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Outline

- Introduction:
  - What do we mean by ‘user-voice’?
  - Why are we offering this training?
  - Introductions?
- Why/how/when to use voices of the poor in RU
  - Some brief examples/case studies
  - Using RU tools to guide appropriate use
- How to make links & identify appropriate voices
- Life Histories: One possible research approach
- Risks and Ethical issues
Whose voice?

- ‘Poor beneficiary’/‘Poor stakeholder’?
- ‘User’?
- ‘Disempowered’ voice?
- Somebody directly/indirectly affected by the issue of the research, who could benefit from an evidence-based change in practice/policy
- Clear link of ‘voice’ to research evidence
Why use this approach rather than formal evidence presentation?

- Very widely used as part of influencing
  - Universal part of advocacy NGO approaches
  - Universal approach to fundraising
- Why?
  - It works!
  - ‘Identifiable victim’
    - Strong ‘altruistic’ effects
    - Large body of literature and evidence
Some case studies

- Kenya’ smallholder dairy sector
- Urban agriculture city Ordinances, Kampala
Case study 1: Dairy marketing policy in Kenya
The dairy sector in Kenya

- Predominantly based on smallholder production with informal marketing by small-scale traders
  - >86% of all marketed milk is sold as raw milk to consumers
- Some 800,000 dairy-cow owning households
- 350,000 full time employees
- Majority of all dairy marketing jobs (over 40,000) are in the informal sector
- Poor consumers access affordable milk, and it is almost invariably boiled before use
Policy environment – pre 2004

• Dairy policy based on industrial cold-chain model
  – Sales of raw milk effectively prohibited in urban areas
• Kenya Dairy Board (KDB) are main regulators
  – But does not reflect range of dairy sector stakeholders
  – Harassed and arrested informal traders
  – Informal traders unlicensed and unable to access training on milk handling
  – Perceived concerns about poor milk quality and public health risks
• Powerful private sector actors put pressure on KDB to stamp out informal trade
SDP evidence

- Quantified dairy-related livelihoods
- Qual/Quan information on practices in sector
  - Farmers/traders/regulators
- Quantified health risks in formal and informal sector
- Developed and piloted approaches (training/equipment/accreditation) to engage and manage quality improvement in informal sector
Policy environment - now

• Positive engagement by KDB with small-scale milk vendors
  – Training and certification, with incentive system
  – Working with partners to help establish business development services to informal sector

• New Dairy Policy in parliamentary process
  – Explicitly recognises role of SSMVs
  – Commits to engaging with informal sector for training and quality improvement
  – Transition of KDB to be stakeholder-managed
SDP’s influencing strategy

Partners and Linkages:

- Advocacy partners: ITDG, ActionAid, SITE, Farmers & farmer groups, Public, MPs
- Research partners and collaborators: Universities, NGOs, farmers, traders, KDB
- Other researchers
- Policy influencing targets: Ministries, KDB, Processors
- Policy influencing strategies include SDP, ILRI, KARI, MoLFD, IPAR, ActionAid, SITE

DFID

Ministries
Process and Partnership for Pro-Poor Policy Change Project

Simplified representation of policy change process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year to Year</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000 to 2003</td>
<td>DFID Snapshot review of SDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Citizen Voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NGOs work at grass roots with farmer groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>New Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NGOs become SDP partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDP Policy Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDP Research and communication activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milk War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KBD dominated by processors Harassment of informal traders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safe milk campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude &amp; behaviour change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Example of key stakeholder voices as part of evidence-based change

• Dairy Policy Forum 2004
  – 2 Govt Ministers present, all high-level stakeholders
  – Wide range of formal evidence presentations

• ‘Unheard Voices’ video played
  – Informal & formal traders
  – Consumers
  – Farmers and farmer groups

• Smallholder farmer versus KDB Chairman
Context at time of Dairy Policy Forum

- New government
- New Strategy for Employment and Wealth Creation
- Civil society links and networks well developed
  - Constitutional review structure support
- Mission of key regulators included supporting livelihoods, employment and improving livelihoods of all sector stakeholders
- Informal sector traders harassed, equipment confiscated in some areas, tolerated in others
Case study 2: Development of urban agriculture Ordinances in Kampala
Urban agriculture
Why urban agriculture?

- Been part of Kampala’s economy for decades
  - Rural-urban migration
  - Land is suitable
- ‘Idle’ land is available
  - Used through a number of access mechanisms
- Important for food security and incomes
- Practised by some 30% of households
- Very important for women
Concerns over urban agriculture:

- **Health Hazard**
  - Biological (mosquitoes, zoonoses)
  - Chemical (heavy metals – Hg, Pb, As)
- **Physical** – car accidents
- **Psychosocial Hazard**
  - Thefts
  - Stress – (nuisance; religious issues)
- **Environmental Hazard**
  - **Pollution** – liquid and solid wastes, contamination of water
Policy environment early-mid1990s

- No specific laws on UA
  - Reference to stray animals in law & order ordinances
  - Generally did not recognise nor prohibit
- Much legislation outdated (colonial)
- Generally interpreted as not allowed
  - Slashing of crops
  - Confiscation of livestock
  - Extraction of payments
  - Little information or extension services available
Key events and activities

• Research by Maxwell in early 1990s
  – Socio-economic importance; nutritional impact
• Ongoing support for urban farmers
  – Agricultural Extension Officers
  – NGOs – incl. Environmental Alert
• International research efforts
  – IDRC; SIUPA/Urban Harvest
• Collaborative R&D activities from 2002
  – KUFSALCC
• Continued farming by urban farmers….
Policy environment now

• A set of 5 new Ordinances on urban agriculture passed by Kampala City Council in 2005
  – Kampala City Urban Agriculture Ordinance
  – Kampala City Livestock and Companion Animal Ordinance
  – Kampala City Meat Ordinance
  – Kampala City Fish Ordinance
  – Kampala City Milk Ordinance.

• Supportive of UA whilst laying framework for addressing public health and other concerns
Process and Partnership for Pro-Poor Policy Change Project

Key policy and political events

- Decentralisation – 1993
  - Accountability
  - Extension officers within Kampala City Council
- PEAP/PMA - 1997
- Local Government Act – 1997
- Review of outdated Ordinances – 1999
  - ‘stalled’ in 2001
- Strong political support from Mayor after 2004
Key stakeholder voices as part of evidence-based change

- Women urban farmers at Maxwell’s meetings
- Regular field visits of decision-makers (facilitated)
- Regular involvement of urban farmers at research communication meetings
Identifying opportunities and channels

- Use strategy development tools to identify
  - Examples using RAPID-based approaches (ROMA)
  - Equally applicable to other strategy development approaches – most share common features
- Outcome Mapping links
  - Sustainable change can come from incremental changes in the **behaviour** of key groups and individuals, not just in their ‘outputs’.
  - Behaviour is closely linked to attitudes, and attitudes can be significantly affected by powerful and moving stories, especially when linked to evidence.
Problem definition - 1

- Complex practice/policy change or simple?
  - Many stakeholders with influence at different levels?
    - Opportunities for reaching lower levels?
    - Could actually be better routes to higher level?

- Systemic factors (understanding context)
  - Democratic process, accountability, responsiveness of key decision-makers
  - Elected decision makers (National/local)
Problem definition - 2

- Systemic factors (cont’d)
  - Civil service
    - strategy/policy developers and technical implementers
    - Strategic, following objectives/targets, but frequently have own incentives (positioning, promotion)

- External factors
  - Example of donor support for constitutional review consultation structures
Strategy development stage

- You now:
  - Understand context, stakeholders and links
  - Have identified key messages & key audiences
  - Have identified desired behaviour change

- Using this knowledge:
  - Is this desired change, in this political/sector context, likely to be influenced by direct/indirect voices of poor SHs as part of communicating evidence?
  - What are the risks
    - To the argument? To the individual?
Getting the right balance

- Strong, robust, ‘formally’ articulated evidence presented with authority of researcher
  - Able to explain details, implications, defend research in contested areas
- Passion and ‘right’ of disempowered stakeholders telling their own stories
  - Able to root the evidence, statistics, big numbers, into the real world of an individual’s life and livelihood
Some mechanisms for linking

- Facilitating attendance at meetings
- Supporting field visits for decision-makers
- Audio recordings
- Video
Identifying most appropriate voices to use
Risks and Ethical considerations

- Group work:
  - What risks could there be in directly/indirectly using the voices of poor/disempowered stakeholders as part of research uptake?
    - Risks to what? Risks to whom?
  - Can you give any examples of questionable use of this approach, and any actual harm?
  - What can be done to identify and manage such risks?
Risks and Ethical considerations

- Duty of care
  - Duty of preventing harm
  - Duty to allow own voices to be heard?
- Approaches for informed consent
- Full awareness of what is planned for any material or event?
- Awareness of what might happen to material (widespread electronic sharing?)
Another aspect of risk – Case study

- MMR vaccination
  - Lancet paper 1998
  - Link between MMR vaccine and autistic disorders and bowel disease
  - Strong media reporting with many affected families repeatedly giving their stories
  - Vast majority of research/researchers did not support this
  - But conservative in arguing vs passionate parents
  - Significant drop in MMR use
  - Significant increase in cases of measles & mumps
  - Wakefield struck off medical register 2010
  - Lancet fully retracted paper from published record
  - Still widespread suspicion of vaccines; long memory