

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

Day 1

Saturday, 3<sup>rd</sup> 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.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Impressions</b>	<b>Expectations</b>
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
Rani	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
Esther	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
Huong	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.
Ha	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
Nellie - 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
Pan Sopheap	Cambodia		
Nina	API - Finance		
Sakdiyah	Translator		
Hira Jhamtani	Translator		
MJ	API - Finance		

**Nellie:**

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]

**Nellie:**

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 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 4<sup>th</sup> 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

Jun:

Welcome to the group. We have participants from Vietnam, Cambodia, Mongolia, Laos, and Indonesia so we're 6 countries in this room. This is sharing session of piloting FACT. Before we start: now it's 11.45. We must break for lunch at 12. As we're running late, we propose that we take lunch at 1PM or 1.30PM. Is it okay? [Participants agreed.]

If you go to Participant's Workbook, page 15, Session 1B. In this session we have two parts, presentation of participants' experience. We have 3 countries: Vietnam, API, and NAMA, to present their cases. You get 15 minutes to present your experience. After finishing 3 presentations we go the 2<sup>nd</sup> step, expert panel, so we ask presenters to present the value of using FACT and lessons learned and the rest to give comments to the panel. That's the agenda for this morning.

First presenter is from Vietnam. Please see in Page 16 for a place to take note. There are important notes that you need to note: differences between their implementation and yours, something from FACT that is not correctly applied, the best insight from the presentation, the main lessons you learn from the case. Note taking will help you focus and get the lessons from these experiences.

#### **Presentation by VFU**

##### **LESSON LEARNT ON PILOT FACT**

By Vietnam Farmers' Union

The Plan on 1st Workshop

- Consultation: Survey, get information about employment needs to improve livelihood for Youth; Use www.how; CROP, place: Thai Binh, Nam Dinh, Hanoi; time: December 2013
- Participatory research: To know what youth in rural areas wants and needs to build foundation for proposals more realistic; engage experts, time: from 1-10/1/2014
- Writing proposals following SMART and using KSK, time: from 11-31/1/2014.
- Lobby mapping and stakeholder analysis for lobby & advocacy: Identify decision makers and stakeholders; classify relevant stakeholders based on power and interest; do lobby mapping; use RPRP; time: From 1st Feb – 1st April/2014

The plan was changed a little bit on place due to time, budget, and availability of staff:

- Place: Dang Xa commune, Gia Lam district, suburb of Hanoi
- Time: Changed a lit bit due to Tet holidays, end of the year with many of review meetings.

What Was Carried Out?

1. Consultation:

- National consultation with representatives from VNFU, Youth's Union, Women' Union
- Membership consultation and participatory research:
  - Where? Dang Xa commune, Gia Lam district, Hanoi
  - When? February
  - Who consulted? Rural youth, farmers in Dang Xa commune.
  - How? FACT

## 2. Participatory research:

- Questionnaire/surveys forms developed with support of internal experts/staff.
- Meeting with rural youth, farmers in Dang Xa to select the priority using participatory approach and fill in the forms.
- Desk study: Collaborated with representatives of Youth's Union to collect reports from Youth's Union, Law, VNFU reports, websites...

## 3. Writing SMART proposal:

Based on the results of consultation and participatory research, using internal experts/staff to write the proposal

## 4. Lobby mapping and stakeholders' analysis:

Using format of power and interest analysis to do lobby mapping and stakeholder analysis.

### What Were Not Possible To Do?

- No consultations with membership in Thai Binh, Nam Dinh due to availability of experts, time and budget.
- Hard to write a SMART proposal due to lack of data and information.
- Due to the budget, number of members who were consulted was very small, expected at least 200 members to make sure the research results but only 20 were consulted.
- Not yet realize the lobby activities due to limited budget: meetings, engaging stakeholders need more budget.

### Results:

- Initial awareness of youth's responsibility on advocacy on farming.
- Not yet SMART enough proposal
- Not yet realize the lobby and present the proposal to decision makers.

### Conclusions

- The plan was not realistic because of the time (Tet holidays in Vietnam, end of the year with so many of review meetings...)
- Leaders of VNFU were not familiar with FACT approach.
- Members were not familiar with FACT approach.
- Budget is small compared with our ambition of activities and places.

### Main Insights of FACT:

- Based on the tasks and functions of VNFU, FACT is very practical, potential and meaningful to help VNFU to know exactly the members' needs to propose to the decision makers.
- One of important tasks realized of the 6th Congress of VNFU is to advocate policies on agriculture, farmers, to know and to show that VNFU knows is very important.
- VNFU uses some of FACT pillars regularly, however, due to capacity and awareness, all FACT system were not used systematically.
- FACT approach should be popularized among staff of VNFU at all levels through TOT method.



- Pilot FACT should be applied in some provinces to be models of FACT because FACT is really practical to this level.

#### Lessons Learnt:

- Awareness raising among leaders to help them know the actual benefits/importance of FACT to get their full support on FACT.
- Increasing the capacity of staff on all FACT concepts through TOT, particularly the lobby and engaging the decision makers.
- Setting up pilot models on using FACT in routine work as well as the Constructive Engagement of some FU at provinces to be the demonstration.
- Instead of using external experts, increasing capacity for key staff on research methods, surveys methods...

#### Additional notes:

The plan after the 1<sup>st</sup> workshop was to help the youth. We made plan to improve the youth. First was performing survey. We used www.how and CROP and we intended to do presentation in three provinces where many lands have been bought so many farmers don't have land anymore (urbanization). We also planned to do participatory research to know what youth in the areas need to build foundation and engage experts. We also planned to write the SMART proposal and lobby mapping and stakeholder analysis.

In the implementation we changed a bit due to time budget and availability of staff. Because February is the lunar New Year, a big festival, it is difficult to conduct review meetings. The plan was to cover three provinces but we did only in one province.

We first do national consultation with representatives of VNFU, Youth's Union, Women's Union and youth representatives from the area. We also did membership consultation.

We did questionnaires/surveys but not with external experts. We also organized meetings with rural youth using participatory approach. After that we do desk study to collect various reports.

We did the writing of SMART proposal but it's not as SMART as we think it should.

We do lobby mapping of one issue - there are many other issues we found.

We did not do consultation in 2 provinces due to limited availability of experts, time, and budget.

It is hard to write a SMART proposal due to a lack of data.

Due to budget, number of participants is small.

#### Jun:

Do you have any question or unclear points? We will have comments later in the expert panel, now is only clarification.

#### Ismu:

Thank you, it's interesting. I'd like to make one comment. The developed process should involve youth groups. Involvement of the youth groups as constituents should start in the beginning, to avoid problems that were explained. For instance, about timing – holiday should be known nationally.

#### Jun:

We have a session in the afternoon on lessons learning that's where we give comments about the concepts applied. For now, just take notes. Next is API.

### **Presentation by API:**

Follow-up Plan - FACT Youth -

By Aliansi Petani Indonesia

#### 1. FACT Implementation Plan

API plans to perform advocacy in accordance with FACT Youth in 3 API regions.

API implements FACT steps based on the four pillars: Consultation to Members, Participatory Research, Writing SMART Proposal, and Lobby Mapping.

#### 2. Implementation of FACT Youth

In accordance with FACT Trajectory, the first pillar was performed through consultation with members in 3 member organizations: PPGS, OPMM, and SPL. Consultation was done through Focus Group Discussion, distributing questionnaires to get relevant information to prepare organization's database as a basis to the next pillar, participatory research.

Writing of a SMART Proposal and lobby mapping have not been done.

In implementing FACT (Pillar 1), we had problems with the time constraint – the FGD was not considered sufficient to explore issues so another FGD is necessary.

In the draft workplan formulated by AFA, the FACT steps to be performed were Pillars 1 and 2, i.e. consultation to members and participatory and desk research. The workplan does not include writing a SMART proposal and lobby mapping of stakeholders.

Up to now, API has performed FACT Youth for Pillars 1 and 2, i.e. Consultation to Members and Participatory Research. The other pillars are not yet implemented, i.e. writing a SMART proposal and lobby mapping of stakeholders.

#### 3. Summary and conclusions

Up till now, the implementation of FACT still agrees with the plan. But to perform lobby mapping, we might need the sufficient funding and intense implementation time.

In implementing FACT steps, the implementation of each pillar was different. Pillar 1 required sufficient time for consultation. For Pillar 2 we still need guidance in how to use the results of members' consultation as preliminary materials/data for the participatory research. We need further consultation to discuss the writing of the SMART proposal.

Based on the practice of implementing FACT, there are some aspects that could be improved within farmers' organizations, in particular regarding documentation to support the organization's database, for use in writing SMART proposals.

FACT Lessons-learned:

- From Pillar 1: Consultation to members should be limited to 25 people.
- In consulting members, we need to know the geographical conditions
- FACT could be applied smoothly in farmers' organizations with good internal condition and with good, organized data set.

**Additional notes:**

We were appointed by API to present implementation of FACT based on the first workshop. API and AFA followed up with a plan in 3 regions: 2 in Jateng (Central Java) and 1 in Jatim (East Java). We have not been able to perform all activities – in FACT methodology we only did pillars 1 and 2. In members consultation we invited youth organizations and worked with them in each region. In the consultation session we distributed questionnaires to find out issues about young farmers. We had problems because this is the first time we did it in regional level. API is still working based on the implementation plan. Now we have not been able as yet to perform pillars 3 and 4. Those require additional funding and intense mentoring. API will also perform members' consultation to strengthen research and support the writing SMART proposal.

Some things we note are the need to perform documentation and data collection for organization's database. Consultation should not exceed 25 members at once. Before consultation we need to know the geographic and physical conditions of the area.

**Jun:**

That's less than 10 minutes. Any questions? Make sure you're writing your notes for the panel session.

**Miriam:**

You mentioned about the geographical conditions. What do you mean?

**API:**

The distance should also be considered. Infrastructure such as road and street lighting might be issues.

**Miriam:**

Do you come up with those problems as you performed the implementation?

**API:**

Yes.

**Jun:**

Next is Indra from NAMAC.

### **Presentation by NAMAC**

Attracting the Young to Agriculture (IYFF agenda)

The plan - main points:

- Consultation to membership - youth members of NAMAC, through online discussion (Dec 25) and face to face (Dec 30)
- Participatory research – use internal expert to design research and do desk study, use results of research by Mongol herders media agency (Jan 15)
- Writing SMART proposals – hire expert to consolidate data and write proposal (Jan 15, 2014)
- Lobby mapping and stakeholder analysis for lobby and advocacy – do lobby map and power matrix, meet NGOs and ministries

What was changed:

None.

Activities carried out:

- Consultation to membership - youth members of NAMAC, through online discussion (Dec 25) and face to face (Dec 19, 20)
- Training /no connection with Youth in Agriculture project/
- Participatory research – use internal expert to design research and do desk study, use results of research by Mongol herders magazine /media agency/
- Writing SMART proposals – hire expert to consolidate data and write proposal /Shombodon.D/
- Lobby mapping and stakeholder analysis for lobby and advocacy – do lobby map and power matrix, meet NGOs and ministries

What was not possible to do:

Not able to meet with ministries and NGOs in the agriculture sector due to budget constraint and not suitable dates

Results so far:

- After consultation meeting, NAMAC youth members decided to meet annually (this year on Aug 15) – will be done in the province
- NAMAC used research of media agency and discussed youth in agriculture issue with them
- The “Mongol herder” media agency established the Young Herders Committee and NAMAC became one representative of Board meeting
- the committee will organize a nationwide consultation among the youth (approx. 500 herders) on May 9-10 (vice president will attend) under the auspices of PM, so government to cover all costs
- Expected result: Vice-president asking FAO and ministry of labor, industry and agri, and NAMAC to organize farmers’ consultation

Was the plan realistic and adequate? Yes.

Implementation: What was accomplished or not accomplished? What conditions were lacking?

We have done almost all our plans except the meeting with NGOs and government ministries due to lack of budget and date

Main insights from FACT concepts - What particular aspects of the organization’s work have been improved by the use of these concepts?

- Due to consultation to members:
  - Farmers getting closer, want to meet every year, discuss problem and what they can do by themselves and with NAMAC (effective contact)
  - The prime minister highly supports the planned consultation
- Due to participatory research:
  - We now have research on youth – now we can show that we know the issue and we can propose good solutions
- Due to SMART proposal:
  - Better proposal, already got results in short time, can more effectively lobby and advocate government through the committee
- Due to lobby mapping and stakeholder analysis:

- Easier to lobby and have contact with decision makers

Lessons learned (for improving the future use of FACT or similar concepts):

- By consulting members and doing participatory research, we can get more support from members and decision makers
- FACT can help members become more empowered and do things for themselves effectively
- Consultation to members taught herders how to meet online
- FACT was the first experience in real consultation and research – so it got enthusiastic support
- Use of templates from AFA made it easy to write reports

**Additional notes:**

We have not participated in the first workshop so you might be surprised how we could do this. We have advantages: we're close to the ministries – our office is only 1-2 minute-walk to their offices. We can contact the government whenever we want. Just two years ago, the democratic government won and we had access to talk to government agencies directly. We also have extensive network 21 branch of NAMAC – every provinces. Two month before Mongolian herders' media agency had just performed a large research.

Our president didn't know about fact but encouraged us to participate in fact youth as we're new in AFA and AFA gave us good guidelines so we're successful in implementation.

We had short time and we focused all our staff to do just this in two months.

Youth members' consultation: face to face and online because AFA asked us to engage more farmers in every province. We have 21 face-to-face and 53 online participants.

Writing SMART proposal: we hired expert that's good in English and experience in writing proposal

Last year is the first annual NAMAC youth members. The vice president will organize farmers' consultation.

**Jun:**

Very good, it's fifteen minutes. Any clarification?

**Cambodia:**

Clarification on the presentation – writing SMART proposal. Date: 15<sup>th</sup> January – not January 2015.

**Miriam:**

So you used an expert to write the proposal?

**Indra:**

Yes, but I always sat beside him and he'd ask questions because he didn't attend the consultation.

**Miriam:**

Usually you should write the proposal but get insight from experts. I think it's innovative and others could learn from that.

**Jun:**

Now we ask for some participants to be panelists: one from Indonesia, one from Vietnam and one from Mongolia. You could remain where you're sitting. Each one of you will have one round of

comment. For the first round use the blue metacard. What is the best value added in using fact in your own organization? Miriam will write the main ideas, you just present.

**Miriam:**

They can compare with before using FACT.

**Sonde:**

We think that FACT is systematic and help us be more accurate in performing mentoring.

**VFU:**

Many policies do not fit farmers' needs. FACT helps policies get closer to farmers' issues and needs through proposing effective proposals and increases members' trust.

**NAMAC:**

Now we know farmers' real problems and what we should do.

**Sonde:**

Aside of facilitating organizational work, it help farmers recognize and express their own problems needs.

**Lany:**

I think it's very credible because it's their experience. But it's more about the output not the process. As for NAMAC it's more than I can imagine from the simple activity of FACT. You have very big results on farmers and government on having consultation with farmers, institutionalizing the facilitation of young members, meeting the media. So it's not added value to your own organization but to your sectors.

**NAMAC:**

If we participated in the 1<sup>st</sup> workshop it would be more difficult because I would think more deeply.

**Miriam:**

I'm amazed that you trained youth herders online.

**Indra:**

It's within their budget and time and we have branches in every province and they help us collect herders.

**Cambodia:**

We're very interested with the result of NAMAC, as they're able to convince herder's community in consultation and bring in the herders to have the meeting where they get the support from the government. We expect other countries in the region will have similar experience of government support. In Cambodia the ministry of agriculture is quite interested in the consultation activities.

**Jun:**

Now we look at the lessons learned. What was your most important lesson learned? Lessons learned can be from a success, a partial success, or even not yet a success, or not what you planned. What works, what doesn't work, when did it work? We still have 4 minutes before lunch. We're quite good with time.

**Sugeng:**

In data mining, it is difficult to eliminate suspicions from members – is it just a project, or an effort to empower communities?

**Sonde:**

Government involvement: lack of government support for civil initiatives.

**VFU:**

We have three main lessons learned:

- We need to do more dissemination to leaders of farmers
- Increase availability of staff to do some pilot and model
- Through knowing the practical issue, it becomes evidence to government to know and give support
- Capacity for the staff who can popularize the fact and give training to the farmers

**Jun:**

It was four or three? I asked only one. [joke]

**Indra:**

Results are not only from NAMAC's hard working. Mongolian government is also looking... they want to do something for the herders.

**Jun:**

Good results are from people working together.

**Indra:**

NAMAC gave them idea. We're in the right condition.

**Jun:**

We ask Laos about what you learn from other countries.

**Laos:**

We are different from your case. It is difficult to do the steps of talking with high power government.

**Jun:**

FACT can give different results. Government might be open, or might be closed.

**Lany:**

First, it's difficult to bring people together, online is a good tool.

Proposal could be general call for an enabling mechanism – it's also good. We don't have to have specific technical proposal, e.g. for a specific project or policy. Technicality of smart proposal should be combined with the credibility of the organization.

AFA can't always conduct training on FACT. With NAMAC we've done through checklists. We need to produce more user-friendly ways to conduct FACT training: templates, guidance...

**Jun:**

Clarifying your point, FACT could also help you with enabling mechanism not only with specific technical. Now it's time for lunch, we get back on 2 PM.

**Miriam:**

The room might need to be secured because we have laptops etc. inside.



## Afternoon Sessions

### Session 2-A

#### Miriam:

Just like this morning, at page 22 of your workbook there's space to make notes. Have you all found it?

#### Presentation by FNN by Mr. Seu Rany (Cambodia)

Title: Attracting the Young to Agriculture (IYFF agenda) – FNN FACT Implementation

Presented by Mr. Seu Rany (Chairperson of FNN)

Main points of the plan:

- Consultation to membership, Nov-Dec 2013
- Participatory research, Jan 2014
- Writing SMART proposals, Feb 2014
- Lobby mapping and stakeholder analysis for lobby and advocacy, Mar 2014

What was changed:

- Consultation to membership, Oct-Dec 2013
- Participatory research, Jan 2014
- Writing SMART proposals, Feb 2014
- Lobby mapping and stakeholder analysis for lobby and advocacy, Mar 2014
- Time frame was adjusted until 2014

What was carried out in the period between the workshops:

- Consultation to membership: FGD, Dec 2013 & Feb 2014; 3 provinces, 2 districts.
- Participatory research: used internal expert; administered questionnaire; desk study (report not yet finished)
- Writing SMART proposal: (ongoing)
- Lobby mapping and stakeholder analysis for lobby and advocacy (not yet)

What was not possible to do:

- Not able to consult all targeted youth due to budget and time and staff constraints
- SMART proposal writing not yet finished due to time and staff constrained
- No lobbying yet, because proposal not yet finished

Results so far:

- Deputy Dir of Gen Dept of Agri & Head of Agriculture Extension observed the consultation – they expressed support to the issue (sensitized) – concerned about migration of youth to cities, lack of labor
- We have better understanding of youth issues in agriculture
- Established better communication and relation with relevant esp. MAFF

- Targeted youth be more aware on risks of migration workers and start considering and focusing much on agricultural works

Conclusions:

- After learning and participating in FACT, we are very interested in the FACT program, because FACT have provided either knowledge of FACT, writing of SMART proposal, and ways to find issues and propose proper solution or lobby mapping decision makers to solve problems. Furthermore the FACT provides a lot of benefits to society especially to youth.

Was the plan realistic and adequate? YES

Implementation - What was accomplished or not accomplished? What conditions were lacking?

Accomplished:

- Consultation to members, participatory research

Not yet accomplished:

- SMART proposal writing due to lack of time and staff (on leave)
- No lobbying yet
- Need more skills and training in lobby and advocacy

Main insights from FACT concepts - What particular aspects of the organization's work have been improved by the use of these concepts?

- Consultation to Membership:
  - Staff and leaders increased capacity to do research
  - Gained more support from members
- Participatory Research
  - Learned how to collect issue and proposed solution
- Writing SMART Proposals
  - Knowledge on preparing proposals improved

Lessons learned (for improving the future use of FACT or similar concepts)

- FACT can help farmer leaders and staff understand the issues of members and to deal with government and partners
- we want to organize FACT workshop with more members (district network leaders), so we need TOT for more leaders and staff

**Additional remarks:**

Time frame was adjusted until 2014 – the original plan was to perform the implementation in 2013.

Why do we put government's involvement as a result? Government came as observers to the consultation. But when we presented the issues that we've found, they were very interested and concerned because they've seen them.

**Clarification:**

**Indra:**

There's lack of staff and experts in participatory research. Could you explain more?

## **Cambodia:**

We work with 15 provinces across the country but we only have 4 staff with several on-going projects. We have constraints of time and staff.

### **Presentation by Inna (Laos)**

Implementation of the FACT Youth in Agriculture, Pek and Khoun Districts, Xiengkhouang by SAEDA, Organic Farmers Association (OFA), and Farmers' Association for Sustainable Agricultural Projects (FASAP)

Plan:

See document: "laos fact follow up plan.doc".

Implementation of the Plan:

See document: "laos fact follow up plan-implementation.doc"

Time:

- We postponed the Consultation to members in Feb 2014
- Participatory research in Feb 2014
- Writing SMART proposals in March and April and
- Lobby mapping

Process:

We used the FACT tool but adjust more appropriate for Farmers and for team. We combined the pillars of FACT, because of budget and times.

Brief summary of the activities that actually were carried out:

In accordance with the FACT pillar, the first and second steps were consultation to members and participatory research in Pek and Khoun District and we use participatory method to get the data (visual activities). After consultation with experts, a policy and SMART proposal was drafted. Later on, lobby mapping was performed for all stakeholders that would be able to push for policy reform, research and activities.

- Consultation workshop in 2 districts
- Participatory research in
  - Pek: in 5 villages the number of participant is 168, women 90 and men 78. In school around 100 people.
  - Khoun: in 5 villages, No186, women 134, men 52
- The 3rd pillar, writing a SMART proposal. We expect that in the near future the proposal could be used by the farmers' group to resolve their problems and used by other organization to develop some activities in that location. Supporting documents: "US Grant Proposal 2014 03 13.docx" and "proposal on Youth in Agri.doc".
- Lobbying:
  - Invited government to attend a meeting
  - Lobby map

Problems:

- Focus group discussions (FGDs) and consultations to members were not sufficient in exploring issues.
- Time

Results so far:

- youth in agriculture is the second priority of Xengkhouang province
- Young people more motivated for agriculture in villages
- Agriculture school try to develop curriculum to campaign students about youth in agriculture field

Conclusions:

- Up to this point, FACT implementation still follows the plan. But the lobby mapping might be problematic
- Implementation of each pillar necessitates further guidance and consultation, as results might not be optimum as we expected.
- We could not do full/much of Lobbying
- Smart proposal

The keywords (AIR, www.how, CROP, KSK, SMART, and RPRP)

Lessons learn:

- We could not find policy support to youth especially youth in agriculture even though the number of the youth is very high.
- We need to do desk research before doing the consultation make sure that we know well the policies & what's existing on the ground

**Additional note:**

Key words slide: The key words helped us a lot. It is very important for us to remember these key words.

**Jun:**

Clarification: So your consultation was not only about asking/raising issues – but also to share information.

**Inna:**

Yes.

**Miriam:**

You said the farmers do not know the policies. You don't know? They don't exist?

**Inna:**

Sometimes they don't exist; sometimes they're not easy to understand.

**Indra:**

There are lots of young people – so you don't really need to advocate agriculture?

**Inna:**

Yes young people are more than 70% of the population. But the young people don't want to work on the field.

**Miriam:**

You found an issue. The farmers don't know there are policies – that's an issue.

**Sonde:**

There were 3 organizations to implement FACT in the youth theme. Have you resolved issues within the three organizations?

**Inna:**

We were in the workshop together, planned together.

### **Presentation by AFA**

Attracting the Young to Agriculture (IYFF agenda) – AFA FACT Implementation

The plan (main points):

- Consultation to membership, Oct-Dec 2013
- Participatory research, Jan 2014
- Writing SMART proposals, Feb 2014
- Lobby mapping and stakeholder analysis for lobby and advocacy, Mar 2014

What was changed:

- Consultation to membership, Oct-Dec 2013 (extended to 2014)
- Participatory research, Jan 2014 (to be done by members, AFA to conduct regional participatory research)
- Writing SMART proposals, Feb 2014 (to be done by members, AFA to collate during FACT regional activity in May 2014)
- Lobby mapping and stakeholder analysis for lobby and advocacy, Mar 2014 (to be done during or after FACT regional activity in May 2014)

Activities carried out:

- Membership consultation among youth by members (Indonesia, Philippines, Vietnam, Nepal, Mongolia, Kyrgyztan,)
- Participatory research by members (data gathering & desk study) (Indonesia, Philippines, Vietnam, Nepal, Mongolia, Kyrgyztan)
- Writing SMART proposal by members (Indonesia, Philippines, Vietnam, Nepal, Mongolia, Kyrgyztan)
- Lobby mapping and stakeholder analysis for lobby and advocacy by members (Indonesia, Vietnam, Nepal, Mongolia, Kyrgyztan)

What was not possible to do:

- Most members not able to prepare very SMART proposals due to different levels of capacity as well as due to time and budget constraint
- Some members not yet finished with all pillars due to lack of time, budget and staff (Cambodia, Thailand, Japan, Taiwan, Korea)

- Most members did not undergo FACT training so they were unfamiliar with the methodology (only Phils, Indonesia, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos)
- AFA not yet able to do regional participatory research, writing SMART proposal, and stakeholder analysis, as consultation to members is not yet finished

Results so far:

- No results yet, AFA regional proposal not yet prepared and presented to decision makers
- PAKISAMA has advocated its policy proposal on Magna Carta for Youth in Rome
- Members are expected to refine proposals to make them SMART and to lobby decision makers in 2014
- AFA is expected draw out a regional policy proposal from the national policy proposals
- AFA is expected to lobby decision makers in 2014

Was the plan realistic and adequate?

- Plan not too realistic. Most members did not undergo FACT training and most members were busy with other activities.
- Support fund to carry-out the Plan not adequate. No provisions for addressing limitations in time, staff, and capacity.

What was accomplished or not accomplished? What conditions were lacking?

Members able to do consultation to members, participatory research, policy proposal writing, stakeholder analysis, but:

- Some not yet finished due to lack of time, staff, capacity
- Policy proposals not too SMART due to limited capacity for policy proposal writing
- AFA has not yet conducted regional participatory research, prepared regional policy proposal , and done stakeholder analysis

What particular aspects of the organization's work have been improved by the use of these concepts?

- Consultation to Membership:
  - Accountability, information, responsiveness by ensuring that real issues and problems of members are being addressed
- Participatory Research
  - Ability to know and show that we know by gathering detailed information and using expert knowledge

What particular aspects of the organization's work have been improved by the use of these concepts?

- Writing SMART Proposals
- Ability to evaluate quality and effectiveness of proposals
- Identified members' need to improve capacity in policy proposal writing
- Lobby Mapping and Stakeholder Analysis

- Ability to identify key stakeholders and plan effective ways to communicate and relate with them
- Identified opportunities to do lobby and advocacy and therefore maximize resources

Lessons learned (for improving the future use of FACT or similar concepts):

- Effective implementation of FACT still depends on existing capacities of organization on the 4 pillars
- Writing SMART proposals is a key area for improvement among AFA members
- Better if all AFA members have undergone FACT workshop to gain clear understanding of methodology
- Difficulties due to language, time and staff availability
- How to integrate FACT with Constructive Engagement?

**Additional notes:**

Usually we performed consultation with the executives of our member organizations. But as we got funding from Agriterra, we can get the executives to consult their members.

We're happy that our members are "FACTorized" but we still need to build the capacity of our members in advocacy and increase our confidence.

**Miriam:**

No questions? [none]

Now that Lany's here, could you give us an energizer.

**Lany:**

You know the kindergarten song: feet, knee, shoulder and head. [Participants and facilitators sang it together with movements.]

**Added Value of FACT**

**Lany:**

Same with you. We now have common understanding of being consultative and participatory.

**Seu Rany:**

More understandable for farmers and youth. When we performed consultation and invited government agencies and other relevant partners, they are interested in the tool. The consulted youth is interested and inspired them to work on agriculture. FACT help understand who to approach.

**Miriam:**

So you have convinced the youth, even before you do the lobby? Just the consultation? Is that right?

**Seu Rany:**

Now it is the trend from youth to migrate from the communities because there's no work – either to the cities or abroad. When we conducted the FACT consultation, they invited the youth and the youth got interested and consider working in agriculture.

**Miriam:**

It's great that even in consultation you can get them interested. In advocating the policy you could help them even more.

**Inna:**

Previously we did things separately and in parts. We can combine many things together with FACT more comprehensively.

**Miriam:**

Anything else to add, from listening to the other organizations? [None.]

Now we can go to the next question: what are the lesson learned?

**Lany:**

The success should not be measured from the result for the proposal. FACT is both a means and a goal. So even if FACT implementation is not yet finished, the empowerment to members is already a good output of applying FACT.

**Seu Rany:**

We found common concern on migration because it leads to lack of labor in agriculture. The government, the farmers, the parents – they are concerned about it. With fact we found a common issue. Before consultation, the perception of farmers and youth is that they don't like being farmers. Farmers are the low class in society. After the consultation, they consider the new perspective to be farmers. We have the ten year vision: self-sufficient farmers in 2020, 100 thousands farmers will be rich.

**Inna:**

We used fact in practical way for our organizations. We can see change at technical school after graduate they try to find work in government or companies, but after we did the consultation workshop they can compare they can be farmer and earn money not only work in company. Not many people but we observed and also in the village in the past youth don't want to be farmers but now we see some young members in the organization.

**Miriam:**

I already see some change but not enough. Three same reasons: lack of budget, time, staff. Can you think of how to solve that? Not now, we'll talk about it later more tomorrow. Any other new understanding?

**Sonde:**

From the presentations I see that there is a trend that FACT ends with proposal. As Lany mentioned, the real value of fact is not about proposal. The issue itself is missed as we focus on preparing proposal.

**Miriam:**

Sometime success depends on external factors. Success could be in form of empowerment. So FACT is not a solution, but a tool.

**Jun:**

The sharing itself is a way to understand FACT more fully. FACT is not only empowering youth but also yourself.

**Miriam:**

You have seen that issues are almost similar across countries. You could use cases from other countries as mirrors in your country.



**Lany:**

We have exec com and any raised concerns are always appreciated. Members said it helps them think of new strategies.

**Miriam:**

Let's have a break of 15 minutes. You can take the time to talk with other organizations.

## SESSION 2-B

### **Miriam:**

Please stand up to the workplace so I can explain about the assignment.

This is all memory aids of FACT. We need you to work as a team. We understand that it won't be easy so please have extra patience with those who need translation.

The first test is all these abbreviations. Could you connect them to one of the pillars? You are all facilitators here – you are going to facilitate the others.

Some are overlapping – you could put them in the middle but keep it clear why you put it there. You can start.

[Participants posting the keyword pages one by one by consensus.]

I have the FACT Reader here, but it's in English. Use your copy to Annex 1 to check your work. [Jun has hard copies of the page. Participants checked and confirmed their work.]

So you've done a good work. Why did you have doubt? We'll keep it here. Does everyone remember what it means?

We keep the space blank for each pillar, to answer 4 questions:

1. Main added values?
2. Concepts not currently applied?
3. Difficulties encountered?
4. Aspects of work improved?

You could post translations beside each question.

Do you understand what we are going to do? To make it easy, let's work on the first column first (main added value). You already worked on it previously (blue cards). The yellow cards might fit in any column so you need to think carefully.

For yourself, could you do reality check? Are they in the right pillar and column?

Mechanism – does it really fit with SMART proposal? It is more about aspect of work.

What do we see here? Where are most of the cards? [Answer: Pillar 1, main added value and improved work.]

Why? Is it because you haven't worked through all the pillars, or is it because we have missed some information? I still have some different color cards. Concepts not correctly applied, I don't see anything here. Could you think of concepts that you find difficult to apply? You have your notes. Could you hang them up? You said writing SMART proposal is difficult – I don't see it here. Can I give you some cards? You can think and discuss with each other.

I heard that you didn't have time to implement it. Or you have understood the concepts but found them difficult to implement.

You will you have exhausted? This wall will help us with the next exercise. It helps us see where we stand in FACT. How it helps our work, where we have gaps, where we're uncertain.

### **Jun:**

Now we will focus in each pillar, in particular difficulties or challenges encountered. Because the success depends on each pillar, so it's time to look at each pillar. Do you know the mind map? You start with an idea and then it branches to another idea. It's not linear. You organize yourself into

four groups. People of the same language should group together for the translation. We'll write on metaplan cards to save the carpet. We start with 5 main difficulties.

After you finish with one pillar you could shift to another pillar. You have 5 minutes on each pillar.

**Miriam:**

Who want to present? Do you have any preference?

Pillar 1: Sonde and Vietnam

Pillar 2: Mongolia

Pillar 3: Laos

Pillar 4: Vietnam

**Pillar 1:**

**Sonde:** In the first pillar, the main issue is member's suspicion of our organization. It resulted in low participation of members, which affected the data accuracy and hampers the implementation of the FACT concept.

**Vietnam:** Our friends from Indonesia have done good linking of issues. Another important issue is the skill of conducting consultation, and how to keep and process information. Infrastructure is also a problem because it's difficult to reach the members. Identification of the right participants in the consultation is also very important.

**Pillar 2:**

There are many "lack of". It's difficult to find experts. There is a lack of budget to perform participatory. There is a lack of staff to work in every province. There is also not enough time. Also we don't have enough research method knowledge – we need to learn more tools and methods for research to design the methodology. The problems are interconnected.

**Pillar 3:**

When we look at the first issue is lack of practical information – not enough concrete data. Because you want to do specific proposal, concrete data should be collected. So that's why to get concrete data to get practical information. This results in not specific proposal. Writing skills are also an issue. It is not difficult to find experts, but difficult to find dollars to hire experts.

**Miriam:**

I saw an issue that is not here: the skill on how to make a proposal. So there are two different things: how to write a beautiful proposal and how to put information into a proposal.

**Pillar 4:**

The first one is the political position. Governments are closed and do not support the organization. There is also weak solidarity. Another issue is lack of practical information. It is difficult to find the right contact and decision makers to do advocacy. And also we have very important difficulty here: limited collaboration with other partners, and we must go to mass protest.

**Miriam:**

So now we have main constraints and challenges. So tonight you can dream about how to solve the challenges. We already have some cards in columns 1 and 4 on how to solve the problems. Thank you for the way you gave yourself in thinking and giving inputs. Thank you for the translators today.

**Jun:**

We're here tomorrow at 9AM.

**Miriam:**

I think we don't have problem to arrive here on time tomorrow? Before you go, get a marker and draw your face here (on the flipchart) how you feel after today. Not too big because we want all faces to fit in here. You may choose any color.

[Participants drew their faces.]