologies for any logistic problems you encountered.

MC:

Hopefully we all can follow the schedule. Now we begin the workshop. Nelly, the floor is yours.

Nelly:

I welcome you all. You're representing almost all of Asia to improve the position of farmers. And all of us, all of you, are working at farmers' organizations and you are there for the better position of farmers.

Hopefully all of you have the FACT Readers and Workbook with you. We have asked the workbook to be translated. We understand that translations might be difficult so we prepared some English books. Please let me know the version you have. [Nelly checked the version held by each participant.]

Now I give the floor to Miriam for the first session, introduction of participants.

Miriam:

This morning I tried to greet all of you but it's not easy to remember all your names.

I will give you each two cards, a blue and pink card. Now please take the pink card. On the pink card, you're going to write your impressions of the first workshop last year – but not more than three words. On the blue card, write your expectations of this workshop. You may write in your own language.

Each of you please stand up, say your name and your organizations, and explain your impressions and expectations. Please limit the explanations to one minute per person because otherwise we will spend whole morning.

Name	Organization	Impressions	Expectations
Ismu	API Bali	Easy to implement in new organizations and projects – not so easy in older organizations or projects	Sharing FACT experiences – listening to other organizations on FACT implementation
Maria Loretha	API NTT	Quite helpful in building my capacity in performing consultation and convincing policy makers in proposing solutions	-
Susatyo	APPOLI	Systematic writing of proposal	Understand more about the method.
Sugeng	SPL	Exploring farmers' need	Learn how to select / prioritize farmers' need
Sonde	API Jateng	Facilitate organizational work due to systematic approach	Understand more about FACT
Surani	Cambodia	FACT is a new method for me, and it's an understandable and systematic method	Hope we can get clearer about the FACT and explain to our members.
Lani	Puan Tani	Got to know FACT as an advocacy tool, a structured tool.	Sharing experiences of different implementations
Intan	Puan Tani	Great and important	Help farmers get rich
Andi Gatot	SPPQT	Great and interesting – could be implemented	Understand more of the FACT materials
Budi Pramono	SPPQT	Interesting, great that we have a systematic advocacy tool to perform structured advocacy	Improve understanding of the FACT methodology and share experience after the first workshop
Ferry	API Seknas	Interesting, understand more of systematical advocacy	Improve my knowledge for the next advocacy
Lany	AFA secretariat	Very participatory approach	Learn more the application of FACT by me and farmers
Ester	AFA secretariat	Confirmation of many things I've believed in regarding advocacy	Gather experience of implementation
Rene	Philippines	Interesting and useful for our advocacy work	Learn more about the advanced features of FACT
Pochan	Laos – organic farmers' organization	Learned a very useful tool in practical work	To share and learn from the others

Innakhon	Laos – Sustainable Development Organization	It is very difficult to summarize all I learned in three words, but I'll try. It's very useful and easier to apply and a very good tool to do advocacy work.	To share our experience and practical work and learn from the other participants and facilitators.
Indra	Mongolia	I didn't participate in the first workshop.	Learn advocacy tool from this workshop
	Vietnam	Learned about FACT for facilitating farmers – it's systematic and easy to implement. We have implemented some pillars but not systematic	To learn more about FACT.
	Vietnam	First time we knew about FACT	Learn about the experience of other countries and make farmers richer
Jun - facilitator	Philippines	Interesting – some people found it new, some found it not new but not implemented systematically	Improvements of advocacy work and of the way we use FACT and the way we train people to use FACT
Luc - facilitator	LTO Nederland	FACT helps you to structure your work better, share this with other organizations, and become more systematic in this line of work	Learn from your all and share ideas and come up with new ideas in the future to use FACT and improve FACT method and the facilitation of meetings
Nelly - facilitator	Agriterra	I saw enormous involvement to learn and to share.	Even higher commitments from participants and facilitators to use and improve FACT and apply FACT to see what new things it could produce for your organizations and contribute to the success to your advocacy work
Sipenep	Cambodia		
Nina	API - Finance		
Sadiya	Translator		
Hira Jamtani	Translator		
MJ	API - Finance		

Nelly:

Additional information about Luc – his name is Luc Groot and Groot means large. From the 1 June 2014 he's going to work with Agriterra and we're quite happy as we'll bring in more advocacy experience to the organization. You will see more of him and he will learn all the languages of Asia. I am looking forward to more collaboration with Luc and with you all.

Miriam:

I heard many similar words, impressions that FACT helps to perform more structured, more systematic work, and expectations to learn more and share cases from other countries to get more progress. Maybe we can collect the cards and show them somewhere as a reminder.

Jun:

You're familiar with the FACT trajectory. That will be explained next by Nelly. This is the third step in the FACT trajectory. The first is the workshop in Indonesia, the Philippines and Vietnam, the second is implementation, and this workshop is Step 3.

This workshop will run in three days. Each day is broken in four parts. In the first day we have introduction and FACT in brief. After the break we have sharing sessions. We will only be together this morning. After 10.30 we will be divided in two groups. Participants from Indonesia and Ester will stay here. The other group will go the room next door. We post the list of names on the door. We divide you in two groups because of the large number of participants and to focus discussion based on the topics. After you hear presentations you will have deeper work in getting the lessons learned.

On Day 2, the first work is recap then continuation of group work, a SWOT analysis in implementation of FACT. After the break we continue the SWOT analysis. In the afternoon we identify capacities need for farmers' organizations to implement FACT better. The last session would be on projecting the use of FACT. There will be a debriefing of your follow-up plans, expectations. Then we have the closure of the two-day workshop.

We took more time than planned, so prepare yourself for a possible extension in the afternoon.

To make the workshop more fruitful, we suggest several workshop norms:

- Mobiles off/silent
- Time keeping
- Responsible for your own learning
- KISS and KILL

Any other norms you'd like to propose?

Miriam:

This might fall within the "responsible for your own learning" item, but we should also "Use of laptop only for workshop purposes". [accepted]

Nelly:

We have changed the original agenda a bit. All of you have the workbook. The workbook will help you remember, because the workshop is about sharing learning. If you want to make any notes, you can write on the side of the slides.

I'll try to guide you through the trajectory in ten minutes.

There are two objectives of the FACT trajectory: to learn from personal experiences and the FACT approach for improving the preparation of policy and other types of proposals.

We have performed the first workshop. The application of FACT is the second step done by you, when you're thinking on how to make it more useful. The third is the fact lessons learnt workshop. You're sharing about how you feel about it, what went well, what not went well, as FACT is not the solution for everything.

The FACT prep workshop that we had 6-8 months ago is linking theory and practice. In the learning by doing phase you implemented the plan in 6-8 months. And today you are analyzing what is done in practice and we are sharing the visions and ideas. That's the full trajectory of FACT.

Now I go to the pillars of FACT. Most of you work in your action plan using all the four pillars; some focused on some pillars.

Consultation to members has 3 purposes: to raise issues to be tackled by the organization, to gather information to prepare proposals, positions, etc., and to get feedback on the preparation of proposals and positions and on the organization's work in general. Sometimes we think we know what farmers want. But when you ask about their dreams, something else comes up. Don't think you know everything. When you prepare proposal, you need to come up with the right information – what is the problem faced by farmers, what are proposed solutions, are they feasible?

What is often forgotten not only here, but also in Europe, is feedback. After getting information you never see the farmers again. They don't know whether your proposal is aligned with their needs. Always check and recheck whether what you're producing is aligned with what the farmers want.

Many of you are struggling with consultation because it's a lot of work. You could do it in meetings – it's perfect moment to ask questions about general issues. Or, you could perform special meetings about specific issues – marketing, etc. Or, with FGD as some of you mentioned in your action plan.

We're working with memory aids. This makes sense in English but maybe not in your language. We welcome you to translate the aids and to make sense of it.

www.how is something you should not forget because it defines the consultation. You can have different people to consult. If there's a law that must be changed or adjusted in January and you consult your members in December, I guarantee you it will be late. You need to know the appropriate time to do so.

The typical step is consulting members but it's not enough. Because if I talk to you but not registering what you're saying and order the information from each of you, it will be wasted. So you can give numbers to the decision makers so they believe you.

The keywords for consultation are AIR – they're applicable to all pillars. If you don't account your decisions to your members, they will not trust you anymore. Because you're not an individual, but a representative of farmers. But you must be informed because if you don't know the real issue the farmers will say that it's not their issue and it won't make sense to talk about that topic.

We now go to the 2nd pillar, participatory research. The pillars look like a very linear way of work. In reality it's not linear and not so systematic. This is a reminder of work to do. So even if participatory research comes after consultation, you might find that you need to do more consultation.

Three main purposes of data gathering:

- If you don't know what farmers want, there's nothing to know.
- If you don't show that you know, you can't convince others.
- To make good and sound proposal backed by research and information.

Participatory Research makes the connection between knowledge of the farmers and the experts. The farmers know everyday reality. Don't think farmers are stupid or not knowledgeable. But you also need experts to make solutions more realistic.

Participatory Research has 6 steps and you can see a mix with the next step (SMART proposal) and combination with the previous pillar (consultation).

Step 1: Defining the methodology (www.how), the organization links up with experts and with farmers.

Step 2: Data gathering from membership (CROP).

Step 3: Data analysis and desk study.

Step 4: Conclusions and initial definition of a draft proposal.

Step 5: Feedback/validation from members.

Step 6: Proposal (document) is defined.

Experts could help you define the questions to ask. Don't underestimate the importance of asking the right questions because otherwise you don't get the right information. It doesn't have to be from the government or universities. They might be in your organization or in your "extended families". Expert could make sense of all this complicated data otherwise it's useless and a waste of your time.

Now we get to the SMART proposal. Most of us are used to writing proposals; we do this all the time. But in this particular workshop we talk about policy proposals – in order to convince the decision makers.

The purpose is to upload the problems and download solutions. We are very good in uploading problems but we forget that we might also have solutions in mind. If you want to propose a solution, make sure it's aligned with the farmer's need.

SMART is an abbreviation that stands for specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and time-bound. I'm not going to dwell on it in detail because it's in your book, but you need to have them in your proposal. Remember the fish example – if you don't use the right hook and bait, the fish will not come and you can't catch it. So write a SMART proposal. Without a downloading solution you don't have a convincing proposal.

Now we come to the last and most challenging part. Before meeting the decision maker you need to do lobby mapping. You need to know where to upload problems. The lobby mapping defines who you can influence. You might influence by talking directly to the decision makers, or to the people that influence the decision makers. You have to massage the environment.

You can classify stakeholders with a matrix where in the horizontal line you have interest and in the vertical line you have power. Farmers usually have high interest but low power. They have to talk with decision makers. But decision makers often have high power but low interest. So you have to influence them and other stakeholders in the 3 quarters and keep people in the 4th quarter happy (low interest low power). Be careful to keep your farmers on board.

You have all the memory aids here [slide].

This is what we discussed in the last workshop.

After the break we will divide in two groups.

SESSION 2

SHARING SESSIONS

Nelly:

The participants will make notes in the workbook page 16. There are the following questions:

- 1) Basic difference of each organizations
- 2) FACT aspects that have been understood but not implemented.
- 3) We will see, e.g. whether API/Ferry has implemented FACT, www.how, you can refer to memory aids and check in the presentations.
- 4) Important insights from the presentations.

Write your comments in the columns and we will have questions and answers session.

Ice Breaker:

Sing and dance by Maria Loretha from API NTT.

Presentation by API National Secretary

1. Implementation Plan

- 1.1 Performing FACT-based advocacy practice for the case of land conflict in Senyerang, Tanjabtim District, Jambi Province. Implementing FACT steps following the four FACT pillars: consultation to members, participatory research, writing SMART proposals, and lobby mapping.
- 1.2 The implementation plan for Senyerang was later cancelled and moved to the village of Lubuk Mandrasah, Tebo District, Jambi. The reason was that the conflict in Senyerang has been resolved, while the one in Lubuk Mandrasah was still unresolved.

2. Implementation

- 2.1 In accordance with the FACT pillar, the first step was consultation to members in Lubuk Mandrasah and distributing database form as a basis for participatory research. After consultation with experts, a SMART proposal was drafted. Later on, lobby mapping was performed for all stakeholders that would be able to push for policy reform regarding land conflict in Lubuk Mandrasah.
- 2.2 In implementing FACT, we had funding problems, because past focus group discussions (FGDs) and consultations to members were not sufficient in exploring issues. An additional FGD was needed and that implies additional costs. Funding was also necessary for undertaking the 4th pillar, lobby mapping and targeting of policy actors conducted at the district government level in Tebo Jambi.
- 2.3 So far we have implemented up to the 3rd pillar, writing a SMART proposal. We expect that in the near future the proposal could be used by the farmers' group in Lubuk Mandrasah in the effort of resolving land conflict in that location.

3. Conclusions

- 3.1 Implementation of plan

Up to this point, FACT implementation still follows the plan. But the lobby mapping might be problematic as funding and intense effort would be required, i.e. staying at the conflict location for an extended period to support the community members in lobbying relevant actors.

- 3.2 Implementation of each pillar necessitates further guidance and consultation, as results might not be optimum. For example, in the 2nd pillar, the results of consultation to members were not sufficient to be the basis of participatory research. Thus we had to ask more relevant documents to be sent. We had not performed the 4th pillar due to the political situation.
- 3.3 Based on the FACT implementation, the organization has been improved by proper documentation of the organization database, in particular regarding the land conflict in Lubuk Mandrasah.
- 3.4 Lessons learned from FACT
It is true that the consultation of members in the 1st pillar must not exceed 25 persons. During consultation, it is important to get to know the geographical condition of the consultation site.
FACT could be implemented in farmers' organizations that are running well as in Lubuk Mandrasah (no on-going internal conflicts).

Additional notes:

The first thing we did in Mandrasah based on FACT was consulting the members on 13-16 February 2013. Around 60 members were present. We collected data through direct interview, questionnaires, and asking members to fill in member database (name, land area, etc.) as a basis for the participatory research. The consultation was in the form of an FGD. The situation was not what we expected as the conflicted land was about one-hour away from the village, a large plantation area away from the daily activities of the village.

Luc asked once how many members participated in the consultation, the list of questions, and what data could be presented to be our lessons learned. Below are my answers:

1. The FGD was conducted with 60 people. We have scheduled for two FGDs, but some farmers heard about the first FGD and decided to join in, coming in from the fields. That makes the FGD a bit crowded.
2. We posed several questions about agricultural activities, the area of claimed land and the role of women in farming.

In the planning step, we developed the plan based on the 4 pillars and discussed with our colleagues in the National Secretary on how to implement the plan. We implemented Pillars 1 and 2. The participatory research was based on field data and communicated with experts. We feel our data is not sufficient, so we asked our farmer members in Tebo to send more data.

Some lessons learned from implementing FACT:

- 1) Consulting members could not run well if the number of participants exceeds 25 people, because it becomes too crowded and difficult to manage time as everyone wants to talk about their problems.

- 2) Before implementing FACT, in particular before consolidation, we should know about the trend of issue that we want to address and the geographical condition. Otherwise we will have problems in recording data. There is no electricity in Mandrasah so we recorded manually.
- 3) From the consultation we obtained new information about our members. There was mistrust among members because their leaders lied to them. So they asked us why we were collecting this data, what we would do with it, whether we would help solve their problems. So before implementing FACT we should know the internal condition of the organization. In the end the members believed that API National Secretary would help solve their problems.

Nelly:

I have some questions and invite you for clarifying questions.

Lani:

Fery explained about the role of female farmers. Related to the issue of land conflict, what is the relevance of women's roles?

Fery:

API wanted to make a women's group, so we identified women's group. During consultation we still found gender bias, women were perceived to live around the kitchen and the house. We met women in the farming context to develop women's group in the region.

Lani:

Land conflict is quite different with land issue. Was it general or specific consultation?

Fery:

It started as general consultation in the first session, but in the second session it was more specific about how the village leaders could be empowered to claim their land.

Ester

- 1) You were surprised that many farmers wanted to join the consultation. Did you change your plan?
- 2) When you spotted an issue and you started asking questions and organizing, did you involve experts?
- 3) Was there a result of proposal with farmers?

Fery:

Yes, we combined the FGD, but we conducted 2 sessions in one day. And farmers did not only complain about the land conflict but also other issues, e.g. how to improve crop's growth, how to select seeds, etc. At first we were overwhelmed by all the issues, but we used metaplan to spot similar issues.

In developing proposal we consulted experts – not academicians but our colleagues in farmers' organizations network such as KPA and JKPP. JKPP is a location mapping organization and holds maps of conflict areas in Jambi and proposes solutions. From inputs from JKPP and KPA, we developed a proposal with proposed solution to the conflict through the district or village government.

[Facilitator asked participants to share their notes, what differences they found between Ferry's presentation and what they did in their organizations.]

Rene:

In Jambi, it is land conflict. In our organization it's lobbying for coconuts. The topics are different but the cases are similar.

[Facilitator explained not to focus on topics but on identifying differences in implementing FACT.]

Loreta:

In API NTT, we involved experts and the Church in participatory research, as the Church plays an important role.

Susatyo:

Based on AIR, the Informed part is not well-supported by farmers' data. You just explored information but there is no supporting data.

Facilitator:

What are main insights that you get from the presentation?

Andi Gatot - SPPQT:

In CROP method you could add the production database. What potentials could be developed, how you could manage production management, because it's an important element in a good proposal.

Luc:

We need to think carefully on how to consult members and prepare for problems, such as huge numbers of participating members. It is true that we need to take into account the situation and the geographical context.

Lani:

The main insight I got is basically similar with Luc. Before consultation you should develop the concepts, strategy and methodology of consultation.

Neli:

The next presentation is SPPQT by Andi Gatot. I only have the older version in Indonesian. An important lesson learned in logistic, it's important to send the presentation on time and the latest version, so we don't lose time.

I don't think Ferry's FACT implementation is wrong, but API followed the old way and we lost the chance to improve farmers' condition. We should involve experts more intensively to get more information, because they can help preparing the questions. The feedback mechanism is also missing from the process.

Presentation by SPPQT

After the Preliminary Workshop, SPPQT planned to perform advocacy of capital access for KSP Qaryah Thayyibah. However, the plan was changed because:

- Capital access is usually formulated by the management of KSP, not by members themselves, because cooperative capital access is a managerial decision.
- Another pressing need of the farmers could be advocated instead, i.e. budget access.

This change of plan was decided through the executive meeting of SPPQT in selecting the advocacy issues. The budget access was selected because improvement of farmers' economic condition is the responsibility of the government.

Implementation of FACT methodology was not optimum because the condition on the ground was often different from our expectation, such as:

- Current political agenda
- Organization's agenda often does not match the social and cultural contexts.

SPPQT has often performed advocacy before, but the FACT methodology helped systematizing the planning and implementation.

Some challenges in the implementation were:

1. Time constraint
2. Resources constraint
3. Lack of organizational skill in presenting problems and proposing solution
4. Lack of understanding of the new methodology

Implementation of FACT methodology on the farmers' group level:

- Paguyuban Petani Bektipertiwi, Desa Gondoriyo Bergas, Kabupaten Semarang: budget access for organic fertilizer manufacturing business, targeting the Ministry of Agriculture to secure 186 million IDR to buy 10 cattle, build cattle sheds (15x3), build fertilizer production house (10x8), build a fermentation pool (4x5), and to buy one shredding machine and one 3-wheeler.
- Kelompok Wanita Tani Sido Dadi, Tingkir, Salatiga: budget access for food processing, targeting the Ministry of Fishery to secure 50 million IDR to buy food processing units, ovens, and refrigerators.
- PP Candi Laras Merbabu (CLM): budget access for supporting the farming entrepreneurship, targeting the Ministry of Agriculture to secure 60 million IDR.

Plan in 2014 was to advocate for budget access to the Ministry of Agriculture by Paguyuban Petani Bumi Madhani Merbabu (PPBM2) through the following process:

1. Consultation to members to map farmers' problems and search solutions for those problems, for farmers' groups at different growth categories: Al Hidayah (medium), Suka Maju (advanced), Kelompok Tani Subur (pioneer): 15 January – 15 February 2014.
2. Data analysis: 25-27 February 2014
3. Consultation to the experts board (KSP QT, BNI, Agricultural Bureau of the District of Semarang): 30 February 2014
4. Interviews and survey: 20-23 January 2014
5. Drafting of proposal: 30 January – 4 February 2014

6. Obtaining members' feedback: 7 February 2014

7. Validating proposal: 11- 12 February 2014

Is the planning adequate and realistic? Yes.

Particular aspects within the organization where FACT has been implemented:

- Facilitating and strengthening consolidation during the planning activity
- Allowing concrete data based on farmers' reality
- Improving groups' collective efforts
- Allowing more measurable, more structured advocacy work
- Facilitating work based on clear, well-planned tasks

Indications of what is impossible to achieve and why:

- Uncertainty of issues to raise, as farmers tend to think in the short term (how to produce crops) instead of exploring the root causes, e.g. lack of supporting technology, or focusing on capital without considering other essential inputs such as natural and human resources.
- Interviews and surveys are designed under the assumption that farmers would not be completely honest in answering questions, which actually is a form of self-deception.

An internal challenge is the gap in supporting FACT among PPBM2 members.

After socialization of the FACT methodology to members through consultations, some of the members are enthusiastic in implementing FACT as a tool of advocacy for the budget of PPBM2, but some members are less enthusiastic because they do not understand the relevance of FACT in the advocacy work.

Lessons learned from FACT implementation at PPBM2

- A respectful conduct is necessary during consultations and focus group discussions (FGDs).
- The FACT methodology is suitable in supporting advocacy work.
- The FACT methodology thus must be included in members' learning and education as a basis of budget advocacy.

A planned activity for FACT Team at PPBM2 with SPPQT is conducting a workshop for the working team, to:

- Draft the questionnaires and interviews;
- Prepare materials for consultation;
- Form the team of participatory research;
- Prepare the activity budget plan;
- Prepare the activity schedule;
- Prepare the activity design.

Forms of activities:

- Workshops at the paguyuban level
- FGDs at the group level
- Interviews
- Surveys (filling in questionnaires)

Clarifications

Ester:

I'm a bit lost. I don't see clearly the consultation to members – how many were involved? How did you perform research? What are the results of the research?

Andi:

The consultation involved 68 people, from 3 farmers' groups and executive committee. The results were stored in a database, which includes issues in production, capital access, and business development. The advocacy data on production and local commodity potentials, e.g. dairy milk, aside of horticulture.

[Facilitator asked about main differences between SPPQT and participants' own organization.]

Loreta:

SPPQT did quick implementation of FACT theories.

[Facilitator mentioned that there is doubt about implementation, and asked what had not been implemented correctly.]

Ester:

I haven't seen how they perform participatory research, how they wrote a proposal. They mentioned the problem of focusing on an issue to unite farmers. Is that the reason they have not written a proposal?

[Facilitator responded that based on the limited action plan, they had not drafted a proposal. There was a plan but they were not ready.]

Budi - SPPQT:

We have often conducted advocacy, but in implementing FACT we focused on consultancy and research.

[Facilitator asked participants about main insights from the presentation.]

Fery:

Andi mentioned that they consulted 3 organizations and faced a time constraint. Perhaps they could focus in one organization and one issue, as in the principle of www.how.

[Facilitator referred to the memory aids, which might help even if you already have lots of experience like SPPQT.]

Luc:

So based on the comments, the solution is that before conducting consultation we used www.how in our planning before getting to the ground. After the first workshop you should have conducted the planning.

[Facilitator said we did not think to know everything that happens in the farmers' groups.]

Luc:

I will be stricter with time. We continue with presentation and return to the workbook to answer the 4 questions and give opportunities for clarification. After presentation we will have an expert panel that will discuss the answers after all presentations are done.

Presentation by PAKISAMA

We focus on the issue of coconut, **1.2 euros** to provide support to coconut small farmers. The purpose is to improve the condition and welfare of the farmers. We plan the advocacy of financial support by using FACT approach and participatory research, involving members and stakeholders. We originally planned the campaign to be on **September but later changed to early June 2014**. The plan was commented by Kristian and revised to be more realistic with the available resources. In 2013 we just collected fund for campaign to respond the Haiyan typhoon, where many farmers fell victims. Finally Pakisama got funding from the Family Farming. On January this year, NAPC conducted a conference of coconut farmers, resulting in commitment of **ten coconut farmers** in ten provinces through facilitation from PAKISAMA. One of the results was to unite farmers' associations, NGOs, decision makers, and government representatives to **enforce and combine documents** and lobby and to follow up on advocacy plans including necessary steps.

Two committees have the responsibilities to:

- 1) Produce documents
- 2) Plan lobby and advocacy

There is a group of experts and NGOs that are concerned about coconut farming and experts from the Congress and cabinet as board of experts being involved in the advocacy plan.

On May-July we will perform validation in 22 provinces and conference among federations of coconut farmers. On August – December 2014 **we expect to lobby the Congress and the national secretary of our alliance members, long march 200 km by coconut farmers to have a dialogue, due to generation gap in the coconut issue. Why there is a need to collect the income from coconut farmers and return it to farmers.**

PAKISAMA has decided on the focus of the issue and has been present at conferences and meetings to continue to the provincial-level workshops. Many people in the Philippines already know how to perform advocacy.

Original plan and expectation:

Over our capacity, there is revision and focusing of issue and area.

There is a need for more resources to perform more farmer consultations.

Lessons learned: need to realize how to conduct more systematic research.

FACT helps us for the lobby and advocacy process and could be done. Each step of activity has secured funding.

Clarifications

Luc:

Do you have clarification questions? I want to ask, how many farmers did you consult? What did you change after learning about FACT?

Rene:

We work with representatives from coconut farmers in 12 provinces. Due to the typhoon Haiyan, some implementation activities must be postponed. But we tried to improve our planning to be more systematic – also our activities.

Nellie:

One point is unclear for me: are the two committees a part of the participatory research.

Rene:

We have two committees as multisectoral working units. They monitor issues relevant to coconut: situation at the Congress, at the Court of Justice, the President's attitude, etc. We try to draft proposals for the interest of farmers, what pressure we need to do to Congress, what law should be drafted. At the Congress there are senators loyal to our adversaries that are against the interest of coconut farmers. Big businessmen would appeal to the Court of Justice to avoid sharing profits to coconut farmers. We advocate for change. We try to persuade the government to provide funding to improve the welfare of coconut farmers.

Nellie:

Did the two committees help you formulate your strategy, so you view them as your experts?

Rene:

Yes, correct.

Ester:

In the conference in January there were many farmers' groups with different issue. We want to draft a common proposal to send to the Congress and the Court of Justice. The two committees comprise farmers, experts, NGOs, and lawyers.

Presentation by Puan Tani

Puan Tani is lucky that after being founded on August 2012 it got the opportunity to learn about FACT to guide its organizational work. This is one of the services offered by the organization: facilitating new businesses among women, in particular farm agricultural businesses.

In Jakarta we planned to conduct advocacy for female farmers' access to water in Dusun Pagon 1 Subang Jawa Barat. After organizing with one of the focal points on the advocacy plan, the target

group, who to involve, there was a recommendation to conduct advocacy in a new group, because there was already an advocacy for water.

After getting inputs from the district coordinator, we tried to get inputs from experts with experience in community development to find out how to conduct consultation.

Then we performed general consultation on Desember, and found a priority issue within the group, i.e. founding businesses. We performed specific consultation on business development and tested with several businesses. The main issue is processing of fruits. We informed Agriterra and followed up with consultation, participatory research, lobby, and so on.

Expert inputs are not only academic but also the from the organization's focal points, our reference for issues on the ground, the targeted group, when and who to involve to have effective consultation. Consultation with women is better in Saturday or Sunday afternoon to be more effective. Later we consulted experts and were advised to use PRA by using some instruments: plano, paper etc.

We assessed the two processes based on the FACT to answer www.how.

Based on inputs we conducted general consultation from access of women to training, innovation, lesson sharing, wage gap, and permanent (not seasonal) businesses. What are the most potential issues for women and what are the solutions? The main issue is sustainability.

We conducted a specific consultation to decide what sustainable business to found.

A key point of consultation is for the facilitator to motivate female participants to speak up and avoid domination by a few participants.

They polished the business ideas, spotting the opportunities and challenges, and solutions to the challenges. We chose large opportunities with small challenges and available solutions.

They need to be empowered first before they come up with the priority issue, i.e. fruit processing.

Pillar II

We identified **points** related with fruit processing.

Research institutions need to respond to commodities of the community, affordable and feasible. So we performed informal meetings based on communication and feasible, and we conducted formal communication by sending letters to the head of the institutions to get approval, and met with the expert coordinators and waited for assignment letters and planned the agende for a demo.

After we ensured that we had an expert we conducted survey to members. We documented the potentials, including materials, human resources, equipment, capital, market access, and the institutional readiness.

Instrumen yang digunakan campuran, ada yang sifatnya diisi selain komoditas tertentu, mereka juga harus mengisi komoditas lain, atau ada yang sifatnya memilih apakah nilai modal yang dipilih kelompok.

Afterwards we conducted training on processing and technology, up to certification.

Then we surveyed the market in the district, the sale of beverage, our market opportunities. From a demo and experts' advice we found out that we needed to conduct consumer test. We called school children, ojek driver, as we target the local market.

Then we reviewed the process based on the relevant FACT component and water.

Till the workshop the plan is still on-going. We had not come to pillars 3 and 4 as we were delayed by slow collaboration with bureaucratic institutions. But they covered the costs of experts at their

institutions, so we got the advice for free. There are also delays in internal communication, and we had other activities to perform aside of the demo.

Both the farmers' group and our organization are quite enthusiastic with this program, and we expect to finish it by June-July 2014.

Conclusion:

Between plan and expectation, we found many factors on the ground that must be accounted for in order to be able to implement the plans well.

Implementation:

Main insights of FACT:

- 1) Consultation is fundamental as we face unpredictable dynamics of farmers.
- 2) Experts' advice helped us a lot in the methodology of strategy and implementation of plans.

Lessons learned:

Challenge: problems in communicating plans and actions due to limited time.

Benefit: other opportunities from the results of discussion with experts in procurement.

Clarification

Budi:

I haven't seen the process of changing from the original plan of advocating water issue to business development. How did you decide on the change? Who decided to change? The lesson learned is about consulting experts.

Lani:

The decision was made by the leaders of Puan Tani, the national secretary and coordinators, with consideration points from the two groups.

[Facilitator commented that the lesson learned is that consulting experts brings new focus.]

Lani:

Water and food processing indeed involve different groups. From 5 prioritized issues, we chose the one with high farmers' interest and needs to be the most important issue.

Ferry:

So in prioritizing issue Puan Tani consulted experts and then their members. Which are more important? Because in FACT we want to raise issues of members, not of experts, based on the situation on the ground.

Lani:

The experts only provided recommendation on formulating the approach to assess various issues. IN the group level there are lots of competing issues.

[Facilitator commented that the FACT method is not linear, step-by-step. You don't have to start by consulting members. You could consult experts first, depends on your need. For example, before climbing a mountain we can ask experts. Sometimes we think experts need to be paid. Experts are people that know the situation; they don't have to be external, paid parties. Expert consultation relates to who could help us find the issue. So it's interesting what Puan Tani has done. FACT is only a tool to help you think.]

Nellie:

We can differentiate experts that deal with methodologies and with contents.

Puan Tani used 2 types of experts to help. They consulted the district coordinators related to the communities and women's groups on the methodology (www.how) so the activities could be effective. Contentwise, experts were consulted for food processing after consulting members, to improve the proposal. So experts could help with methodologies and with contents.

Presentation by Maria Loreta – API NTT

FACT Follow-up Plan

Purposes :

- Preserve local seeds, in particular sorghum, millets, barley .
- Large use of market-oriented hybrid corn seeds from companies (as the seeds are provided free of charge by the government).
- Potential unused land - in NTT 70% of agricultural land is not irrigated.
- Local farmers prefer local seeds.
- A need to introduce to the community the local food, i.e. sorghum, millets, that are more adaptive to the local condition, especially in view of climate change, food insecurity, and nutrition issue.

How we implemented FACT

- We formed a team to consult farmers / members from Sumba, Manggarai Barat, Nagekeo, Ende, Sikka, Adonara, Sumba, Rote, focusing on dry farming;
- We collected local food seeds from each community and assess the utilization of unused land through participatory research

Member consultation:

- We decided on who to perform consult and who to consult. I explained about food, the importance of local food, connection with human rights, climate change, and nutrition.
- We discussed the need to build communal silo to reserve seeds and distribute free seeds.
- We explored local issues in farming and food: pests, division of work, natural farming
- We asked response from members and developed a SMART proposal by involving experts: Zevrinus MSI, a graduate of Wageningen University working at the Food Resilience Agency (*Badan Ketahanan Pangan*) of the District of East Flores and DR. Sutoro from the BB Biogen at the Ministry of Agriculture. Then we performed lobby mapping to all stakeholders. As a matter of fact, our advocacy on local seeds and dry farming was started on 2009 and the FACT methodology suits our need.

- The result is the Regional Regulation No.12 on local development, in December 2013;
- Sorghum Milling Factories

Lobbying religious leaders

- This is important as 80% of the population in Flores are Catholics and loyal to the Church;
- I always campaign the need to involve the Church in local campaigns, and they also invite us;
- We persuade the Church to support this movement as it's pro-poor and pro-desolate. Economic empowerment of church members is important.

Clarification

Ester:

Was the December resolution a result of FACT?

Loreta:

We performed campaign and advocacy since 2009, then Ika contacted us for learning, and we need support from experts and the Church in order to get the regional government to help us, because legal permission is quite important. For example, I was reproached by the Agricultural Bureau for posting videos against rice and maize in Youtube, because they said it's too frontal.

[The facilitator commented that it's interesting. Not all groups have performed lobbying. It's an important and smart step to involve the Church. RPRP is a good lesson learned. FACT should be adapted as you run your activities.]

Nellie:

I have a question. I understand that you explained to your members the importance of food sovereignty. So was it general consultation or a knowledge sharing? Did you perform consultation or just explain your vision and mission? Did members get opportunities to provide inputs and opinions?

Loreta:

Not only consultation, but also distribution of free seeds up to the postharvest processing.

Facilitator:

Please prepare answers to the questions: added value and lessons learned. You can also comment in relation to the workbook, whether FACT adds value.

PUAN TANI

Added value:

- Improving the work of consultation
- Expert network results in many opportunities for organization development
- Improve work efficiency, because of clear direction and steps
- Analysis of public figures through lobby mapping, helping us in approaching the right people to help us talk with farmers.

Lessons learned:

- Challenges in socialization. We started with implementation and explained the FACT later, because socialization or members is difficult if they don't have skills.
- We invited experts in tutoring to avoid the failure of government's projects, where fund is often provided before farmers are informed about the activities.
- In the farmers' level, communication is an issue. We have to be patient, not pushy, because this is for their interest so they have to be active. We just motivate.
- We need to reflect on our experience.
- Adjustment to local culture to be able to decide on future steps.

PAKISAMA

Added value:

- We can manage our advocacy campaign well. Despite the disaster, with FACT implementation we could proceed with our plan because it had been laid out clearly.
- More control over activities due to good planning.
- Rene likes CROP

Lessons learned:

FACT helps us unite farmers' voice in the Philippines in a large scale and enable us to write a petition to support wider advocacy. We can get more partners on specific issues such as advocacy. Ideas from farmers are also ideas from civil society organization organization. We collect all the knowledge as a basis to our planning in our organization and to help us deliver the points of our advocacy.

SPPQT

Added value:

Measurable, systematic, well-planned methodology for advocacy

Lessons learned:

FACT is a method of thinking for ways forward in a smart, realistic manner.

SEKNAS API

Added value:

The systematic advocacy work is more effective and communicative, both internally within the organization and with members. Previously from consulting members we went straight to lobby, without research and lobby mapping.

Lessons learned:

We have performed advocacy before implementing FACT. What we learned is that member consultation should not exceed 25 people to avoid communication issues. Also not all farmers could write, or speak Indonesian. The concept of www.how is important in conducting consultation.

API NTT

Added value:

Agriterra enlightened us and reminded us to do advocacy with valid, instead of false, data – thus increasing the chance of success.

APPOLI

Added value:

Work effectiveness has been improved with FACT.

Lessons learned:

Experts are engaged not from among academicians, but from practitioners. For example, for advocacy on cooperatives we did not engage a university lecturer of the cooperative system but an experienced leader of a cooperative.

Facilitator:

Communication with members is an added value and it will increase accountability of the organization by members. Any aspects not yet implemented?

Ester:

- Not the number of members but the method
- Sometimes people don't believe. Community organization needs many steps, starting from social integration and building trust like Puan Tani. They already have coordinators that are trusted, so the learning can be flexible.
- The 3rd learning of FACT scope, the experience of the Philippines could be done. Different scope requires different methodology focus.
- FACT is not always linear, depends on the case and community situation, but it's not a problem.

Facilitator asked for a break due to time constraint. If there were still comments, participants could talk directly to the facilitators.

SESSION 3A FORMULATION OF LESSONS LEARNED

Oleh Fasilitator: Neli

We will define the lessons learned from implementing the theory into practice (3A pages 29-30).

Of the 5 presentation, please answer 4 questions:

- 1) Added value
- 2) Concepts not correctly implemented
- 3) Challenges
- 4) Improved aspects of organization work

For numbers 2 and 3 you could see the comments you wrote in your workbook about the presentations of the 5 organization. Please stand at front to discuss.

Issues you have in added value could be relevant to the 3rd column. Otherwise identify other problems. We can discuss about concepts that are not correctly implemented.

Luc:

Identification of no.2 could also refer to no. 4. We have listened to presentations – they only serve as references. You could write as much as you want.

Ester:

Aside of the presentations in general, you could put in parentheses if there are some points that could not be implemented based on some case.

Luc:

In general, all could not implement www.how. As mentioned by Ferry, **the process does not have to be linear**. This is quite feasible for organizations like API. You could consult Luc directly for pillars 3 and 4 as long as we are accountable to our constituents, as long as the advocacy is not only the interest of management but also the farmers, so the process is really bottom up.

Facilitator thinks that though this is feasible, there is added value if we are patient in following the process step by step. If we go straight to advocacy, the government might be reluctant to listen. But if we proceed slowly through participatory research, we get more evidence, in greater details, for advocacy and could better deliver the message.

A SMART proposal will have value if the decision makers could see what the farmers want. Established organizations could do it easily but the proposal would be like an undercooked food – it's raw inside. So to involve all stakeholders and raise their awareness and support requires patience and time. We could not just jump and need to follow several steps, though they do not have to be sequential.

Based on Luc's experience as a lobbyist working directly with the government, representing 60% of Dutch farmers, we need strong back-up from farmers, who need to see what we say to the government. So if we get challenges we have back-up.

For challenges such as too many people attending FGD, you should review the HOW for consulting a large group. It has been identified from the presentation. Are there other issues on the ground in implementing FACT?

Loreta:

After mapping stakeholder, we still had problems in convincing the decision makers even with the support of experts.

Ester:

It's better if you prioritize issues instead of dealing with all of them.

Lani:

It is difficult to implement the plan, e.g. in changing schedule due to farmers' dynamics and other interests and agenda.

Andi Gatot:

Providing understanding to farmers' communities is not one-off because sometimes they have problems understanding our explanation.

Rene - Pakisama:

We have problems getting data from the government.

SESSION GROUP DISCUSSION

Nelly:

We will make two groups, one speaking in Indonesian and another in English. Please identify main challenges from each pillar. We will make mind maps on flip charts. You can see 4 flip charts with the name of the pillar. Please discuss the main challenges of each pillar. You must cover all pillars, so once you finished you move to another pillar, but one person should stay to explain to the other groups.

1) Indonesian group: Susatyo, Loreta, Budi, Andi (starting with Pillars 1 and 2)

2) English group: Ester, Intan, Lani, Rene, Fery (starting with Pillars 3 and 4)

[Group work]

Results:

Pillar 1:

- The main challenges are: consultation method regarding strategy, number of participants, purpose and focus, context and reality, farmers' availability, and costs
- Who to involve in consultation: challenges to meet the goals, e.g. discussing land ownership but involving farmers that already own land
- Locality issue: understanding the culture, translation to local languages
- Geographical issue: challenges to reach constituent in terms of costs and time.

Pillar 2:

- Challenges to get experts due to availability and commitment to join the board and costs
- Capacity of the human resources in research, e.g. persuasion skill to have the members fill the survey completely and accurately
- When to complete data
- Writing realistic proposal that suits the need
- How to gain trust from farmers themselves and other actors
- Ability to explore data from various sources and experts to support the results of research

Pillar 3:

- Difficult to do without consultant's support
- Difficult to get, also due to time – it is often late and not synchronized
- Difficult to decide the strongest argument to convince the government
- Other issues surface – which to prioritize, as we do not have adequate skills for writing proposals

Pillar 4:

- Main challenges: bureaucratic complexity, who to contact and who really have the power to decide
- Lack of lobbying skills
- Difficult to know the target due to regular mutation within government agencies
- We need to know various lobbying methods, e.g. formal meetings or demonstrations

Tomorrow we will check these challenges, see solutions to them.