|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Danish organisation | Global Aktion (GA) |
| Title of the intervention | Peasants’ Rights Achieve Climate Justice |
| Partner name | La Via Campesina Southern and Eastern Africa |
| Amount applied for | DKK 3.556.656,85 |
| Countries | Zimbabwe, Mozambique, South Africa, DR Congo, Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania |
| Period (# of months) | July 2022 – July 2025 (36 months) |

|  |
| --- |
| Objective and relevance |

## 1.1 Purpose

On the 17th of December 2018, the UN General Assembly adopted the UN Declaration on the Rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas (UNDROP). At the forefront of this struggle was La Via Campesina (LVC), a global social movement fighting for the rights and independence of small-scale food producers (SSFPs or peasants). Through the work of LVC and their allies, the collective rights of peasants was recognised when the UN adopted the declaration as an international legal instrument. With this tool in hand, the arena of the struggle has now shifted, from the offices of diplomats in Geneva, Rome and New York, to the offices of national and local parliaments, mayors and agricultural extension officers, to ensure the implementation of the declaration into law and practice. The actors of this cause are now the peasants themselves, organised in communities, grassroots social movements, unions and other non-governmental organisations pushing for change at national level.

The regional chapter of LVC in Southern and Eastern Africa (LVC SEAf) is a network connecting the civil society of the region representing SSFPs in this struggle for their own rights. LVC SEAf have since 2008 managed to mobilise organisations directly representing more than 550.000 peasants. The UNDROP represents a unique opportunity for peasants to claim their rights - a group that has been politically and economically marginalised for decades and pushed into ever more precarious life conditions. UNDROP is an important tool to ensure the political framework that allows for and promotes the politically neglected agricultural farming practices of SSFPs. SSFPs are the main producers of food for the world and do so in a sustainable way compared to the dominant industrial food production - feeding a large part of the world’s population using only 12% of the agricultural land globally[[1]](#footnote-1). Despite the importance of agriculture in the region, SSFPs areamongst the most politically underrepresented and disenfranchised groups of society. This is evidenced by the national and regional decision making in the region regarding issues of tenure, land use, agricultural policy and climate change responses that leave SSFPs in insecure and marginalised positions[[2]](#footnote-2).

The main purpose of this intervention is that the rights of peasants, their agroecological practices and their demand for climate justice are formative to rural and agrarian policies in South and Eastern Africa on local, national and regional levels. The means to do this is to support the LVC SEAf network as champions of the human rights of peasants. The intervention will specifically support the member organisations in the LVC SEAf network in their efforts to organise the SSFPs in the region, educate them on their rights and push for the implementation of the UNDROP as a means to better their livelihoods and achieve climate justice.

Although LVC SEAf has achieved much in terms of mobilising peasants across the region, amongst others through previous interventions in partnership with Global Aktion (GA), the network still faces shortcomings to achieve its goals. The main challenges that this intervention seeks to address can be summarised as:

* Inconsistent level of know-how on the use of agroecological farming methods among SSFPs in the region and in LVC SEAf’s member organisations, leading to reduced farming outputs and less legitimacy by peasants in convincing farmers and policy makers of the usefulness of agroecology.
* Inadequate experience with strategic campaigning among key people in the member organisations and the SSFPs they represent including limited know-how about peasants’ rights as described in the UNDROP and on how to use the UNDROP as a tool for advocacy.
* Policy developments in land and agriculture sectors in the region are not informed by UNDROP and the promising evidence of the usefulness of agroecology in the light of climate change.

The intervention will strengthen the capacity of LVC SEAf’s regional network from a bottom up approach by targeting local members across seven countries (Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Tanzania, South Africa, Uganda, Kenya and DR Congo). This will be done through strengthening the knowledge sharing and coordinated advocacy efforts of peasants across the region, rooted in the experience and belief that just and lasting change is rooted in mobilisation, alliance building and coordinated action across local, national and regional levels. A strong regional network can provide this and thus support each member organisation to hold their national and local decision makers accountable to respect, protect and fulfil the rights of peasants as described in the UNDROP.

Pushing for peasants’ rights requires that peasants have a basic material wellbeing, including mechanisms that make them more resilient to the impacts of climate change and the expansion of industrial agriculture in the region. This intervention takes on a comprehensive approach by building on the successes of expanding the use of agroecological farming methods. Agroecology serves as a means to adapt to unpredictable weather patterns but also to mitigate and curb climate change. By supporting the expansion of knowledge and practises on agroecology, the intervention lays the foundation for - and increases the legitimacy of the advocacy efforts of peasants, as they can provide concrete solutions to the environmental problems and climate change. The intervention also seeks to further increase the legitimacy of peasants as a collective with rights and political agency.

|  |
| --- |
| **Key concepts:**  UNDROP: The UNDROP ratifies e.g. that; 1) Peasants have the right to participate in decision-making processes on food and agriculture policy and the right to healthy and adequate food produced through ecologically sound and sustainable methods that respect their cultures 2) States shall stimulate sustainable production, including agroecological and organic production, and facilitate direct farmer-to-consumer sales 3) Peasants have the right to maintain, control, protect and develop their own seeds and traditional knowledge [[3]](#footnote-3).  Climate Justice: The struggle to transform the global economic system for the just redistribution of resources, representation and political power. The climate crisis is a political issue, and the effects of climate change and environmental degradation are disproportionately affecting people and communities that have contributed very little to causing the crisis[[4]](#footnote-4).  Agroecology: A farming method and philosophy built on peasants’ traditional and indigenous knowledge which treats the Earth with respect and care. It is centred around regenerative farming practises without the use of external inputs from the agroindustry. Agroecology is built upon the exchange of seeds and knowledge, a variety of crop, and recycling of nutrients to keep the health and vitality of the soil[[5]](#footnote-5). |

Building on former interventions

The intervention builds upon two previous interventions; “Building Climate Justice Advocacy with Small-Scale Farmers in Southern and Eastern Africa” (j.nr.: 16-1903-LI-sep) and “Pathway to Climate Justice” (j.nr.: 18-2267-UI) where GA has partnered with LVC SEAf. The previous interventions have increased the internal capacity of LVC SEAf as a political network representing SSFPs. Specifically, the interventions have focused on documenting how climate change affects peasants in the region and on strengthening a common understanding of climate change as a social and political problem upheld by unjust power structures that should be countered through the political mobilisation of peasants. This has fostered a well informed and empowered member base, ready to undertake the challenge of the proposed intervention which gradually leaves more responsibility in the hands of the member organisations.

Through the past interventions LVC SEAf has achieved a strengthened position as a political regional network representing SSFPs, exemplified by its key role in establishing the African Climate Justice Group[[6]](#footnote-6). The comparative study and external evaluation of the second project conclude that the interventions have increased the awareness amongst SSFPs of agroecology as a key component in establishing climate justice in the region and as a practical way of organising and to stay resilient in the face of climate change. The member organisations now hold a greater capacity to organise politically and disseminate practical and theoretical knowledge to their members which will be the underlying key to successfully implement the objectives of the proposed intervention. The interventions have contributed to establishing SSFPs’ self-understanding as a community with rights and legitimate political demands, thus empowering the network’s member base to become political actors of change in the region.

Representatives of the LVC SEAf member organisations all emphasise that their political strategies at national levels and organisational knowledge have been refined and strengthened by the sharing of experiences, dissemination of knowledge and strategic insights provided by the LVC SEAf network. This has in turn empowered the organisations when claiming their rights vis-a-vis duty bearers at national levels. Thus, this intervention builds on results from previous cooperation when aiming to further consolidate the cooperation between SSFPs in the region.

## 1.2 Context

The context analysis takes its point of departure in the situation of peasants. SSFPs across the seven countries operate within different contexts, but are facing a range of similar challenges. Therefore, the capacity and knowledge of the peasants’ groups within the seven countries will be improved by the sharing of experiences and context analyses within the network, and by coordinated advocacy efforts. Despite the large geographical area, peasants are affected by the same structural patterns of inequality, political underrepresentation, devastating impacts of the climate crisis, the consequences of economic liberalisation and lack of respect for peasants’ collective rights. Peasants in the region report that they share a lot of the same struggles[[7]](#footnote-7). This, as well as notable national differences, will be expanded upon in the following paragraphs.

Environmental conditions

SSFPs in the region are facing similar environmental threats such as the crisis of biodiversity loss, soil erosion, droughts and extreme weather with devastating impacts on rural communities. Climate change and resource depletion are some of the core environmental challenges that members of LVC SEAf must respond to on a daily basis. The climate crisis has changed the predictability of the weather patterns and increased the occurrences of weather extremes in the region, which amongst other things burn crops and wash away entire areas of farming fields. Table 1 illustrates the environmental challenges that members in the LVC SEAf network face on a daily basis.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Country | Environmental conditions affecting SSFPs |
| Uganda | Changing weather patterns, more and longer droughts and consequently water scarcity. Increasing pests and diseases in crops. Soil erosion, decreased yields and yield losses due to extreme weather |
| Mozambique | One of the most climate vulnerable countries in the world, particularly exposed to droughts, floods and cyclones, leading to high levels of food insecurity and water scarcity. Soil erosion, decreased yields and crop losses due to extreme weather. |
| South Africa | Droughts and unpredictable rain patterns, leading to water scarcity. Appearance of new crop and livestock diseases, contamination of ground water and weakening of resilience in some seeds. Decreased yields and crop losses due to extreme weather. |
| Zimbabwe | Droughts, more extreme weather (floods and storms) and unpredictable rain patterns, leading to water scarcity. Soil erosion, decreased yields and yield losses due to extreme weather. |
| DR Congo | Unpredictable weather patterns and occasional droughts. Soil erosion, decreased yields and crop losses due to extreme weather. |
| Tanzania | More unpredictable weather patterns and less rain, more pests and insect “invasions”. Water scarcity. Deforestation, soil erosion, decreased yields and crop losses due to extreme weather. |
| Kenya | Droughts and erratic rain patterns. Contamination of rivers and other irrigation sources leads to water scarcity. Extreme weather such as floods and hail storms lead to decreased yields and crop losses. |

Table 1: Main environmental challenges in the SEAf region, reported by the member organisations in the LVC SEAf network.

The increasing and devastating impact of the climate crisis affects the most vulnerable in society the hardest and it is the main contributor to widespread food insecurity, population displacement and stress on water resources in the region.

Social conditions

The social relations and conditions in the region are affected by patriarchal relations of power[[8]](#footnote-8). When it comes to access to land, SSFPs across the region have to navigate legal systems of ownership and tenure, favouring men at the expense of women and youth wanting to settle on a piece of land to cultivate. This social stratification is visible in the context of food insecurity. SSFPs across the region are experiencing hunger more often and in a more profound manner than the general population in the region since they are the most marginalised socio-economic group and directly dependent on a healthy soil and predictable weather.

Governments throughout Southeast Africa have become more authoritarian over the last years, imposing legislation that revokes democratic rights and weakens oversight of decision-making processes. The crack-down on civil society is affecting the entire LVC SEAf network in its struggle for political change as there is less room for political mobilisation and perspectives criticising governments and the political elites. While governments in several countries such as Tanzania and Uganda already before the pandemic were increasingly cracking down on civil society and opposition, the trend has been aggravated during the COVID-19 and the following lockdowns. As a consequence, the space for civil society and the norms for political participation has narrowed, leaving a weakened civil society in the region. COVID-19 continues to be present in the region, and affects the LVC network through travel restrictions etc. but the effects of the pandemic on society is now less of a “state of emergency” in all countries.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Country | Civil and political rights |
| Uganda | Increasing crackdown on civil society and media, which has been exacerbated during the pandemic, such as criminalization and imprisonment of journalists and human rights activists. SSFP have lost their source of income due to lockdown and covid restrictions. |
| Mozambique | Increasing crackdown on civil society and silencing of media. Lack of access to land for SSFPs, and forced displacement due to the government's prioritisation of large-scale, export oriented projects, such as the Nacala Corridor. Increased securitization and violence in Northern Mozambique makes it challenging for SSFPs to organise. |
| South Africa | Limited civic space, and increasing threats and intimidations towards activists, including police violence and killings. Civil society has mobilised during COVID to respond to lack of healthcare for many citizens. Land grabbing and lack of access to land is a constant struggle. |
| Zimbabwe | The civic space and freedom of speech is limited, and the government continues to criminalise opposition voices, media and human rights activists. Disputes over tenure and access to land for SSFPs |
| DR Congo | Increase in human rights violations such as imprisonment of activists and repression of demonstrations and general political instability. Land scarcity affecting SSFPs in certain regions. |
| Tanzania | Limited civic space, particularly affecting the media and freedom of expression, but some signs that the government will revoke controversial media laws. |
| Kenya | Declining civic space: Freedom of speech is declining, restrictive media laws and police brutality during demonstrations. Increasingly difficult for activists to do their work, as they are increasingly being threatened by authorities and criminalised for their work. |

Table 2: Primary right-related challenges in the SEAf region, reported by the member organisations in the LVC SEAf network.

As illustrated in table 2, the access to civil and political rights is a constant struggle across the entire region for the members of the LVC network, but to different extents depending on the degrees of corruption and financial interests of the juridical system and political environment. For instance, in Mozambique, SSFPs, civil society and independent media are faced with severe threats and violent reactions to their work. This has forced LVC in Mozambique to reconsider their strategic political communication and working practices thus curtailing the freedom of expression. In Uganda and Congo, SSFPs are facing illegal displacements, violations of women’s land rights, poor working conditions for rural workers and lack of physical space for political mobilisation, following an increased crack-down on civil society.

Political conditions

Southeast Africa is characterised by high socioeconomic inequalities and international financial institutions and development actors have a high presence and influence over national economic and social development policies in most of the countries. With financial institutions influencing national policies, and the persistent high levels of public debt in several of the countries. There is a pressure towards national governments to promote and prioritise development projects that favour foreign investments and focus on open competition in export markets. This political approach affects SSFPs because it leads to governments promoting input-intensive industrial farming projects which lead to soil depletion and concentration in land ownership. In the attempt to attract foreign investments, governments are complicit in forcefully depriving rural communities of their land to make way for mega-plantations of export-driven monocrop cultivation (e.g. the Tana River Delta project in Kenya).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Country | Political institutional Challenges |
| Uganda | Agricultural policies favours private companies and pushes a business-based agricultural approach (agrofuels, GMOs, REDD+). SSFPs are not capable of competing with subsidised imports and their market access is limited by restrictions, standards and subsidies. |
| Mozambique | Policies do not support sustainable agriculture and SSFPs, due to focus on export-oriented agriculture. Limited financial support to and market access for SSFPs. Very high levels of food insecurity. FAO classifies the country as “high risk” for hunger and acute food insecurity[[9]](#footnote-9) |
| South Africa | Lack of financial and political governmental support to SSFPs, including lack of land redistribution reforms. Lack of market access. Policies target middle-class and large scale agriculture. Changing administrations do not follow through on policies. Criminalising seed sharing. |
| Zimbabwe | Lack of policies supporting and acknowledging peasants' rights, and policies do not protect peasant seeds or support agroecology. |
| DR Congo | Lack of financial and political government support to SSFPs such as for instance insecure tenure Lack of market access due to widespread corruption and poor infrastructure. |
| Tanzania | Policies focus on large scale, export-led agriculture, due to the influence of international finance institutions and the economy’s dependence on foreign aid. Lack of policies supporting SSFPs and their rights, while the government focuses on climate smart agriculture and dissemination of hybrid seeds supported by international donors. Seed sharing is being criminalised. |
| Kenya | Lack of policies supporting SSFPs politically and financially. Low food security and increased food prices. Policies favouring large scale climate smart agriculture resulting in land grabbing. |

Table 3: Main political institutional challenges in the SEAf region, reported by the member organisations in the LVC SEAf network.

Despite many similarities, there are some notable differences. One illustrative example is seen in peasants’ access to resources and the countries’ implementation of the privatisation and patenting of seeds. In Tanzania and South Africa many peasants are caught up in financial dependency to the agroindustry and seed companies due to their countries’ privatisation of seeds and the criminalisation of seed sharing[[10]](#footnote-10). Peasants in Congo and Kenya do not have the same experiences because these specific seed harmonisation laws have not been put into practice in their countries yet.

The political institutional challenge that affects the LVC SEAf network the most, is lack of support to the agricultural practices, organisation and local markets that their members advocate for. In South Africa for instance, the support from national decision makers to their members is very limited and unstable. SSFPs in South Africa have previously succeeded in being represented at the table when land reforms are debated but have also lost their position whenever a new administration enters the governmental corridors, yet again leaving South African SFFPs outside political influence.

Fragility

Based on the context described above we conclude that the region is characterised by some elements of fragility, such as the current armed conflict in Mozambique, and the economic instability in Zimbabwe which have resulted in situations with social unrest. However, the context of this intervention as a whole is not estimated as fragile. This is due to the design and development of the intervention where the objectives and activities underpin advocacy efforts for peasants’ rights, capacity strengthening, and resilience of peasant communities and organisations. It builds on a strong partnership with LVC SEAf who has many years of experience working with capacity building and mobilisation of SSPFs in this region that for many years have been marked by elements of fragility. The LVC SEAf network has proved to be flexible in the planning and implementation of activities across the region in the previous interventions. They have shown to be able to effectively continue their work despite challenging situations such as the COVID-19 lockdowns and political instability. These experiences and expertise contribute to the likelihood of implementing the intervention and achieving the expected goals despite being implemented in a region characterised by some elements of fragility.

## 1.3 Strengthening civil society organising to advance social justice

Strengthening civil society organising to advance social justice is the cornerstone of the intervention. LVC SEAf is working towards transformative change by advancing peasants’ rights and by providing SSFPs with concrete farming practices and organisational skills to improve their livelihoods and resilience to climate change. One of the key roles of LVC SEAf is to facilitate knowledge sharing and capacity building within the LVC network in the region. In this intervention specifically by supporting organised SSFPs in their advocacy strategies, political analyses and their capacity to organise and mobilise for social justice. The intervention thus aims at strengthening the LVC SEAf network with skills to be advocates for political changes that will lead to the respect and implementation of peasants’ rights.

## 1.4 Responding to climate- and environmental conditions

Mitigation and adaptation to changing climate- and environmental conditions are the underlying premise of this intervention and the intervention responds to climate- and environmental conditions that compromises the livelihoods of SSFPs in a number of ways. First of all, by advocating for political and structural change in proposing policies that favour agroecological practices and respect the rights of SSFPs as described by the UNDROP, as well as by mitigating and enabling SSFPs to adapt to the negative impacts of climate change.


Secondly, the intervention responds to climate- and environmental conditions by increasing awareness of agroecological farming practises among SSFPs to improve the resilience to extreme weather patterns as a means of adaptation and also as a means to mitigate climate change. Agroecological approaches have proven resilient to the climate and environmental conditions facing farmers and agricultural workers, because of the diversified nature of small-scale farming which supports household economies even as droughts and other weather extremes hit[[11]](#footnote-11).

Thirdly, the intervention responds to climate- and environmental conditions by considering the number of flights and ecological footprint of the intervention. The intervention itself has a strong focus on national and localised activities with a minimum of physical attendance by LVC SEAf’s regional representatives, thus limiting the number of cross border travelling. However, experience from the previous intervention during the pandemic has shown that although many activities can be altered to online or hybrid forms, this is not without challenges in terms of participation and quality of the outcomes of the activities. High data costs and lack of access to the internet make it challenging to arrange large and inclusive events for SSFPs from all seven countries. The partners therefore assess that there is still a need to have a minimum of physical meetings on regional level during the intervention.

|  |
| --- |
| 2. The partnership |

## 2.1 Participant partners

The intervention built on a strong partnership between the Danish solidarity organisation Global Aktion (GA) and LVC SEAf, who have collaborated on tackling issues of structural injustices and promoting climate justice since 2016.

******

*Figure 1: LVC SEAf structure*

La Via Campesina Southern and Eastern Africa (LVC SEAf)

LVC is an international social movement of peasants, small- and medium-sized food producers, landless people, migrant workers, rural women, indigenous people, rural youth, and agricultural workers. The regional secretariat in Zimbabwe has more than 10 years of experience implementing activities at a regional level. LVC SEAf's activities are implemented in a decentralised manner, and LVC SEAf has a key role when it comes to disseminating knowledge to its members. Further, it facilitates networks of communications and creates spaces for sharing experiences and knowledge among the member organisations in the region. The LVC SEAf network consists of eight member organisations:

1. Zimbabwe Smallholder Farmer Forum (**ZIMSOFF**): Zimbabwean CSO with a member base consisting of approx. 12.000 SFFPs based in 8 provinces, organised in 4 clusters around the country.
2. Kenyan Peasant League (**KPL**): Social movement of peasants and rural workers, consisting of approx. 400 members. KPL operates primarily in Migori county, Western Kenya.
3. Mtandao wa Vikundi vya Wakulima Tanzania (**MVIWATA**): National network bringing together more than 100.000 individual members of small-scale farmers groups across 23 regions in Tanzania. Primary focus is to strengthen the network, facilitate exchange of knowledge and push for SSFPs’ interests in policy development.
4. Confédération Paysanne du Congo (**COPACO**): CSO and political platform consisting of approx. 450 cooperatives and organisations. Operates throughout the DR Congo by bringing together small agricultural producers, breeders, fishermen, hunters, artisans and other associations for the development of agricultural and rural employment from 13 regions.
5. Landless Peoples Movement (**LPM**): CSO consisting of approx. 4-500 landless people in rural areas of South Africa, historically focusing on the need for just land reforms. Mostly active in the regions of Limpopo, Gauteng, KwaZulu-Natal and Westcoast.
6. Food Sovereignty Campaign (**FSC**): National platform bringing together environmental and social justice groups, SSFPs, consumers, landless peoples, rural workers in the struggle against hunger in South Africa. Broad member base consisting of both elderly landless people in the rural areas as well as young city dwellers with medium long education in urban township areas.
7. União Nacional de Camponeses (**UNAC**): CSO representing approx. 150.000 SSFPs from around Mozambique pushing for peasants political and economic rights and access to land.
8. Eastern and Southern Africa Small Scale Farmers’ Forum Uganda (**ESAFF**): Farmer-led CSO representing 1359 community groups with approx. 48.200 individual SSFPs in 54 districts in Uganda. Working towards making SSPFs central political actors and self-reliant through sustainable agricultural practices.

While all share a focus of improving their constituencies' living conditions and pushing for political change, each organisation have different histories, resources and range of different entry points and strategies. Some organisations have a long history rooted in the struggle for independence and the fight to dismantle the colonial power structures, institutions and land tenure structures and policies that in many places still play a big role in everyday life of the rural populations. An example is LPM which was established as a reaction to the apartheid regime’s suppression of landless people, which initially has had a different approach to ensuring the rights of peasants - namely through a substantial land reform - than e.g. ZIMSOFF which was established in 2002 working explicitly to advance agroecology and climate justice and thus bringing a different history and capacity than LPM to the network. While sharing similar visions, the levels of expertise and experiences with a range of organisational and political issues differ. E.g. whereas FSC and KPL have proven to hold a great expertise in planning and carrying out advocacy campaigns and popular mobilisation around popular demands, organisations such as ESAFF and UNAC have reportedly had less success with this. These differences in history, strategies and expertise are all considered as assets to the network and central to its raison d'etre, as the members, in their own words, are able to benefit greatly of the exchange with like-minded grassroots organisations and movements of different backgrounds. The merits of the network and the previous interventions, are testimonies to success of this methodology, which provide the foundation for this intervention.

The regional work is coordinated through **Regional Working Collectives (RWCs)** that consist of democratically elected regional delegates of the movement. The RWCs work on specific political priorities of the movement, develop action plans and follow up on international and regional advocacy. The RWCs have active representation and participation of all members in the region, and thus ensure information flow between national and regional level. As illustrated in figure 1, the LVC SEAf network communicates and works together with SSFPs and target local authorities.

ZIMSOFF

The LVC SEAf secretariat is currently physically hosted by ZIMSOFF in Zimbabwe who also has the role as the implementing and administrative responsible partner in this intervention. A LVC SEAf Climate Justice Officer was hired as project officer during the first intervention, and has been sustained by LVC SEAf beyond the intervention and will continue as Climate Justice Officer in this proposed intervention. ZIMSOFF organises and empowers SSFPs in Zimbabwe by practising sustainable and viable organic agriculture and aims to raise public awareness on agroecology, land injustice and food sovereignty. From 2014-2021 ZIMSOFF held the special position of the International Coordinating Committee of LVC.

Global Aktion

Global Aktion is a Danish solidarity organisation run by around 100 volunteer activists organised in thematic working groups. The organisation is governed by the board and has a secretariat of 4-6 people, including Project and Financial Officers, who support the activists in project management. In close collaboration with its partners around the world, GA works towards changing the unequal power structures that uphold the ever-growing global inequality. GA aims to empower people to mobilise and push for change in their local setting, while supporting their struggles on a global scale. GA has years of experience in working with grassroot organisations in the Global South, particularly in Southern and Eastern Africa. A central focus in the GA strategy has since 2016 been climate justice and food sovereignty, which has resulted in a national push for climate justice in Denmark through schooling, demonstrations and political pressure.

## 2.2 Previous cooperation between the partners

The collaboration can be described as both a solidarity alliance and a project partnership, which has been consolidated and strengthened through two previous interventions. The intervention has been developed with inputs from LVC SEAf member organisations in order to include learnings from previous interventions. Thus this intervention builds on best practices. The experiences from the partnership so far has confirmed that ownership of the intervention, its activities and purpose in the target group is key to its success. Ownership of the intervention amongst member organisations has resulted in active involvement, and has easened the implementation of activities. This was evident for activities such as delivery of hard infrastructure for training at agroecology schools, which has been experienced as highly relevant and were initially demanded by SSFPs themselves. The external evaluation highlights that knowledge material tailored to the lives and demands of SSFPs in their local languages have been received well by the SSFPs and that improvement of the agroecology schools contribute to the mobilisation of SSFPs in the area and strengthen the sense of ownership to the intervention.

The previous interventions have demonstrated that the national member organisations now have the capacity to undertake e.g. agroecological training themselves with organisational and educational support from the LVC SEAf secretariat. This was tested in South Africa in the fall of 2020, when the COVID-19 lockdown prevented the LVC SEAf staff from taking physical part in a training session. This meant that the national partner was responsible for the planning and implementation of a training session with online guidance from the LVC SEAf secretariat.

## 2.3 Roles and responsibilities of the partners

During the last intervention the member organisations have increased their knowledge on key LVC concepts and their capacity to conduct training for their members. The Climate Justice Officer and Financial Officer will still be responsible for the implementation vis-a-vis GA.

LVC SEAf and its regional secretariat carry the main responsibility of planning and coordination. The Climate Justice Officer and the ZIMSOFF Financial Officer will continue to manage the project from Harare, Zimbabwe. They are both familiar and experienced with the partnership and are able to ensure a smooth transition into the new intervention - both have played vital roles in the partnership so far. The Climate Justice Officer will continue to be responsible for the day-to-day coordination and overseeing of activities and the overall progress over the project implementation as well as ongoing communication with GA and LVC SEAf member organisations. This includes drafting of statements, writing and distribution of publications, logistical arrangements of a wide range of activities, narrative reporting, overlooking the financial management. The Financial Officer will handle all financial management, bookkeeping and reporting in accordance with CISU’s guidelines under supervision of the Climate Justice Officer. A Communication Officer will be joining the Climate Justice Officer to support her and the RWC with external communication tasks at regional level and to support the member organisations in their advocacy efforts. This position will strengthen the outreach and the quality of strategic advocacy of the individual member organisations and the network as an entity. All three will be under the supervision of the National Coordinator and the Executive Committee of ZIMSOFF. Based on previous experience, this composition of staff coupled with volunteer (wo)man hours within the network is assessed sufficient to achieve the aims of the intervention.

GA has the responsibility of the intermediate and final management, monitoring, reviewing, reporting and evaluation in accordance with the procedures laid down in agreement with CISU. The overall responsibility for the intervention itself lies with the board of GA. Overseeing the daily project management on behalf of the Danish organisation is in the hands of the GA Climate Group, which is responsible towards the board of GA. GA’s secretariat will provide support to the intervention in terms of (wo)man-hours. This support consists of participation of secretariat staff in monitoring, evaluation and project related skill sharing. On the Danish side, the financial management of the intervention is carried out by the GA Climate Group in close cooperation with the GA Project and Finance Officers. The information work in Denmark is implemented by GA. GA strives to be an active and equal political partner beyond the formal requirements of the project partnership. Therefore, GA will participate in workshops with the LVC SEAf network to get a more profound understanding of the partners’ strategies, methodologies and challenges and exchange learnings. At these meetings, GA will contribute with its perspectives, experiences with strategic political pressure and context analyses.

## 2.4 Relationship and collaboration between the partners

GA and LVC SEAf both value and strive for a partnership that is equal and participatory, including the involvement of GA and LVC SEAf member organisations in activities where they can make valuable contributions. During the two previous interventions, GA and LVC SEAf have collaborated on a number of issues and events beyond the project partnership. This has strengthened the mutual analysis of climate justice and agroecology and their relationship as political allies. Through the previous interventions, the political analysis of social, economic and political injustice has been sharpened and developed within the organisations of LVC SEAf and GA respectively. This is illustrated by the fact that GA has been using the work and analysis of LVC actively throughout the past years and has been a solid contributor to putting food sovereignty and climate justice on the political agenda in Denmark when arranging and participating in political debates such as public seminars and activist schools.

Monitoring visits are planned to overlap with activities taking place in Zimbabwe and other member countries in order for the GA group to directly engage with key personnel and SSFPs in the region aiming at improving the understanding among the partners. The intervention will build on a continuous and close dialogue between GA, LVC SEAf and the national organisations, thus strengthening the relationship between the partners and their capacities to push for climate justice in their contexts. Moreover, the LVC SEAf network will participate in GA’s partner seminar which is to be held in South Africa in the Fall of 2022 (j.nr. 21-3773-CSP-RI). It is a physical meeting across the South-to-South network of Global Aktion’s partners that will address the increasing problems of shrinking civic space. The seminar aims to strengthen common strategies, social ties and the ability of each organisation to advocate in their local contexts and make use of our north/south alliance.

## 2.5 Relation to other actors

Engaging with and strengthening the relationship to relevant stakeholders, plays a key role in the intervention. To push for the implementation of UNDROP, the LVC SEAf member organisations will engage with local and national duty bearers and allies, while the regional network of LVC SEAf simultaneously will engage in regional and international forums.

Key people in the member organisations play an important role in strengthening the organisations’ relations to external actors, as they are expected to plan and be responsible for carrying out most of the advocacy efforts on national and local level. In this matter the shared capacity and knowledge of the LVC SEAf network can be used as an important resource to strengthen the individual member organisations. The national organisations will engage in policy dialogue with extension officers to showcase peasants’ solutions to mitigate and adapt to climate change.

Strengthening relations to other actors such as CSOs and human rights organisations is integral to the intervention. Alliance building on a local level plays an important role in creating resilience against shrinking civic space and in mobilising and pushing for structural change allowing peasants to claim their rights and build just and sustainable food systems. During the advocacy efforts the members will engage with national Human Rights Commissions and create alliances with other national human rights actors. The intervention will also create stronger ties to local and national media such as radio stations since the Communication Officer will have a special focus on supporting member organisations in creating new relations with local and national media outlets such as community radios and national newspapers.

At a regional level, LVC SEAf will continue to engage in the African Climate Justice Group and the African Food Sovereignty Alliance. By taking active part in these alliances at regional level, it is expected to have a spillover effect on the LVC SEAf member organisations, who will get a broader network of allies within their countries. Moreover, alternative civil society summits will contribute to cementing the relationship to regional allies and policy makers. Overall, the increased engagement with networks of allies on a regional level and the engagement with policy makers on national and local level will increase the visibility of LVC in the region.

|  |
| --- |
| 3. Target groups, objective, strategy, and expected results |

## 3.1 Composition of target groups

**The primary target group** consists of the peasants, all members of LVC SEAf organisations, who will participate directly in the activities. The primary target group is broad since it reflects the composition of the network’s diverse member base. Special attention is given to ensure equal participation, and the organisations have to make sure that all activities will be attended by no more than 50% men, and to ensure the representation of women and youth. This supports a decentralised strategic selection process that will ensure the most efficient dissemination of knowledge and have a strong catalyst effect. The number of people within the primary group is approx. 1000 participants. The different activities are targeted towards two distinctive subgroups within the organisations: 1A) key people and 1B) ordinary members.

**Target group 1A** are categorised as “key people”; they are peasants from the LVC network who hold special responsibilities and play central roles within their organisations. They represent both activists and staff:

* Political Officers: carry responsibility for planning and organising strategic campaigning, policy development and external communication. They are central to strengthening the organisational capacity.
* Trainers of trainers (ToT): key to the dissemination of knowledge to the ordinary members (target group 1B) within their constituencies. The main focus of the trainers will be on the UNDROP and the agroecological practices within a national and local context.
* The regional Agroecology and Climate Justice Working Collective: represent the organisations in the LVC network. They engage in the intervention with a democratic mandate enabling them to make strategic decisions on behalf of their organisations. They are responsible for coordinating the network’s participation in a wide range of political events

The total number of people in target group 1A is approx. 650 composed of an equal number of people from each member organisation.

**Target group 1B** consists of representatives from the LVC SEAf member organisations: individuals who have been selected through democratic processes in the member organisations. They are all peasants, with interest and engagement in the topics of the trainings they will take part in. Target group 1B is rather broad, reflecting the memberbase of the LVC organisations and leaving room for the organisations themselves to democratically decide who is to take active part in what activities. Target group 1B will among other things participate in trainings on agroecology and the UNDROP and are committed to actively act on their learnings in their own national and subnational contexts aiming to influence the secondary target group. Approx. 350 members will participate in the intervention as target group 1B, proportionally reflecting the eight member organisations.

**The secondary target group** are people who will not take active part in the activities, but who will be targeted indirectly. This group can also be divided into two subgroups: 2A) Ordinary members and 2B) duty bearers.

**Target group 2A** consists of ordinary members of LVC SEAf member organisations as well as potential new members. It is a large group counting around 550.000 SSFPs which is the estimated total number of people organised under LVC SEAf regionally at this moment. This target group will be affected by the intervention through dissemination of knowledge on agroecology and the UNDROP following the engagement of the primary target groups. Target group 2A will also be affected in that they will be part of the grassroots organising and take part in carrying out the campaigning around climate justice and peasants rights within their organisation. Further, they will be affected by the political change that will happen following the push for political change at local, national and regional levels through strategic campaigning and lobbying.

**Target group 2B** consists of the duty bearers who are gatekeepers in terms of advancing the fulfilment of peasants’ rights as described in the UNDROP. These duty bearers are being targeted through the advocacy activities implemented by the regional Agroecology and Climate Justice Working Collective, the LVC SEAf secretariat and member organisations. Because the member organisations’ work within different contexts and represent members with different backgrounds and political priorities, the relevant duty bearers vary across the region. National policy makers are the main duty bearers of the implementation of UNDROP, and this intervention therefore targets these both directly, and through cooperation with regional and local duty bearers in the position for pushing national policy makers. Within the category of national policy makers lies administrative departments, political chambers and politicians. They engage with policy makers directly through hearings, lobbying and meetings with governments. Furthermore, local authorities and extension officers (local bureaucrats) often play an influential role in shaping the agricultural model and determining peasants’ possibilities on a local level.

The prioritising of which duty bearers to focus on depends on the strategy of the individual member organisations who will decide for themselves which strategic policy areas and targets they choose to pursue. Examples of the different approaches of member organisations are MVIWATA campaigning against the patenting of seeds in Tanzania, targeting the governments’ agricultural department as the main duty bearer. ZIMSOFF has during the past years been lobbying local extension officers and local authorities to further agroecological practices in their support and advisory of farmers in Zimbabwe. ESAFF Uganda has been pushing for better access to land and water by lobbying the National Department of Water Management.

## 3.2 Target groups benefiting from the intervention

The primary target group benefits from the intervention by actively participating in activities and thereby being given resources and capacity to highlight the collective voice of the SSFPs. The intervention impacts the member organisations by facilitating and expanding their work to protect the rights and improve the living standards of the SSFPs and rural populations at large. Moreover, the intervention aims at creating long-lasting, structural changes so as to enhance peasants’ rights, which will have a positive impact on peasants in general (secondary target group). The secondary target group is large in numbers and therefore it is difficult to reach and impact this group to a full extent. However, through LVC SEAf’s farmer to farmer methodology[[12]](#footnote-12) as well as the increased visibility of their agroecology solutions due to advocacy efforts, it is expected that the intervention will also influence and inspire other peasants to organise themselves to claim their rights and to practice agroecology.

Following the modus operandi of LVC SEAf as a social movement, the key messages for the planning and carrying out of strategic advocacy efforts towards relevant policy makers are identified and articulated by the primary target group itself. Moreover, all knowledge production (training materials and methodology) within the intervention will be based on the voices and experience of the target groups. Building on positive experience from the former interventions, this approach to production of educational material is expected to affirm and empower the target group and partners as it will not only improve capacity and knowledge. Instead it will contribute to addressing key issues related to the politics of knowledge production and dissemination. This is key to achieving social justice from a Global South perspective, where knowledge production tends to be dominated by outside experts.


## 3.3 Involvement of the target group

The project design process has been participatory as GA has discussed priorities and ideas in the inception phase directly with representatives from the eight member organisations. In order to qualify the understanding of the local contexts and major challenges of the SSFPs, the external evaluation has also feeded actively into the final design of the intervention. Throughout the entire design phase, the primary target group has been actively involved in the development and the design of the intervention via representation in the RWC. The collective has developed the strategy of the regions’ work on food sovereignty, agroecology and climate justice. Further, the primary target group has contributed with inputs to activities and strategy through meetings with GA and LVC SEAf, and by written inputs. Thus, the design of the intervention has to a great extent been developed by the target group itself and the LVC SEAf has actively received a renewed mandate to develop the intervention on behalf of the member organisations through the democratic structure of LVC.

## 3.4 Strategy

The overall objective of the intervention is that the rights of peasants, their agroecological practices and their demands for climate justice are formative to rural and agrarian policies in South and Eastern Africa on local, national and regional levels. The assumption underlying the design of the intervention is that the overall objective will be achieved through a sustained effort to strengthen and empower long-term grassroots mobilisation and self-organising amongst peasants and a strengthening of the capacity of civil society more broadly. This approach to achieve political and societal change has been refined and practised by LVC for many years. Several organisations emphasise that their strategies have been refined by the knowledge and strategic insights they have gained from regional strategy sessions during the past years. E.g. development of training methodologies, and public narratives disseminated through popular education material from previous interventions are seen as great steps of progression and as positive consequences of the regional collaboration.

The design of the intervention will contribute to the achievement of the overall goal through a combination of **strategic service deliveries**, **advocacy** and **capacity building**, thus balancing the development triangle. Many of the activities in the intervention will be implemented simultaneously, so that these three aspects will feed into each other and mutually reinforce each other. The advocacy efforts in the first part of the intervention uses material developed and distributed in the former interventions, while the advocacy efforts later on is based on the educational- and advocacy materials developed within this intervention. There is a gradual progression from a larger share of capacity building and service delivery activities in the beginning (objective 1 and 2) towards more advocacy activities by the end of the intervention (objective 3). The activities tied to immediate objectives 1 and 2 are mainly characterised as capacity building and strategic service delivery. The sequence of activities, their interlinkages and the balance of strategic service, advocacy and capacity building is illustrated in the figure below.



*Figure 2: Overview of activities*

This intervention builds on the same theory of change as previous interventions, focused on empowering SSFPs to be drivers of political change in their local contexts. However, the intervention has a new advocacy strategy and new objectives, aiming at realising peasants' rights as declared in the UNDROP. The new advocacy approach uses UNDROP as a tool for member organisations to domesticate and use strategically in their advocacy efforts to advance agroecology and climate justice.

The capacity building and service delivery activities have three main foci as illustrated in the figure above: 1. training on agroecology, 2. training on peasants’ rights as stated in the UNDROP, and 3. training on how to campaign and approach duty bearers to strategically advocate for the implementation of political demands. Training on agroecology forms an integral part of the intervention because successful advocacy depends on concrete and practical alternative solutions that can be presented to policy makers. A knowledgeable membership base with practical experiences with agroecology is believed to be fundamental to the development of political demands and alternatives to existing legislation and mainstream policy development. Today, all member organisations actively use the physical agroecology schools to demonstrate the positive impacts of agroecology to local level policymakers, other SSFPs and political allies. The intervention will strengthen SSFPs’ competence on agroecology so that the advocacy efforts are rooted in existing practices. Training on UNDROP and strategic advocacy lay the necessary foundations for member organisations to engage in advocacy efforts on this relatively new issue. These trainings have been requested from all member organisations.

Decentralisation of power, resources and knowledge from corporate actors towards peasants, consumers and local communities is a central goal of LVC SEAf’s work, as well as a strategy to achieve climate justice through bottom-up organising. This logic is also central in this intervention, and decentralisation is both a strategy and an inherent goal in the development objective. The intervention is designed as a process, where the regional secretariat gradually hands over responsibility to member organisations as they increase their capacity on peasants’ rights and agroecology. As a consequence, the design of the intervention is to strengthen the capacity of the network and member organisations respectively and together. The strategy provides a structured framework through which the network as an entity and as separate member organisations strengthen their capacities to independently carry out the work needed to reach their goals. It is a process through which SSFPs are empowered as legitimate political actors vis-a-vis relevant political decision makers. Following the strong emphasis on network building and advocacy in the intervention, the communication officer will assist in conveying peasants’ demands in a strategic manner.

The design of the strategy also reflects that the network holds different levels of capacity and experience and work within different societal, political and environmental contexts. The strategy is therefore designed elastically so that all member organisations can take part in the intervention and contribute with whatever level of resources and experience they have.

The intervention will be implemented at three different levels: regional, national and local. Some activities are coordinated and implemented regionally, to ensure learning from best practices in all participating organisations. The majority of the training is coordinated and implemented at national and local level, with some support in the form of materials from the regional secretariat. Most of the advocacy efforts will happen at the national and local level. This reflects the political analysis by the member organisations and LVC SEAf that assess that advocacy is most likely to be impactful on local and national levels, as many organisations have established good relations to policy makers on national and local level. Duty bearers from the perspective of the implementation of the UNDROP are national policy makers. In the planned advocacy activities, local and regional decision makers will also be strategically targeted in that they can put pressure on national duty bearers.

**3.5 Objectives, activities and expected results - Intervention design: Logical Framework Approach**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Overall objective:** The rights of peasants, their agroecological practices and their demand for climate justice are formative to rural and agrarian policies in South and Eastern Africa on local, national and regional levels. | |
| **Immediate objectives 1:** By July 2024, peasants are empowered to practice agroecology and claim their rights, and the legitimacy of member organisations is strengthened. | |
| **Indicators** | **Means of Verifications** |
| **1.1** UNDROP manuals have been layouted, translated, adapted to the regional context and shared with member organisations and at least five allies. 15 physical and 4 regional online trainings have been conducted and evaluated.  **1.2** 15 trainings on Agroecology and the UNDROP have been conducted.  **1.3** All organisations have facilitated the experiences of farmers to be recorded and shared for internal and external use.  **1.4** All organisations have applied for hard infrastructure and physical improvements of the national AE schools have been completed. | **1.1** Physical manuals printed and photos, participant lists and evaluation forms illustrate that the manuals have been used in each organisation.  **1.2** Photos, participant lists and evaluation forms illustrate that the manuals have been used.  **1.3** Minutes/summaries of trainings and evaluation forms  **1.4** Member organisation application for physical infrastructure, statements from members. |
| **Expected output** | **Activities** |
| **1.1** Member organisations of LVC SEAf have the capabilities to independently conduct training on agroecology, climate justice and human rights-based advocacy | **1.1.1** Development of basic and advanced training materials for domesticating the UNDROP as an advocacy and educational tool for SSFPs  **1.1.2** Training of trainers on the UNDROP and human rights-based advocacy  **1.1.3** Training of trainers on #PeasantAEAchievesCJ curriculum |
| **1.2** Peasants in the network have access to support for improving their agroecological practises and information about their rights as peasants and rural workers and how they can claim their rights | **1.2.1** 8 trainings at local level on agroecology and basic introduction to human rights-based advocacy. **1.2.2** 7 peasants’ rights trainings (UNDROP schools) at national level (understand your rights). |
| **1.3** Member organisations of LVC SEAf have collected information and priorities from their members for developing advocacy strategies at national level | **1.3.1** During activity 1.2.1 and 1.2.2, peasants formulate key challenges and opportunities in claiming their rights as peasants and scaling out agroecology. |
| **1.4** AE schools are strengthened and made more sustainable through the delivery of relevant hard infrastructure | **1.4.1** Hard infrastructure supporting 8 agroecology schools. |
| **Immediate objective 2:** By January 2024, LVC SEAf and members have developed key messages and advocacy material which demonstrates the value of agroecology and key priorities for implementing UNDROP and climate justice at national level | |
| **Indicators** | **Means of Verifications** |
| **2.1** Insights and feedback from members brought up at biannual webinars are shared  **2.2** Workshops on shrinking civic space and political campaigning have been conducted **2.3** The Communication officer has contributed to the framing and development of political messages for campaign material.Advocacy material based on policy proposals has been layouted and printed  **2.4** Four member organisations have hired an advocacy consultant and in cooperation conducted 4 national policy analyses and 4 technical policy proposals | **2.1** Minutes or recordings, and participant lists. Statements from participants on the webinars’ effects.  **2.2** Minutes, participant lists, evaluation forms  **2.3** Delivery of copies of advocacy material from all 8 member organisations. Statements from members on the communication officers assistance.  **2.4** ToR for consultant, output of analysis, input of key political messages for campaign material and policy proposals |
| **Expected output** | **Activities** |
| **2.1** LVC SEAf has improved channels of communication for knowledge sharing between the members. | **2.1.1** LVC SEAf coordinates biannual webinars and regular updates for knowledge sharing between its member organisations. |
| **2.2** LVC SEAf has supported member organisations in analysing information and priorities for advocacy strategies collected from their members, and formulation of key messages for each country. | **2.2.1** 4 workshops for key people of member organisations on how to navigate and mobilise in shrinking civic space as a social movement (online). **2.2.2** 7 workshops at national level for key people of member organisations on political campaigning and engagement with policy makers. |
| **2.3** LVC SEAf has developed popular advocacy material for each country and for the region, customised in collaboration with the members to meet their priorities. | **2.3.1** Hard and soft-copy of campaign materials developed to be used by member organisations targeting policy makers. |
| **2.4** LVC SEAf and 4 members have developed technical proposals and advocacy material for 4 countries. | **2.4.1** Mapping and background analysis of policy gaps, barriers, and opportunities relevant to CJ, agroecology and peasant rights affecting SSFPs at national level by 4 member organisations. **2.4.2** Development of 4 technical policy proposals and strategies on relevant political issues affecting SSFPs at national and regional level. |
| **Immediate Objective 3:** By July 2025, SSFPs have strategically advocated, campaigned and engaged with duty bearers in order to push them to respect, protect and fulfil the rights of peasants, and to support the scaling up of agroecology at national levels. | |
| **Indicators** | **Means of Verifications** |
| **3.1** 16 national advocacy meetings and event targeting decision makers have been conducted. Representatives of LVC SEAf have participated in regional and international political events and formed alliances.  **3.2** Media mentions of peasant rights, preferably from decision makers of peasant rights, agroecology or climate justice.  **3.3** Advocacy strategies, experiences, and campaign material have been exchanged across the region. A regional strategy meeting has been conducted and a way forward for the network agreed upon | **3.1** Photos, statements from politicians on social media, mentions in local news outlets and community radio. Minimum three new alliances with CSOs, political statement  **3.2** Documentation of statements (e.g. newspaper, broadcast, local medias or social media), MoU  **3.3** Quarterly Monitoring and evaluation reports and a documentation of a new roadmap for LVC SEAf network |
| **Expected output** | **Activities** |
| **3.1** LVC SEAf has supported member organisations in running advocacy campaigns on local and national level on CJ, AE and peasant rights for each country (using materials under output 2.3 and 2.4). | **3.1.1** 8 public meetings with relevant decision makers to claim rights and propose solutions at national level. **3.1.2** 8 subnational agroecology fairs. |
| **3.2** LVC SEAf and their members have engaged in policy dialogue and political events on CJ, agroecology and peasant rights. | **3.2.1** LVC SEAf delegates participate in international political events promoting demands from members **3.2.2** Co-creation and participation in 3 regional alternative civil society summits in conjunction with other mainstream political events that promote false solutions and undermine peasants’ rights. |
| **3.3** Continuous evaluation and exchanges of the advocacy strategies for each country. | **3.3.1**. Regional strategy meeting for status, evaluation and strategizing for a way forward of the advocacy efforts. |

Methods and modus operandi in pursuit of Immediate Objective 1:

*By July 2024, peasants are empowered to practice agroecology and claim their rights, and the legitimacy of member organisations is strengthened.*

Given the human rights-based approach of the strategy, capacity building on peasants’ rights as defined in the UNDROP, is a central aspect of immediate objective 1. Immediate objective 1 will be achieved through two lines of activities that balance strategic service delivery and capacity building: Trainings on UNDROP and trainings on agroecology. The UNDROP training activities focus on making the UNDROP relevant to local contexts (activity 1.1.1) and on how to use it as an advocacy tool (activity 1.1.2 and 1.2.2). The Climate Justice Officer and the RWC are together responsible for implementing the national training of trainers (activity 1.1.2) that will equip key people from member organisations with the skills to independently conduct trainings for their members (activity 1.2.2). The agroecology training follows the same modus operandi, but the process begins with the training of trainers (activity 1.1.3) as the RWC has already developed a curriculum on agroecology and climate justice during the previous intervention. The training of trainers methodology is a key component of LVC’s farmer-to-farmer horizontal learning pedagogy and is central to this intervention (activity 1.1.2 and 1.1.3).

In continuation of the training-of-trainers sessions, seven national UNDROP trainings (activity 1.2.2) and eight local trainings on agroecology (activity 1.2.1) will be conducted. The trainings will consolidate the training methodology within each member organisation and will be used to develop and refine the methodologies and training material. All trainings have thorough feedback and evaluation at its core to ensure that the methods and material continuously improve and reflect and resonate with the experience of SSFPs. Through training, the primary target group will achieve skills on how to practice agroecology, knowledge on their rights, and tools to work politically to claim these rights.

A number of activities in pursuit of immediate objective 1 are centred around the existing physical agroecological schools in the seven countries. The schools are training centres where members can seek advice, participate in trainings (activity 1.2.1 and 1.2.2) and share experiences on agroecological practises. Simultaneously, they serve as spaces for political mobilisation and demonstration of the viability of agroecological practises (activity 3.1.2). Therefore, another component of strategic service delivery takes the form of hard infrastructure: equipment and tools to maintain and expand the schools. The Climate Justice Officer will distribute funds to member organisations in accordance with a list of criteria agreed upon between LVC SEAf and GA. The network has requested the possibility to further develop the schools through physical improvements such as storage facilities, fish ponds and seed banks (activity 1.4.1).

The two lines of training (agroecology and UNDROP) constitute a foundation for impactful and effective advocacy. In order to ensure that the strategic advocacy efforts build upon the priorities and learnings of the SSFPs themselves, the trainers will be responsible for gathering the policy priorities and articulation of main challenges at local trainings (activity 1.3.1).

Methods and modus operandi in pursuit of Immediate Objective 2:

*By January 2024, LVC SEAf and members have developed key messages and advocacy material which demonstrates the value of agroecology and key priorities for implementing UNDROP at national level.*

The activities tied to this objective aim at capacity building of key people on campaigning based on the UNDROP. Through activities such as workshops on shrinking civic space (activity 2.2.1) and workshops on political campaigning and engagement with policy makers (activity 2.2.2), SSFPs will be strengthened in their ability to organise themselves and to articulate peasants’ rights and agroecology to relevant stakeholders. These trainings will increase their abilities to adjust their operations to the altered political landscape and shrinking of civic space.

The workshop on shrinking civic space (activity 2.2.1) will be coordinated by the Climate Justice Officer, and co-facilitated by one or two member organisations. The activity will take place in the beginning of the intervention, followed by the campaigning workshop (activity 2.2.2) leading directly to the production of campaign material in each organisation (activity 2.3.1). Activity 2.2.2. will be organised by the member organisations themselves with inputs from LVC SEAf secretariat ensuring best practises from the network. The workshops will equip member organisations with the skills and knowhow of how to improve their design, planning and formulation of political campaigning and advocacy efforts.

Peasants’ rights include policy areas such as land use, water management, spatial planning and tenure regulation, human rights law, patents and intellectual rights, UN declarations, tariffs and trade agreements amongst others. As part of the intervention, four[[13]](#footnote-13) member organisations will be assisted by consultants to make a thorough mapping of policy gaps and opportunities in their context (activity 2.4.1). This will be used as an outset to develop alternative policy proposals advancing peasants rights, agroecology and climate justice (activity 2.4.2), e.g. how national policies on land tenure should be designed to comply with the principles in the UNDROP. This set-up around the analysis of policy gaps and development of policy proposals is an example of the elastic - yet structured - intervention. It is designed to meet the needs and demands of the SSFPs in their different contexts and allows the member organisations to take part in the intervention in a way that matches their particular strategic priorities. The advocacy efforts are continuously informed by the experience of SSFPs (activity 1.3.1), collected through national (activity 1.2.2) and local trainings (activity 1.2.1)*.*

To advocate for the implementation UNDROP is a new exercise for many of the LVC SEAf organisations. Therefore, it is important to work with a framework to share strategies, success stories, hardships and experiences with advocacy between the organisations. The Climate Justice Officer has the responsibility to coordinate the share information between member organisations through regular updates and biannual webinars (activity 2.1.1). This allows for learning from best experiences and a continuous fine-tuning of the organisations’ advocacy and mobilisation strategies. Moreover, regular information sharing between the organisations will build a sense of solidarity in the LVC SEAf network and lay the foundations for more (bilateral) cooperation between member organisations, also beyond this intervention.

Methods and modus operandi in pursuit of Immediate Objective 3:

*By July 2025, SSFPs have strategically advocated, campaigned and engaged with duty bearers in order to push them to respect, protect and fulfil the rights of peasants, and to support the scaling up of agroecology at national levels.*

The activities within objective 3 build on the outputs of the activities in objective 1 and 2, and put these learnings into practice. Through advocacy efforts at local, national and regional level, peasants will push duty bearers in each country to implement the rights of SSFPs into national policies and programs. The advocacy activities aim at achieving lasting, structural changes in policies that affect peasants and their ability to obtain their rights, such as land tenure schemes in South Africa and access to local markets in DRC. With UNDROP as a starting point, peasants will obtain practical experience and skills in how to design campaigns, map relevant stakeholders and how to approach them. This will increase the abilities of the peasants in the member organisations to hold duty bearers accountable to their obligations in the UNDROP. Moreover, the advocacy efforts are also a way of increasing the legitimacy of peasants as a collective with rights and legitimate political demands.

Key people in the member organisations are responsible for implementing the advocacy efforts by targeting duty bearers and the broader public through public meetings (activity 3.1.1.) and agroecology fairs (activity 3.1.2.). The Climate Justice Officer will provide support to the member organisations to implement the public meetings and agroecology fairs. The fairs build on the learnings from trainings on agroecology (activity 1.1.3.) and the provision of hard infrastructure (activity 1.4.1.). The agroecology fairs are important arenas for the member organisations to reach a broader public and existing and potential political ally rallying for political change and seeking to improve the livelihoods of the SSFPs, thus creating stronger alliances at local levels. Moreover, it enables member organisations to present policy makers with concrete alternatives to industrial farming projects and demonstrate its usefulness to those who have the power to make policy changes supporting agroecology efforts.

Participation in international political events (activity 3.2.1) and participation in alternative civil society summits (activity 3.2.2) is part of the alliance building on a regional and international level as well as actual advocacy. LVC SEAf delegates will participate in an international event of relevance to LVC’s work to promote peasants rights each year. The event will be an arena for alliance building with like-minded social movements and an arena to approach policy makers at national and regional level to present peasants’ political demands. The delegates will develop political demands that LVC SEAf and member organisations will present to relevant decision makers during and after the summit. The RWC will decide on an event with the most potential for advocacy.

The alternative civil society summit (activity 3.2.2) will be co-created and facilitated by the LVC SEAf secretariat and the RWC each year. The summit will be an arena to push national and regional policy makers to take real measures to implement the UNDROP, based on peasants’ own solutions and put forward the learnings from immediate objectives 1 and 2. Three democratically selected LVC SEAf delegates will participate in the summit each year, with the mandate to create new alliances and engage in policy dialogue with policy makers on the UNDROP. An online component will be organised, to ensure that all member organisations will be briefed and give their input and testimonies during the summit. The intervention culminates in an online regional strategy meeting (activity 3.3.1), which is a capacity building activity organised by the RWC. The meeting will ensure that the learnings from the intervention will feed into future national and regional strategic plans, and especially in future advocacy efforts.

## 3.6 Establishing lasting improvements for poor and marginalised target groups

## This intervention strengthens the organising and builds capacity among SSFPs so that they can improve their living conditions and climate change resilience through: Practising agroecology and becoming more skilled political actors pushing for policies that respect peasants’ rights in their local contexts.

Strengthening the organisational skills and capacity for advancing peasants rights through advocacy

The SSPFs in the member organisations will get skills and tools to improve their livelihoods through capacity building on agroecology and strengthening of the agroecology schools. They also get skills on how to do more effective political advocacy towards local and national stakeholders, to achieve their collective rights as peasants. This happens through a series of training and workshops on agroecology, peasants rights and advocacy (activity 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3, 2.2.1 and 2.2.2). Schooling on peasant rights and rights-based advocacy as well as the concrete advocacy efforts (activity 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.2.1 and 3.2.2) will boost the necessary practical experience of SSFPs to effectively push for long lasting institutional changes that will realise peasants’ human rights in practice. The educational material produced about peasants’ rights in the UNDROP (activity 1.1.1) will become an integral part of knowledge dissemination beyond the scope of the intervention, and is thus a means to promote the sustainability of the intervention. A more skillful and knowledgeable member base will strengthen the LVC SEAf member organisations and their ability to successfully champion the human rights of peasants in their different contexts.

Another aspect of the intervention’s sustainability, is a focus on alliance building on national and local level, which happens by educating key people on how to engage in policy dialogue with local duty bearers (activity 2.2.2) and through actual advocacy efforts (activity 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.2.1 and 3.2.2). In their advocacy activities, the organisations will link up and co-create policy proposals with other like-minded organisations and social movements. These ties will be strengthened through shared strategic agendas. Poor, vulnerable and marginalised target groups will thus be strengthened in their capacity of being political actors in their own life, which is not restricted to the period of this intervention. Moreover, the workshop on shrinking civic space (2.2.1), also builds resilience in the organisations through creation of strategies on how to effectively organise and achieve change in a context of increasingly oppressive regimes, including increased alliance building at national and local level.

The intervention will have an external evaluation with a special focus on evaluating the advocacy strategies of the intervention, with emphasis on what changes they have led to for the end beneficiaries on the ground. The results of the evaluation will be used by LVC SEAf and the member organisations to fine-tune their advocacy efforts and strategies so as to best cater for the realisation of peasants rights in the regional strategy meeting (activity 3.3.1). The RWCs will play an important role in ensuring the systematisation of experiences, including that learnings are transmitted between regional and national levels, and planning and executing a phase-out strategy towards the end of the intervention.

The advocacy efforts carried out by the LVC network will contribute to bring about sustainable political change and improvement for the target group. The advocacy efforts will strengthen the visibility of peasant’s struggles on the political scene in the local areas, in the media and vis-a-vis duty bearers. The relations and collaboration with duty bearers will be strengthened through a sustained pressure and persistent show-casing of agroecology practices at demonstration plots. Through the advocacy activities in the network (e.g. the dissemination of materials, trainings, fairs, public meetings), more SSFPs will be mobilised, thus sustaining the network.

Transfer of knowledge and responsibility

An important part of the sustainability of the cooperation between GA and LVC so far, is the gradual transfer of capacity and responsibilities from the LVC SEAf secretariat to national organisations, so that the regional secretariat gradually plays a smaller role in developing and implementing activities on national levels. An example is the capacity and knowledge which will be transferred from key people in the member organisations to the broader member basein the training of trainers activities (1.1.2 and 1.1.3).

Through LVC SEAf’s modus operandi of horisontal farmer-to-farmer learning, the activities in this intervention is expected to have a catalyst effect which reaches beyond the scope of this intervention and becomes integral to the organisation's overall political work. Over time, the key people will hand over their learnings to other personnel, thus continuously expanding agroecology practices and knowledge of the UNDROP and advocacy skills amongst peasants in the region. National agroecology schools are the main arena for knowledge exchange in the member organisations, and they will be strengthened through the delivery of hard infrastructure as a means to improve sustainability of the intervention.

The gradual decentralisation of responsibility to member organisations also speaks to the long term financial sustainability of the intervention. The learnings from the trainings and the educational material (activities 1.1.3-1.3.1) will be incorporated into the member organisations’ working plans after the end of the intervention. The ownership of the intervention in member organisations and the domestication of learnings ensures that the intervention has a catalyst effect, also after the end of the intervention. Despite the increasing responsibility on the member organisations, the implementation is not dependent on paid staff on national levels. Through training of trainers (activity 1.1.2 and 1.1.3), the organisations continue to disseminate and reproduce the learnings from this intervention after the end of the project without being dependent on paid staff nationally.

Agroecology is practical resilience

It is crucial to emphasise that scaling up of agroecology in the region, and thereby increasing communities’ practical experience with agroecology, is an important way of building resilience and financial independence of peasant communities. This is necessary to improve the climatic, social and financial conditions of SSFPs. The expansion of agroecology is key to create lasting improvements for the target group. SSFPs are expected to continue to practise agroecology after the intervention, as it makes them more resilient to the effects of climate change and financially independent of financial institutions and corporations that they would otherwise be forced to buy seeds and chemical inputs from.

The expansion of agroecological practices have proved to have significant and positive effects on SSFPs’ livelihoods during the previous interventions, something that is continuously being emphasised by the LVC SEAf network. The scaling up of agroecological practices has made peasant communities more resilient to the effects of climate change, more food secure and more financially independent, all being indicators of lasting improvements of their livelihoods. The adoption of agroecological practices have allowed peasant communities to become more resilient to a changing climate as well as more financially independent of the agroindustry. Examples of this is seen in that farmers in Shashe in Masvingo, Zimbabwe currently grow more than sufficient crops to feed their local community, also in dry periods. In Congo, peasants save, grow and share indigenous seeds, which has made them independent of commercial seed markets.

## 3.7 Risk assessment

Due to the scope of the application, the risk assessment does not include detailed risk analyses for each country. Rather, the section includes the risks associated with the project at regional level, with notable exceptions described.

Political risks

*There is a high risk of political developments affecting the implementation of certain activities, but the impact is low, as LVC and GA have many years of experience with doing political work in unstable political contexts, and we have a set of mitigating methods, such as relocation of activities, hybrid events etc.*

Given that the intervention takes place in seven countries, the implementation is vulnerable to societal changes, social unrest and political instability. Such events can affect the intervention by hindering key people from participating in certain activities, or by forcing the organisations to alter the location and timing of activities. The risk of political unrest differs between countries and also within the countries, and we assess that the highest risks at local level to be in Northern Mozambique (Cabo Delgado), which is highly militarised. There are a few other areas, where we assess the risk of political instability to be higher than the average. In Migori in Western Kenya where KPL work, and in several of the regions where COPACO work in DR Congo, the levels of political instability are high. To mitigate this risk, the member organisations have high levels of flexibility to decide where, when and how they will implement the different activities.

The political development in all countries will be closely monitored by GA, LVC SEAf and their member organisations. LVC SEAf has many years of experience working politically in the region and has developed safety policies for their interventions. As a regional network, LVC SEAf will still be able to continue activities in the case that political instability will force the delay or cancellation of certain activities. As the implementing organisation, ZIMSOFF in Zimbabwe plays a critical role in the intervention. Throughout the partnership, ZIMSOFF has proven resilient and able to adapt to changing conditions of operation during political coups, hyperinflation, liquidity crisis with banks, economic sanctions and longer cuts to power and internet. However, in the unfortunate event that ZIMSOFF will be unable to operate for shorter or longer periods of time, the LVC SEAf secretariat has employees located in Maptu, Mozambique and Morogoro, Tanzania, who could take over the implementing role provisionally.

Societal risks

*The risks associated with shrinking civic space and COVID-19 in the region pose a medium risk for the implementation of the project, and we assess the impact to be low because of mitigation measures and experience with implementing a similar intervention during the first lockdowns.*

The shrinking civic space poses a risk to the intervention, as there is a tendency of increased criminalization, including imprisonment of activists in the region, a trend that has been exacerbated during the pandemic. The general picture is that activists in the LVC network are not targeted by their governments, and the member organisations have maintained a relatively positive relation to the government. However, some outspoken social leaders from the organisations have been threatened by local and national authorities or corporations due to their work, and have been forced to flee their country for a shorter period. GA and LVC have strategies in place for how to act in these situations. LVC has for instance used Globalt Fokus’ Rapid Response Program to help evacuate individuals who are at risk due to their work. Because of the shrinking civic space in the region, the intervention has a specific focus on building capacity within the member organisations on how to organise and work politically in a context of shrinking space for civil society. This includes the establishment of mechanisms for early response to laws and regulations that limit SSFPs ability to play an active role in the democratic debate.

COVID-19 is one of the most present societal risks at the moment, although currently the measures are less restrictive and more predictable in all countries, compared to the beginning of the pandemic. New waves of COVID-19 outbreaks and following government restrictions can force the partners to change or delay the implementation of certain activities. However, LVC SEAf have had time to learn from, and adapt to, the conditions of the pandemic. During the last intervention, LVC SEAf and the member organisations have been able to complete the activities (many of them moved online), despite challenges such as bad internet connectivity and high data costs. We therefore assess COVID-19 to be a present societal risk with high likelihood of continuing, but we expect its impact on this intervention to be low. To mitigate the impacts of COVID-19, the intervention will still contain a high ratio of online meetings, and more national level activities than the previous intervention. Moreover, we expect that the Partner Seminar, and the mitigation measures that will come out of it will strengthen GA and LVCs ability to mobilise and engage in advocacy work in the face of COVID-19 and the associated shrinking civic space. This will significantly reduce the potential impact of COVID-19 and shrinking civic space on this intervention.

Climate risks:

*The likelihood of extreme weather impacting certain activities within the intervention is high, and we assess the impacts to be medium. Mitigation strategies and the flexible strategy allows national organisations to adjust or move activities in the case of extreme weather events, thus reducing the impacts of such events.*

We assess that the intervention is particularly vulnerable to extreme weather events, which can destroy infrastructure and prevent people from participating in activities or destroy the facilities where activities are to be arranged. Water scarcity (due to droughts or privatisation of water resources) can lead to the destruction of crops at the demonstration plots in the agroecology schools, and thereby limit both advocacy work, and hinder full trainings to take place. Therefore, there is an increased focus on water harvesting techniques at the agroecology schools. This is expected to increase the resilience of the demonstration plots at the agroecology schools. We assess the likelihood of extreme weather situations to affect activities (relocation, change of dates, individuals prevented from participating) within the intervention to be high. But given the climate adaptation strategies employed by the SSFPs, they will be more resilient, and the impacts of climate change related events affecting their livelihoods is decreased.

Due to the high risk of extreme weather events impacting some activities of the intervention, a number of mitigation and adaptation strategies are put in place. The intervention has more events at local level, which means that the travel distances for participants are shorter, and activities can more easily be rescheduled in the case of extreme weather events. Moreover, the pandemic has given the organisations useful experience with arranging hybrid events in the case that individuals are prevented from participating. The organisations have years of experience arranging activities in a context of increasingly unstable climate, and are used to relocating events when needed. Moreover, the investments in physical facilities at the agroecology schools will focus on things that will improve the sustainability of the schools, such as e.g. seed banks. These investments will increase the resilience and long-term sustainability of the schools.

## 3.8 Monitoring and systematisation of experiences

The intervention will monitor and evaluate the impact of activities and project progression in a systematic manner based on positive experiences from the former interventions. Progress reporting has been successful in capturing the activities, output, outcomes and impact of the intervention, as it combines narrative reporting with pictures and testimonies from activities carried out. The progress reporting will have two foci; narrative and financial reporting. Quarterly progress reports will be followed up by meetings between the partners to evaluate the progress of the implementation, clarify doubts and make adjustments if needed. Another monitoring tool which will also be used in this intervention is surveys amongst the activity participants aiming to continuously develop content and shape the training to fit the local needs.

A new dynamic monitoring framework has been developed to capture the broader impact of the intervention that cannot easily be captured in the quarterly reporting. This includes a greater focus on monitoring the sense of ownership of the intervention by the member organisations, such as the domestication of the intervention into member organisations’ strategic programs. As another new monitoring parameter for this intervention, the project will focus on monitoring changes in the local contexts in which the SSFPs live and work, such as changes in policies and programmes and media coverage of issues of peasant rights and agroecology. In the regular updates member organisations are encouraged to share local stories of success or hardship, thus enabling horizontal learning between the member organisations and a constant refinement of trainings and advocacy strategies.

The external evaluation will be conducted halfway through the intervention, so the results can be used to fine-tune the monitoring and systematisation of experiences. The evaluation will pay special attention to evaluating the advocacy efforts and strategies, thus enabling learning between the member organisations and refinement of the advocacy strategies both in each country and regionally. Moreover, the external evaluation will monitor the broader, structural changes the intervention is creating and contributing to, by using qualitative methods that capture how key people understand themselves as part of a broader social movement. In order to capture changes in advocacy capacity, the evaluation will monitor spillover effects such as new alliances with other social movements or organisations. The external evaluator will interview peasants about e.g. their sense of empowerment to be able to approach different duty bearers and advocate for their rights and the promotion of peasant agroecology. This is also a way to capture how the relation to other actors has developed during the intervention and how alliance building can foster catalyst effects and sustainability.

|  |
| --- |
| Intervention-related information work in Denmark |

## 4.1 The purpose of the information work

The purpose of GA’s information work is to question structural inequalities and political injustice. Notably to integrate a critical debate on food systems and consolidate a critical political analysis into the general climate change discourse in Denmark. This will be done through activities that target the climate justice movement and put forward the shared political analysis by LVC SEAf and GA as well as stories from the frontline communities and peasants in the SEAf region. Ultimately, the aim is to politicise the climate justice agenda and strengthen the call for political change towards policy makers in Denmark and Europe.

GA has a wide range of positive experiences with this sort of political capacity building and advocacy effort. Latest the campaign “Klima før Frihandel”, where GA activists arranged webinars, seminars and talks for different Danish climate movements about global aspects of climate justice, based on the analysis of LVC and experience of LVC members. Besides producing information material, disseminating knowledge and critical analyses, participating in climate justice events as keynote speakers or debate participants, GA will host an activist school that will strengthen the knowledge and capacities of the climate movement on climate justice and its ability to organise and act strategically and politically. The target group is the climate movement in Denmark, who are engaged in the political debate in Denmark or interested in topics such as climate justice, environment and social justice. To reach the target group and inspire them to act, GA has developed a number of fixed elements and channels that are used in campaigns, as they have proven to be successful in previous campaign efforts. These are among other things: Strategic focus on the use of social media in all information and campaign work, production of animated short films for distribution on SoMe, electronic newsletters, articles and opinion pieces in relevant media, street-based actions, production of fact-based reports and compiling documentation to be used by either allies or policy makers directly.

1. FAO (2021): Which farms feed the world and has farmland become more concentrated? [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. See external evaluation of Pathway to Climate Justice (j. nr.: 18-2267-UI), uploaded at Vores CISU. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. To see the full declaration, visit: [UN Declaration on the rights of peasants.pdf (geneva-academy.ch)](https://www.geneva-academy.ch/joomlatools-files/docman-files/UN%20Declaration%20on%20the%20rights%20of%20peasants.pdf#:~:text=United%20Nations%20Declaration%20on%20the%20Rights%20of%20Peasants,Peasants%20and%20Other%20People%20Working%20in%20Rural%20Areas%2C) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Simmons, Daisy (2020): What is “climate justice”? Yale Climate Connections. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. LVC SEAf and Global Aktion 2017: Peasant Agroecology Achieves Climate Justice - A Primer [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The African Climate Justice Groups is a coalition which gathers different social movements on the continent. In 2020 they developed their proposals and demands for how to achieve climate justice on the African continent, in the light of the COVID-19 pandemic and its social consequences. [africaclimatejustice.org](https://www.africaclimatejustice.org/) [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Research reports by LVC and GA from the two previous interventions. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. LVC & GA Research reports from previous interventions and UNICEF report:[Gender equality | UNICEF Eastern and Southern Africa](https://www.unicef.org/esa/gender-equality) [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. https://www.fao.org/3/cb8376en/cb8376en.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. [South Africa’s new seed law and its impacts on farmer seed systems and agricultural biodiversity | ACB (acbio.org.za)](https://www.acbio.org.za/south-africas-new-seed-law-and-its-impacts-farmer-seed-systems-and-agricultural-biodiversity) [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Boaventura Monjane, Ruth Nyambura and Peter Rosset (2021): Peasant farmers’ perspectives and practises towards food sovereignty and climate justice through agroecology in Southern and East Africa. LVC SEAf. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. A method where farmers learn from other farmers in order to learn from best practices and share experiences with agroecology. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. The organisations will be selected based on the organisations room of manoeuvre and potential to affect duty bearers [↑](#footnote-ref-13)