

# NATURAL RESOURCES SYSTEMS PROGRAMME

## NRSP Project Communication Plan Guidelines Research Projects

November 2003

Natural Resources Systems Programme  
HTS Development Ltd  
Thamesfield House  
Boundary Way  
Hemel Hempstead  
HP2 7SR  
UK

Tel: +44 (0)1442 202439  
Fax: +44 (0)1442 219886  
Email: [nrsp@htsdevelopment.com](mailto:nrsp@htsdevelopment.com)

---

# **NRSP Project Communication Plan Guidelines**

## **Research Projects**

### **Introduction**

1. The importance of communication in research and development programmes is well established. For a research project, effective communication is vital not just in terms of promotion of eventual research outputs and products, but throughout the project life. Effective communication encourages buy-in from a wide range of stakeholders and helps the project identify and understand stakeholders' needs. By creating awareness of what a project is doing amongst stakeholders at a range of levels, communication enhances the uptake of research findings and products. This in turn leads to greater research and development impact.

2. Communication is no longer seen as simply a top-down mechanism for the transfer of information, but as an iterative, interactive, multi-directional process involving a wide range of stakeholders. It is recognised that the users of the products that research delivers have differing needs and perspectives, and that they are generators and transformers, as well as users of information.

3. NRSP projects and their staff have always recognised the importance of effective communication and have been keen to develop this dimension of their projects. Projects have been successful in using communications to improve project outputs and impact and have made important contributions to communications methods in research. The communications activities have ranged from simple initiatives (e.g. establishing good relations with research partners and other project stakeholders, working with local networks, matching materials and activities to the different needs of a range of stakeholders) to the more comprehensive (e.g. inception and design phases to investigate the communication needs of stakeholder groups).

4. Emphasis on communication is an important element of NRSP's strategy for increasing the effectiveness and impact of its project portfolio. This is particularly important in the final stages of NRSP when an increased proportion of programme funding is allocated to uptake promotion activities, as part of its strategic plan. Some of this funding is allocated for specially designed uptake promotion projects.

5. Some of this funding will be available to earlier and current research projects that wish to upgrade their communications activities in order to promote their research products and so enhance project impact. These projects will have developed research products that they wish to promote, they have, or want to develop, plans to do this and they could benefit from additional funds. This funding recognises that earlier and current research projects are constrained in implementing a properly formulated communication plan because this was not allowed for in their original budget and team composition.

### **About these guidelines**

6. These guidelines have been developed within the context of the increased funding available for the communication component of NRSP projects. The guidelines have two objectives:

- First, to assist project teams to identify, plan and manage their communication activities as an integral part of their (NRSP) research project.
- Second, to help NRSP interact with its projects on communications activities and to monitor and evaluate project progress and achievement for these activities.

7. The first objective is general and derives from NRSP's strategic objective to increase the uptake and impact of its research projects. By providing these guidelines NRSP management hopes to improve the capacity of projects to develop and implement a communication plan (CP), increase uptake promotion and deliver greater research and development impact.

8. The second objective is specific and derives from NRSP's need to effectively manage its projects with respect to communications. This is particularly important within the context of providing additional funding for communications activities. These guidelines are designed to inform projects of what NRSP needs from them as communication plans. Wherever possible extant NRSP project documentation is used. However, because communications is a recent additional dimension to projects, some extra documentation is requested. It is hoped that these guidelines will minimise the transaction costs for NRSP, and for projects, in managing a project's communications work and of providing additional funding for communications.

### **Communication Plan Guidelines format and structure**

9. NRSP recognises that although providing a framework for planning, design and documentation of a CP may be helpful, there is a danger that the framework can be restrictive. Also it can become just another item to be filled-in without sufficient thought and regard to the processes and reasons for choices. To achieve a satisfactory balance between the advantages and disadvantages of providing a framework for developing a CP, these guidelines do not provide a proforma format. Instead they provide information in three parts:

- **Part 1** provides information to help project teams answer 10 key communication questions (see Box 1) as they plan, implement and present their communication activities from the start of the project to completion. This information is presented with respect to each question at three stages of an NRSP project (Proposal, Inception and Mid-term Review).
- **Part 2** gives Examples based on communication work from other NRSP projects and assignments selected to help project teams think about the detail of what needs to be considered and how to document it. These examples can be adapted by project teams to assist them to develop and document their CP.
- **Part 3** lists resources that project teams will find useful in carrying out the various processes needed for developing their CP. These include: guidelines on how to develop a CP; examples of CPs from other NRSP projects; and guidelines on specific kinds of activities such as developing a website or carrying out a survey on the communication context of stakeholders.

10. The 10 key questions on communications that provide the framework for these guidelines are presented in Box 1.

**Box 1: NRSP's 10 key Communication Plan Questions**

- Q1** What are the aims of the project's Communication Plan in relation to the project purpose?
- Q2** Who within the project team will be responsible for the implementation of the Communication Plan?
- Q3** Who are the communication stakeholders for the project?
- Q4** What are the research products and other issues that the project team need to communicate about with the communication stakeholders?
- Q5** What are the current knowledge, attitudes and practices (KAP) of the communication stakeholders in relation to the products to be promoted?
- Q6** What are the objectives of communicating about the products to the communication stakeholders (i.e. what might they want to be able to do once the project team have communicated with them)?
- Q7** What media and channels might be used to communicate with the various communication stakeholders in relation to the research products (e.g. what is accessible to them, what are their preferences, what can be sustained after the project is over )?
- Q8** How will the project team ensure that communication materials are useful (e.g. contain relevant information), usable (e.g. in a language they understand) and accessible (e.g. at a suitable time and place) for those with whom the project wishes to communicate during and after the project?
- Q9** Are the proposed Communication Plan activities and materials included in the project budget?
- Q10** How will the project team monitor and evaluate the implementation of the Communication Plan and its component parts?

11. It is important to emphasise that project teams are free to choose what approaches and methods to use to address the 10 questions. However, suggestions as to which questions to focus on and what needs documenting for a CP at the different stages of a project are given in Box 2.

| <b>Box 2: Guidance on documenting Communication Plans in NRSP Research Projects</b> |                  |   |
|---|------------------|---|
| <b>Project proposal</b>   | <i>RDI</i>       | <b>Q2</b> in 20b, 21, section G<br><b>Q3</b> in 16b&d<br><b>Q4</b> in 18b<br><b>Q6</b> in 19a,b<br><b>Q7</b> in 16d   |
|   | <i>Log-Frame</i> | <b>Q6</b> for OVIs<br><b>Q7</b> for Milestones<br><b>Q10</b> for M&E  |
|   | <i>Bar Chart</i> | <b>Q2</b> Ensure communication related activities and team responsibilities are identified and included.  |
|   | <i>Budget</i>    | <b>Q9</b> Allow for predicted communication activities and products   |
| <b>Inception Report</b>   | <i>CP</i>        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include draft CP as an appendix to inception report.</li> <li>• Limit the CP to 3-5 pages</li> <li>• Review all 10Qs</li> <li>• Present a summary table as part of the draft CP covering:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Q1</b></li> <li>○ <b>Q3</b></li> <li>○ <b>Q4</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>  |
| <b>Mid-term Review (MTR)</b>  | <i>Log-Frame</i> | Review logframe to identify communication related activities, products, milestones, OVIs and MOVs that can be strengthened and flag these in the project's MTR presentation.  |
|   | <i>Bar Chart</i> | Ensure communication activities and team responsibilities are covered in the bar chart  |
|   | <i>Budget</i>    | Review budget and flag adjustments that may be needed for communication activities and products   |
|   | <i>CP</i>        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mid-term review CP as stand-alone submission to MTR</li> <li>• Limit the CP to 5-8 pages</li> <li>• Review:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Q1</b></li> <li>○ <b>Q3</b></li> <li>○ <b>Q4</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Emphasis on:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Q5</b></li> <li>○ <b>Q6</b></li> <li>○ <b>Q7</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Present a summary table as part of the CP covering:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Q3</b></li> <li>○ <b>Q4</b></li> <li>○ <b>Q7</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul> |

### NRSP's review of a project's Communication Plan

12. These guidelines are written to help project teams develop and document their CP in a way that is effective as a planning and management tool. However, they are also useful for communicating with NRSP which regards a CP as an important tool to help monitor and evaluate project progress. For this reason, since April 2003 NRSP has included a review of a project's CP three times in the project cycle.

- First, as part of the review of the project proposal (e.g. RD1, NCB).
- Second, as part of the project's inception report, i.e. three months after project inception.
- Third as part of the project's mid-term review.

As part of these reviews NRSP asks projects to present their CP in a brief synthesis document (see Box 2 for details).

### Synthesis and presentation of information

13. The main difference between what goes into the inception report and the mid-term review versions of a CP will be in the greater detail and certainty of proposals and work plans required in the mid-term review version.

14. Between the start of the project and the mid-term review project teams will need to have found out a great deal about the communication context and needs of communication stakeholders. This is about understanding what they want and need from the project as well as what the project wants and needs from them. Without this information it will be difficult to justify the choices made about how to communicate about research products. It will also be difficult to decide on communication priorities

15. It is important that the level of detail presented in both the inception report and mid-term review versions of a CP are relevant to the context in which the project is working and also to the stage of the project. Both the inception report and mid-term review versions of project CPs should give evidence that the 10 Questions have been worked through and applied in its development.

16. Developing a CP will undoubtedly involve more documentation than is implied by the CP report length limits suggested in Box 2. This is because there are a large number of issues to be worked through in detail. Some issues require significant information to be collected and collated and doing this takes space. However, a CP should be a synthesis document and the project should be able to distil and present the information needed within these limits.

17. Although project teams are free to present analysed and synthesised information in any way which they think fit, NRSP suggests that, as part of this synthesis, the following summary tables are used in the Inception and MTR CP reports.

### Summary table at Inception Phase for Research Projects

| POTENTIAL communication stakeholders               | POTENTIAL research products and communication objective for each |  |           |                                 |
|--|--|--|-----------|---------------------------------|
|  | <i>[Add extra columns as needed]</i>                             |  |           |                                 |
|  | Product 1  | Why this product for this group?   | Product 2 | Why this product for this group |
| Identify potential communication stakeholder group | Brief description of potential product (e.g. radio programme.)   | Brief reason for using this product (e.g. most farmer's can't read and most households listen to the local radio station in the evenings.) |           |                                 |
| <i>[Add extra rows as needed]</i>                  |  |  |           |                                 |

**Summary table at MTR stage**

| <b>PRIORITISED communication stakeholders</b>                    | <b>PRIORITISED research products and communication objective for each</b><br><i>[Add extra columns as needed]</i> |   |                  |   |
|--|---|---|------------------|---|
|  | <b>Product 1</b>  | <b>Why this product for this group?</b>   | <b>Product 2</b> | <b>Why this product for this group?</b> |
| Identify and describe the prioritised communication stakeholders | Brief description of product including medium, content etc.   | Reason for using this product as investigated through stakeholder consultation etc. |                  |   |
| <i>[Add extra rows as needed]</i>                                |   |   |                  |   |

**Future development of these guidelines**

18. These guidelines will be updated to reflect project teams’ experiences in the processes involved in developing and implementing CPs. Suggestions and additions from project teams to improve any part of these guidelines are welcome.

**Box 3 DEFINITIONS**

**Research output:** This defines a change that a project aims to achieve, and considers it can achieve, within the project term. The precise nature of this change is specified in the narrative text of the third planning level of a logframe matrix. For detecting the attainment of this change, ways to measure/detect it (the objectively verifiable indicators, OVIs) are defined. Also, the sources of evidence (the means of verification, MoVs) for the performance of the indicator(s) are specified. The research products that a project plans to deliver will be some of the MoVs.

**Research product:** Findings and results of research e.g., methods; conceptual models; decision-making aids; recommendations; scientific understanding delivered in various accessible forms; technical information; transferable technologies; sets of alternatives from which end-users choose

**Research findings:** The interpretative handling of research results including their refinement into specific research products (as defined above).

**Developmental impact (or simply impact):** Changes in livelihoods and the NR base, both of which have favourable effects on human wellbeing and living standards that could be sustained and improved on over time. Changes in local institutions are closely linked with this positive outcome.

With respect to commissioned research, **impact** may initially be localised (i.e., at a pilot level) relating to the target sites of a project or sequence of projects. Achieving similar changes in non-pilot sites is intimately linked with the promotion of the uptake of research products (see above).

**Scaling-up:** More quality benefits to more people over a wider geographical area more quickly, more equitably and more lastingly (IIRR, 2000. *Going to scale: Can we bring more benefits to more people, more quickly?* Slang, Caveat, Philippines: International Institute of Rural Reconstruction.

**Communication context:** The circumstances in which the communication with the communication stakeholders occurs. This can be assessed by answering such questions as: Which media do communication stakeholders have access to? Which language do they prefer for communication? What are their literacy levels? What are their information networks?

## **Part 1 Guidance on how to work with the ten questions**

This section is designed to help project teams get a better understanding of the ten questions and what project teams need to present to NRSP at the different stages of the project. It also gives information on resources and examples to guide project teams.

Under each question project teams will find:

- General explanation or comment
- Explanation or comment relating to the CP for the project proposal, inception report and mid-term review (MTR) (with cross reference to Box 2)
- Cross-references to the relevant Example in Part 2 and the Resources in Part 3

Part 2 Examples have been taken from other NRSP projects. They document a range of project activities carried out as part of a CP. In some cases they have been adapted for this brief (e.g. they have been shortened, or terminology has been changed to fit with the definitions currently in use by NRSP. These definitions are given in Box 3).

Examples are intended as an aid to thinking about documenting a CP. Project teams are encouraged to adapt them or use them as the basis for developing their own tables.

Cross-references to Part 3 Resources cover:

- Examples of CPs (Resources 2, 3, 4, 7).
- Guidelines for developing CPs ( Resources 11,12, 13,14,15)
- Approaches to stakeholder analysis ( Resources 1, 2 ,6 ,10,)
- Examples of planning, costing and using local media and local media consultants (Resource 4 and 13).
- Methods for finding out about the communication context in which people live and work (Resource 2, 4, 5 and 6).
- Methods for finding out what people already know, think about and practice in relation to a specific NR technology or NR management practice (Resource 1, 2, 5)
- Methods for pre-testing for, and achieving, usability and comprehension (print or computer based communication) (Resource 2, 8, 16 and 17)
- An approach to monitoring/tracking what project teams are doing (Resource 9).



## **Q1 What are the aims of the project’s Communication Plan in relation to the project purpose?**

The aim(s) of a projects CP is/are not the same as the purpose of the project. However, the CP is part of the means of achieving project purpose, and it should make clear how the communication aim(s) supports project purpose.

**Proposal** - A review of the project outputs provides a useful starting point for establishing project communication aims.

**Inception Report**- Project teams will need to consider the short (during the life of the project) and long term aims (once the project is over) of the CP in relation to project purpose and outputs. Aims may differ for communication that is internal or external to the project.

A synthesis of the assessment of applying Q1 should be presented in the Inception Report CP using a table or tables based on those given in Part 2.

**MTR** - When developing the Mid-Term Review version of a CP, it is important to ask whether the aims have changed and, if so, how and why? If the answer is yes then the aim of the CP will need to be rewritten and the other questions reconsidered within the context of the changed aim.

|   |
|---|
| <b>Part 2 Example:</b>  |
| Table 1 An example of short and long term communication aims                    |
| Table 2 Table showing what needs to be taken account of from previous projects. |
| <b>Part 3 Resources:</b> 3, 6, 7  |

## **Q2 Who within the project team will be responsible for the implementation of the Communication Plan?**

This question addresses the issue of how responsibility for implementing a CP is distributed within a project team. The involvement of all team members and sharing of responsibility for the CP is important. However, NRSP experience shows that having one person within a project team who has the main responsibility for the implementation of a CP, working with the other team members works well. To be effective the person responsible needs to have demonstrable skills and experience in communication. This person should also co-ordinate the monitoring and evaluation of communication activities.

**Proposal** - The project RD1 should provide a clear statement on:

- Who will be responsible for the CP (section 20b)
- The communication expertise of the person responsible for the CP and other relevant project team members (section 20b and Section G).
- Who will do what and when in the CP (activity bar chart in section 21).

**Inception Report** – The person responsible for the CP should prepare the draft CP.

**MTR** – Project teams need to consider whether the way in which responsibility for the overall CP and its component parts has been assigned has been effective so far. If not the project team needs to consider whether changes need to be made in staffing and/or in time allocation.

|                        |
|------------------------|
| <b>Part 2 Example:</b> |
|------------------------|

|  |
|--|
| Table 3 Example of an internal project-planning table. |
|--|

|                               |
|-------------------------------|
| <b>Part 3 Resources:</b> 1, 2 |
|-------------------------------|

### Q3 Who are the communication stakeholders for the project?

The communication stakeholders are those with whom the project must communicate in order to ensure the short and long term objectives of the CP and thus project purpose.

To answer this question project teams need to:

- Review the stakeholders for the project
- Identify those stakeholders with whom the project must communicate in order to achieve the CP aims defined in response to Q1.

It is important to consider whether the communication needs of contrasting groups (e.g. men and women, old and young, poor and less-poor) require special attention in the CP. Contrasting groups frequently have different communication needs. The implications of these needs should be applied throughout the project CP.

A key need is that the stakeholder analysis is comprehensive at all levels (local, national and international). It will be useful for the project to develop a list of communication stakeholders that can be updated as the project progresses. In this list, increasing specification (e.g. names, addresses, position held) can be collected about the contact persons as the project progresses.

**Proposal** - Provide as much information on communication stakeholders, including target institutions, as is practical at this stage.

**Inception Report** – It may not be possible to name all the communication stakeholders, nor specific individuals in the Inception Report. However, the report should provide a good idea of the categories of individuals and organisations who comprise the potential communication stakeholders.

A synthesis of the assessment of applying Q3 should be presented in the Inception Report CP using a table or tables based on those given in Part 2.

**MTR**- In the Mid-Term Review version of the CP, project teams should be able to identify the communication stakeholders not only by the organisations or groups who are the main contact point for communication, but also by their name and their position in the organisation.

A synthesis of the assessment of applying Q3 should be presented in the MTR CP using a table or tables based on those given in Part 2.

**Part 2 Example:**

Table 4 Inception phase table for an uptake promotion project.

**Part 3 Resources:** 3, 5, 10

#### **Q4 What are the research products and other issues that the project needs to communicate about with the communication stakeholders?**

To answer this question project teams need to focus on:

- the overall work of the project
- the research products of the project.

Communication about the overall work of the project needs to take account of its different aspects (e.g. objectives, methods, and management). Where a project contains a novel feature (e.g. a new method) this may require a particular communication emphasis, especially when the method affects how the project works internally and with beneficiaries and other stakeholders.

There are also different types of research products to take into account (e.g. methods, decision-making tools, process recommendations, technical information and policy implications/recommendations).

**Proposal** - At the proposal stage the products of a research project will be tentative. The project teams synthesis of potential or actual products to be communicated should be included in the RD1.

**Inception Report** - Communication about the project may be more important in the earlier stages of the project than the later stages. The Inception Workshop will be an important component of the communication about the project and will also be important in obtaining stakeholder buy-in.

Potential research products need to be assessed for effectiveness against project objectives. Communication is two-way and feedback from communication activities in the early stages of a project will help project teams to assess potential research products. Project teams will also have to match research products with communication stakeholders according to their needs and the objectives of the project.

The synthesis of project teams assessment of potential products according to stakeholder communication needs should be presented in the Inception Report CP.

**MTR** - The emphasis in communicating about the project may change in the later stages of the project. These changes will need to be identified in the CP.

By the MTR project teams should know what research products the project can realistically deliver and their relative priority to achieving project purpose. These products should be identified in the Mid-Term Review CP and linked to the assessment derived from Q5, Q6 & Q7.

**Part 2: Example tables**

Table 5 Table linking research products to stakeholders

Table 6 Table showing which stakeholders are involved in issues central to the project.

**Part 3:** Resources: No specific resources recommended

**Q5 What are the current knowledge, attitudes and practices (KAP) of the communication stakeholders in relation to the products to be promoted?**

Correctly identifying, understanding and acting on the implications of the communication stakeholders KAP is central to developing a relevant CP.

*Proposal* – At this stage project teams may have little or no first hand understanding of the KAP, but may be able to draw on findings and experiences in an earlier project. Work on the KAP should be included in the logframe as an activity and its completion included as a milestone.

*Inception Report* - The key features of the KAP information need to be documented here. Work plans should also show how and when the additional KAP information will be collected.

*MTR* - By the MTR, the KAP information should have been gathered from the various communication stakeholders and analysed. A synthesis of this work needs to be made for the mid-term review CP. It should identify the main features of the KAP and show that they have been taken into account in decisions on the CP. If the synthesis does not show this then the MTR will request the project to provide additional material to show that the KAP has been adequately established. This will include logframe revisions to firm up Output level OVI (relating to stakeholder interaction).

**Part 2: Examples:**

Table 7 Example of KAP table. Adapted from NRSP assignment PD 124

Table 8 Overview of the information needs of the stakeholder institutions ...

**Part 3 Resources:** 2, 5, 6

**Q6 What are the objectives of communicating about the research products to the communication stakeholders (i.e. what might they want to be able to do once the project has communicated with them)?**

Answering Q3, Q4 and Q5 will have led to some prioritisation within the communication stakeholder by research product combinations. Identifying the communication objectives for each research product in relation to a specific communication stakeholder/group of stakeholders will help project teams to identify the preferred communication materials (see Q7).

## Research Projects

**Proposal** - The communication objectives will enable project teams to define the project output OVIs and possibly certain product specific MoVs in the logframe.

**Inception Report** - The Inception Report version of the CP may be able to provide some extra information for this question.

**MTR** - By the MTR project teams will need to have specific, realistic objectives in place. These will need to balance the needs of communication stakeholders in relation to the products, the objectives, and resources of the project and should be presented in the Mid-Term Review CP.

Project teams should also review the logframe with respect to this question to determine if the OVIs and MoVs can be strengthened on the basis of the improved definition of communication objectives.

|                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Part 2: Examples</b>             |  |
| Table 9                             | Example of the different communication objectives for specific stakeholder groups.                                     |
| Table 10                            | Example of a table in which the communication objectives have been linked to the KAP of different stakeholders groups. |
| <b>Part 3 Resources: 1, 2, 3, 7</b> |  |

## **Q7 What media and channels might be used to communicate with the various communication stakeholders in relation to the research products (e.g. what is accessible to them, what are their preferences, what can be sustained after the project is over)?**

This question is about the decisions to be made about the communication materials to be used e.g. to use a pamphlet, brief, video or street drama. Making decisions will be influenced by an understanding of:

- who the research product is for and their preferred means of communication.
- the communication objective for the specific groups or contrasting subgroups.
- the best means of communication for the specific product.

To answer this question project teams need to find out about the communication context within which communication stakeholders and contrasting subgroups live and work (e.g. which media do they have access to, which language do they prefer for communication, what are their literacy levels?).

Between the start of the project and the mid-term review project teams will need to find out a great deal about the communication context and needs of project teams communication stakeholders (e.g. which media do they have access to, which language do they prefer for communication, what are their literacy levels?). Project teams also need to take into account the KAP analysis. Without this information it will be difficult to decide on the level and form of the communication required for each of the research products for the differing communication stakeholders. It will also be difficult to decide on project communication priorities.

## Research Projects

Issues of sustainability after project exit must be considered. For example: what communication material does the project team plan to deliver to communication stakeholders to assist uptake promotion after project completion, will they be able to use and pass it on to others as needed (e.g. through further production, through adaptation and translation, through training, workshops)?

**Proposal** - Answers to the initial assessment with respect to this question will help identify project activities and particularly the communication products that can be used as activity milestones in the logframe.

**Inception Report** - Although The Inception Report CP will only be able to provide some information for this question project work plans should show when, how and by whom this information will be collected.

**MTR** - The centrepiece of a Mid-Term Review version of a CP is answering and presenting this question. When the Mid-Term Review CP is written the logframe should be reviewed to update the project activities, milestones and OVIs. Priorities will need to have been established by the MTR about which research products, in which formats, for which communication stakeholders, can realistically be delivered to best meet the projects objectives.

A synthesis of the assessment of applying Q7 should be included in the MTR CP using a table or tables based on those given in Part 2.

|   |
|---|
| <p><b>Part 2 Examples</b></p> <p>Table 11 Example of a table showing initial decisions on ... media and channels</p> <p>Table 12 The table shows the material ... or the communication activity</p> <p><b>Part 3 Resources:</b> 4, 5, 6, 13, 14</p> |
|---|

**Q8 How will the project team ensure that communication materials are useful (e.g. contain relevant information), usable (e.g. in a language they understand) and accessible (e.g. at a suitable time and place) for those with whom project teams wish to communicate during and after the project?**

This will involve identifying mechanisms for testing, quality control, and feedback and will be a prime responsibility of the person responsible for the CP. Plans for sustaining the availability of communication materials and activities such as training, beyond the life of the project, must also be considered.

**Proposal** – The project RD1 will not need to identify these activities in detail. However, any budget proposed for communication activities should take account of the fact that the processes and activities needed to develop appropriate communications materials and activities in the second half of the project will have to be paid for.

**Inception Report** – The Inception Report will not need to specify these activities, but by the MTR they will have to be allowed for. The Inception Report needs to show how this issue will be considered (e.g. methods and skills identified) during the first half of the project.

**MTR** - By the MTR the realisable research products will have been identified (see Q4) and the Mid-Term Review CP should include the processes and activities needed to develop appropriate communications materials and activities in the second half of the project. These need to be included in the revised activity bar chart.

|  |
|--|
| <b>Part 2 Examples:</b> None available |
|--|

|                                    |
|------------------------------------|
| <b>Part 3 Resources:</b> 8, 16, 17 |
|------------------------------------|

### **Q9 Are the proposed Communication Plan activities and materials included in the project budget?**

**Proposal** - NRSP recommends 10% of the project budget for communications. As part of budget preparation project teams need to work through the budget implications of planned communications activities. This is a crucial step in RD1 preparation and should not be skipped because, although budget can be reallocated during project progress, this will only be done when well justified.

**Inception Report** - Assess whether the communication activities and products, identified as necessary for the CP, are achievable within the project budget. If not then project teams will need to prioritise. Reallocating budget at the project inception report stage will not normally be possible.

**MTR** – At the MTR there is potential to reallocate budget. Thus at the MTR, NRSP will need to know if the provision made for communication activities and products at the start of the project is still adequate. If not then project teams will need to be able to justify the suggested reallocation of the budget. Part of this justification will emerge from answering Q7, and will need to be based on detailed costing.

|                        |
|------------------------|
| <b>Part 2 Examples</b> |
|------------------------|

|  |
|--|
| Table 13 Costed recommendations for awareness creation for farmers and aquaculture extension agencies. |
|--|

|                                |
|--------------------------------|
| <b>Part 3 Resources:</b> 4, 13 |
|--------------------------------|

### **Q10 How will the project team monitor and evaluate the implementation of the Communication Plan and its component parts?**

To be able to answer this question project teams will need to put in place a monitoring and evaluation or tracking system.

**Proposal** - Monitoring and evaluation of the CP should be embedded in the project log-frame, with required communication activities. Delivery of communication materials (after

## Research Projects

due production and testing) and the holding of workshops should be listed as project milestones and may also be Output MoVs.

The action(s) that communication materials are designed to engender (see communication objectives above in Q6) are appropriate Output level OVIs.

***Inception Report*** - The Inception Report CP is an opportunity to review the project logframe. For a research project this review is unlikely to suggest changes although project teams may wish to flag changes to be made at the MTR.

***MTR*** - By the MTR, and as a result of monitoring and evaluating the CP, project teams should be able to say whether what has been done so far in the CP has been effective. If it has been then the project submission to the MTR should provide evidence that it has been effective. If it has not been, then the reasons why not should be identified. Project teams will need to identify what changes are needed to improve effectiveness and how, when and by whom. The project logframe will need to be revised to include agreed changes.

|  |
|--|
| <p><b>Part 2 Examples</b></p> <p>Table 14 Table showing the way in which communication related activities and products can be integrated into a logframe for monitoring.</p> <p><b>Part 3 Resources: 9</b></p> |
|--|



## Part 2 Examples

**Part 2** gives Examples based on communication work from other NRSP projects. Examples have been selected to help project teams assemble, analyse and present the information specific to the 10 questions and can be adapted to suit individual projects.

### Q1 What are the aims of the project’s Communication Plan in relation to the project purpose?

**Table 1 An example of short and long term communication aims for NRSP project R7958 ‘Developing supportive policy environments for improved land management strategies – Nepal’**

|  |
|--|
| Short term   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To ensure that land management research successes and their policy implications enter the public policy discourse in Nepal, at political and administrative (service provision) levels.</li> <li>To facilitate stakeholder support for and participation in the research process.</li> </ul>  |
| Long term  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>That tested processes of linking research to policy making and implementation are known about by NR researchers in Nepal and internationally</li> <li>The approach and methods used in the research, and the findings, are widely known about, are subject to international peer review and are available to be validated and adapted to other contexts.</li> </ul> |

**Table 2 What needs to be taken account of from previous, relevant projects. Taken from NRSP assignment PD124 ‘Better Options for Integrated Floodplain Management – Uptake Promotion’**

| <i>Project</i>  | <i>Link to PD124 CP</i>  |
|---|--|
| R6756: Investigation of the livelihood strategies and resource use patterns in floodplain production systems based on rice and fish in Bangladesh | Developed a conceptual model of floodplains and an integrated management strategy for floodplains. These outputs formed the basis of R7868. Both projects appear to have a good network with target organisations. |
| R7868: Maximisation of joint benefits from multiple resource use in Bangladesh floodplains  | Some of the dissemination from this project may have influenced actions in other research/development projects. The final report may provide the basis for developing initial communication materials              |
| R8083: Strengthened rural services for improved livelihoods in Bangladesh   | Methods used in understanding information systems and flows at community level are important for this research.  |
| R8195: Integrated floodplain management - institutional environments and participatory methods  | Background work on understanding approaches to IFM in Bangladesh and the institutions that affect or influence uptake. Important work for influencing at policy level.   |
| R8223: Consensus building in common pool resources: A learning and communication programme for participatory action plan development (PAPD)       | Close link to the stakeholders involved in awareness raising activities. PAPD is a method that is being used in IFM.   |

## Q2 Who within the project team will be responsible for the implementation of the Communication Plan?

**Table 3 Example of an internal project-planning table. Based on NRSP SEM project R7073 ‘Improved communication strategies for renewable natural resource research outputs’**

| What needs to be done   | Who by (suggestions)   | When  |
|---|--|---|
| Identify Communication driver   | NR Research team   | RD1 stage   |
| Identify NR Research products   | NR research team   | RD1 and throughout  |
| Identify communication stakeholders and importance to project   | NR research team<br>PRA experts<br>Social researchers  | Inception phase and throughout  |
| Conduct communication context assessment  | NR research team<br>PRA experts<br>Social researchers<br>Communication expert  | Inception phase   |
| Conduct Communication Needs Assessment  | NR research team<br>PRA experts<br>Social researchers<br>Professional workshop facilitators  | Inception phase and whenever new stakeholders are identified  |
| Identify communication objectives   | NR research team<br>target audience<br>social researchers<br>communication experts   | Inception phase review for MTR  |
| Develop materials   | Varies depending on what is needed - could involve all or any of:<br>NR research team<br>Target audience<br>Communication experts<br>Workshop facilitators<br>Trainers | Varies, depending on when above steps have been developed   |
| Development of Pre-testing and of communication materials (needs to address ease of use, fitness for purpose, comprehensibility of text, pictures, symbols etc) with intermediate and end users. Formative evaluation of training activities and associated manuals | NR research team<br>Social researchers<br>Communication experts  | During media Development<br>During planning of training or other communication activities such as workshops, local drama etc. |
| Monitor and evaluate Development and use of communication materials and communication activities such as workshops and training   | NR research team<br>Social researchers<br>Communication experts  | Once media have been distributed<br>Once training has started, or local drama has been performed etc.                         |
| Monitor and evaluate overall CP with stakeholders   | NR research team<br>Stakeholders<br>Communication experts  | Throughout project cycle  |

### Q3 Who are the communication stakeholders for the project?

**Table 4 Inception phase table for an uptake promotion project. Adapted from NRSP assignment PD124 'Better Options for Integrated Floodplain Management – Uptake Promotion'**

| Communication stakeholders (groups and organisations) | Specify these for the country(ies) and project   | Specific details (individuals, organisation)   | Why important to project   |
|---|--|--|--|
| <b>Target groups and end users</b>                    | Fish farmers   | <i>To be filled in as the project develops</i> | Involved with pond culture, pan culture and paddy cum fish culture in the flood plain area   |
|   | Subsistence fishers  |  | Catch fish from the open water fishery for their household consumption   |
|   | Fish traders   |  | Buy fish from local fisherman and sell this to the big markets   |
|   | Elite's group / local Elite  |  | They can play positive role at the grass roots level in mobilising the farmers and fishers (have less capacity to influence the upper hierarchy decision-makers).  |
|   | <i>Upazila Paris (UZP):</i> Government has not yet decided to form this 2 <sup>nd</sup> .layer of legal admin. Power structure |  | Will play vital role in resource management with other stakeholders at <i>upazila</i> level.   |
|   | Zila Parishad (ZP)   |  | 3rd layer legal administrative power structures. Plays vital role in resource management with other stakeholders at district level.  |
|   | Union Parishad (UP)  |  | Elected representatives are the centres of local government structure at rural level. Has both positive and negative effect in implementation of floodplain management practices. Can play a vital role in new technology implementation, field level advocacy and conflict resolution |
| <b>Intermediaries</b>                                 | Research organisations (such as CNRS)  |  | Involved with sustainable wetland resource management, research, planning and implementation with active participation of local people   |
|   | Local Government Engineering Department (LGED)   |  | Important role in development of rural infrastructure and communication net works. LGED is implementing small-scale water management projects through local communities in collaboration with DoF, MoL and local organisations.  |
|   | INGOs (need identifying)   |  | Directly working in integrated floodplain management practice in collaboration with NGOs, GOs, and donors. Potential to influence government and donor communities.  |
|   | Bangladesh Rural Development Board (BRDB)  |  | Long term priority work on rural development through flood control related work. Strong network at all levels with high influence capacity.  |
| <b>Target Institutions</b>                            | DoF  |  | Most important sector for sustainable use of water and floodplain resources.   |
|   | Department of the Environment (DoE)  |  | DoE is very important sector to control environmental degradation practices. Has potential to influence the policy makers. No representation at <i>upazila</i> level.  |
|   | MoL / Department of Land   |  | Most government land resources are under the MoL control. Some water-bodies have already been handed over to DoF for better use under development project management. MOL has high potential for influencing the government  |

## Research Projects

| <b>Communication stakeholders (groups and organisations)</b> | <b>Specify these for the country(ies) and project</b> | <b>Specific details (individuals, organisation)</b> | <b>Why important to project</b>   |
|--|---|---|---|
|  | DAE   |   | Important sector to ensure agricultural practices and crop production management. Positive link has been developed between DAE and the DoF for integrated development approaches. |

**Q4 What are the research products and other issues that project needs to communicate about with the communication stakeholders?**

**Table 5: Research products linked to stakeholders for whom they are relevant. Adapted from NRSP project R7668 ‘Ameliorating pollution in Caribbean coastal waters’.**

| Stakeholders by role in relation to chemical use | Research products  |   |                      |   |   |
|--|--|---|----------------------|---|---|
|  | Review of soil management and use of agro-chemicals in agriculture | Agro-chemical toxicity and recommended management options | Baseline survey data | Guidelines for monitoring agro-chemical imports | Options for monitoring environmental health |
| CGPC*  | X  | X   | X                    | X   | X   |
| Application                                      | X  | X   | X                    |   | X   |
| Distributors                                     | X  | X   |                      |   |   |
| Manufacturers                                    | X  | X   |                      |   |   |
| Import   |  | X   |                      | X   |   |
| Govt. Agencies                                   | X  | X   | X                    | X   | X   |
| Research Institutes                              | X  | X   | X                    | X   | X   |
| NGO'S National & International                   | X  | X   | X                    | X   | X   |

\*Co-ordinating group of Pesticides Control Boards in the Caribbean

**Table 6: Research products broken down into specific issues that need to be addressed with different stakeholder groups stakeholder groups. Taken from NRSP project R7668 ‘Ameliorating pollution in Caribbean coastal waters’.**

| STAKEHOLDER                                     | ISSUES |           |                |           |            |          |                  |            |                   |
|---|--------|-----------|----------------|-----------|------------|----------|------------------|------------|-------------------|
|   | Health | Pollution | Illegal import | Wrong use | Repack-age | Cocktail | Protect-ive wear | Equip-ment | Storage/ Disposal |
| <b>IMPORT</b>                                   |        |           |                |           |            |          |                  |            |                   |
| Port Authority                                  |        | ✓         | ✓              |           |            |          | ✓                |            | ✓                 |
| Customs & Excise                                |        | ✓         | ✓              |           |            |          |                  |            |                   |
| PCB*  | ✓      | ✓         | ✓              |           |            |          | ✓                |            | ✓                 |
| Import agent                                    |        |           | ✓              |           | ✓          |          |                  |            | ✓                 |
| Chemical Co                                     |        | ✓         |                |           | ✓          |          |                  | ✓          | ✓                 |
| PCB   | ✓      | ✓         |                |           | ✓          |          | ✓                |            |                   |
| <b>DISTRIBUTION</b>                             |        |           |                |           |            |          |                  |            |                   |
| Agric board                                     | ✓      | ✓         |                | ✓         | ✓          | ✓        | ✓                | ✓          | ✓                 |
| Farm shop                                       |        |           |                |           | ✓          | ✓        | ✓                | ✓          | ✓                 |
| Chemical depot                                  |        |           |                |           | ✓          | ✓        |                  |            | ✓                 |
| <b>APPLICATION</b>                              |        |           |                |           |            |          |                  |            |                   |
| Pest operator                                   | ✓      | ✓         |                | ✓         |            | ✓        | ✓                | ✓          | ✓                 |
| Farmer  | ✓      | ✓         | ✓              | ✓         |            | ✓        | ✓                | ✓          | ✓                 |
| <b>AGENCIES / INSTITUTIONS</b>                  |        |           |                |           |            |          |                  |            |                   |
| Health Authority                                | ✓      |           | ✓              | ✓         |            |          | ✓                |            |                   |
| Extension Service (agriculture, fish, forestry) | ✓      | ✓         | ✓              | ✓         | ✓          | ✓        |                  |            | ✓                 |
| National NGOs                                   | ✓      | ✓         | ✓              | ✓         |            |          |                  |            | ✓                 |
| Internnal (e.g. FAO)                            | ✓      | ✓         | ✓              | ✓         |            | ✓        |                  |            |                   |

**Q5 What are the current knowledge, attitudes and practices (KAP) of the communication stakeholders in relation to the products to be promoted?**

**Table 7 Example of KAP table. Adapted from NRSP assignment PD124 inception phase (Better options for integrated floodplain management)**

| Communication Stakeholder    | Knowledge of IFM                               | Attitude or Awareness of IFM                    | Practice of IFM                                    |
|------------------------------|--|---|--|
| LGEP                         | Medium   | High  | There is a policy to promote IFM                   |
| Divisional Forest Office     | Low – no policy in organisation                | Medium – knows about IFM and who is responsible | low  |
| Fisheries Officers (Upazila) | Medium – through field visits and DoF projects | Medium – there is no policy in DoF for IFM      | Low – medium?                                      |
| Dept. Fisheries (CBFM2)      | Medium?  | High – through DoF Fisheries Management Policy  | Medium – High? Mainly in donor supported projects? |

**Table 8 Overview of the information needs of the stakeholder institutions collected through interviews. Adapted from R6759 ‘Aquaculture extension: Overview and a framework of options. A case study of aquaculture extension planning by a DFID research project in Eastern India’**

| Org. /Inst. | Information needs   | What can project do   |
|-------------|---|---|
| CIFA        | Much need for research into options for small-scale farmers with seasonal water bodies. Not much need for on-farm research, since method of testing technology developed on-station works well. | Recommendations from KRIBP(E) project will be incorporated into existing extension message to farmers. Therefore training material for CIFA staff is needed (i.e. booklets, more detailed literature, video films etc.).  |
| FFDA        | Need for extension methods for reaching poor farmers. Recommendations regarding aquaculture options for poor farmers from the KRIBP (E) aquaculture project would be useful for the FFDA.       | FEOs should be trained in on-farm research techniques via discussions and meetings with KRIBP(E) staff. The DoF would need printed materials (leaflets and books on techniques). Specific technology relevant to poor farmers developed in the KRIBP(E) aquaculture research would be easy to extend to the farmers that the DoF is working with. Farmer-to-farmer extension could also be used, with farmers groups interacting. FFDA could use videos, farmers’ meetings where farmers could communicate techniques or research practices that work to each other - e.g. via visits of progressive farmers to other farmers practising different methods. |
| Farmers     | Great need for framework for carrying out research with farmers.  | Farmer-to-farmer extension via farmers’ meetings should be arranged at block level (two meetings per block so that farmers from a radius of no more than 10km could attend, travelling to and from in the morning and evening). These meetings should be held after December. It would be difficult to get women to attend meetings because of their domestic duties.   |

## Research Projects

| <b>Org. /Inst.</b> | <b>Information needs</b>   | <b>What can project do</b>   |
|--------------------|--|--|
| KVK                | Need for poverty focused technology derived from experimenting with farmers on their farms. Interest in the KRIBP(E) approach as research into aquaculture options for poor farmers without perennial water bodies would fill a gap. Demand for low-input technology and recommendations for producing fish for household consumption. | For the training of extension workers, government officials and NGOs, detailed literature would be required, e.g. descriptions of in-depth studies with site-specific details. For training farmers easy literature or posters, Chow dance and folk songs on cassettes would be useful. Suggested exposure visits for KVK farmers to KRIBP(E) farmers to discuss practices and options. Also suggested a forum for NGOs, KVKs, ICAR and other scientists and private companies, DoF and other governmental institutions to meet and share experiences. |
| SRI                | Interest in the research carried out at KRIBP(E), identified need for options for marginal farmers with seasonal ponds.  | SRI trainers would need booklets and a course from KRIBP(E) staff in the farmer-research methodology. For the dissemination of specific technologies or low-input aquaculture options for seasonal ponds, SRI would need written material for their extension personnel, and recommend that meetings between SRI and KRIBP(E) farmers be arranged for farmers to share information.  |
| YMCA               | Need for aquaculture options or technology for the poorest farmers as these are not currently addressed. Would welcome details of methodology for how to involve farmers more in the research process.   | The YMCA would welcome both new aquaculture technologies and information relating to the research process. Most useful would be a training course for their staff in the methodologies used in the KRIBP(E) project, as well as in any technology or husbandry recommendations, which could also be recorded on video films they could show to farmers.  |

Sources: Dr. K. Kumar, CIFA; Dr. Moharty, Principal Scientist, CIFA; Dr. S.K. Sarkar, Senior Scientist, In Charge of KVK & TTC, CIFA; Mr. B.N. Baskey, DFO, DoF, Purulia; Mr. A. Kumar, DFO & CEO, FFDA, Ranchi; Mr. S.P. Singh, FEO, Ranchi; Mr. R. Nishad, fish farmer under FFDA project, Karra block; Mr. Maharaji Dibyan KVK Ranchi; Mr. Madan, SRI, Ranchi; Mr. D. Masih, Secretary YMCA, Ranchi.

**Q6 What are the objectives of communicating about the products to the communication stakeholders ( i.e. what might they want to be able to do once project team have communicated with them)?**

**Table 9 Example of the different communication objectives for specific stakeholder groups. Adapted from R7958 ‘Developing supportive policy environments for improved land management strategies’**

| Communication Stakeholders  | Communication objectives (“CPs will ... ”)  |
|---|---|
| <b>Research partners</b><br>(i.e. communication within the research team) | Achieve shared vision of research objectives, approach, workplan<br>Develop capacity to use TORA methodology in other projects  |
| <b>Informants</b>   | Participate in the empirical research<br>Assert ownership of research findings<br>Validate/correct data and interpretation  |
| <b>HMG policy makers</b>  | Participate in the research<br>Be aware of research findings on LMS<br>Take account of LMS issues in policy making  |
| <b>Local government</b>   | Be aware of impact of local government policies and actions on local LMS decisions<br>Validate/provide perspective on data and interpretation   |
| <b>Service delivery bodies agencies</b>                                   | Participate in the research<br>Be aware of LMS implications of their implementation arrangements and policies<br>Be aware of research findings on LMS<br>Know how to engage in constructive dialogue with policy makers |
| <b>NR researchers, Nepal</b>  | Critically review project’s methods and findings<br>Be aware of, and use, tested ways of linking research to policy making  |
| <b>Donors, INGOs in Nepal</b>   | Be aware of the research and its findings   |
| <b>NR researchers, global</b>   | Critically review project’s methods and findings<br>Be aware of tested ways of linking research to policy making and adapt these to their own working contexts  |
| <b>NRSP management</b>  | Monitor progress and advise research team   |

**Table 10: Example of a table in which the communication objectives have been linked to the KAP of different stakeholders groups. Taken from PD124 ‘Better Options for Integrated Floodplain Management – Uptake Promotion’**

| Stakeholder                  | Knowledge                                      | Practice                         | Awareness                                       | Objective of communications |   | Media   |
|------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---|---|
| LGEP                         | Medium   | There is a policy to promote IFM | High?   | Informing/<br>Influencing   | To share lessons of good practice across sectors?<br>Skills development of staff<br>Working with local government | Face to face discussions<br><br>Short presentations on key points<br><br>Email? |
| Divisional Forest Office     | Low – no policy in organisation                | low                              | Medium – knows about IFM and who is responsible | Raise awareness             | Possibly to share experience across sectors?  | Cross-sectoral discussion groups  |
| Fisheries Officers (Upazila) | Medium – through field visits and DoF projects | Low – medium?                    | Medium – there is no policy in DoF for IFM      |                             |   | Email discussion; electronic briefs   |



**Q7 What media and channels might be used to communicate with the various communication stakeholders in relation to the research products (i.e. what is accessible to them, what are their preferences, what can be sustained after the project is over )?**

**Table 11 Example of a table showing initial decisions on which media and channels will be used. It builds on Table 8. Adapted from R7958, ‘Developing supportive policy environments for improved land management strategies’.**

| <b>Communication Stakeholders</b>                                      | <b>Communication objectives</b><br>(‘Communication stakeholders will..’)  | <b>Indicative research products and other issues for communication</b>   | <b>Methods, channels</b>  |
|--|---|--|---|
| <b>Research partners</b> (i.e. communication within the research team) | Achieve shared vision of research objectives, approach, workplan<br>Develop capacity to use TORA methodology in other projects  | Workplans<br>Fieldwork protocols<br>Guidelines on methods<br>Draft data analysis and interpretation<br>Draft reports on empirical studies and project events | Email<br>Meetings<br>Co-authoring papers<br>Participation in all fieldwork, data analysis and interpretation  |
| <b>Informants</b>  | Participate in the empirical research<br>Assert ownership of research findings<br>Validate/correct data and interpretation  | Objectives and methods<br>Provisional findings from empirical studies  | Pre-fieldwork meetings in VDCs<br>Local workshops to present findings for validation / correction   |
| <b>HMG policy makers</b>   | Participate in the research<br>Be aware of research findings on LMS<br>Take account of LMS issues in policy making  | Objectives and process of the project<br>Local successful LMS research outputs<br>Implications of policies for local LMS decisions                           | Meetings and workshops<br>Short briefing papers<br>Radio<br>(others to be decided at stakeholder workshop July 2003)  |
| <b>Local government</b>  | Be aware of impact of local government policies and actions on local LMS decisions<br>Validate/provide perspective on data and interpretation   | Project findings on factors influencing LMS decisions  | Short briefing papers<br>Radio<br>Meetings with local government in the field research areas  |
| <b>Service delivery bodies agencies</b>                                | Participate in the research<br>Be aware of LMS implications of their implementation arrangements and policies<br>Be aware of research findings on LMS<br>Know how to engage in constructive dialogue with policy makers | Objectives and process of the project<br>Local successful LMS research outputs<br>Implications of operational policies for local LMS decisions               | Short briefing papers<br>Radio<br>Meetings with management<br>Stakeholder workshops   |
| <b>NR researchers, Nepal</b>   | Critically review project’s methods and findings<br>Be aware of, and use, tested ways of linking research to policy making  | Research methods and findings<br>Guidelines on how to engage in dialogue with policy making processes  | Training (in addition to those indicated below for NR researchers, global)  |
| <b>Donors, INGOs in Nepal</b>  | Be aware of the research and its findings   | Research methods and findings  | Briefing papers<br>Visits by research team members  |
| <b>NR researchers, global</b>  | Critically review project’s methods and findings<br>Be aware of tested ways of linking research to policy making and adapt these to their own working contexts  | Research methods and findings  | Working papers available in paper and electronic form and on WWW<br>Papers submitted to refereed journals<br>Papers submitted to practitioner journals<br>Networks (e.g. AgREN newsletter and paper)<br>Workshops & conferences (papers, posters) |

**Table 12** The table shows the material that will be produced, or the communication activity that will take place (both in italics), for each stakeholder group and research output. Adapted from MTR project submission for R7668 'Impact and amelioration of sediment and agro-chemical pollution in Caribbean coastal waters'

| <b>RESEARCH OUTPUT</b>  | <b>STAKEHOLDER GROUP</b>                                      |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|---|--|
|   | <b>CGPC<br/>Government<br/>Agencies</b>                       | <b>Users of<br/>chemicals</b>   | <b>Import<br/>Control</b>                         | <b>NGO'S<br/>(National and<br/>international)</b>            |
| <b>Quantification of imports</b>  | <i>Table/ Report</i>  |   | <i>Table/ Report</i>                              | <i>Table</i>   |
| <b>Administrative procedures</b>  | <i>Report: imports &amp; harmonised procedures</i>            |   | <i>Report: imports &amp; harmonise procedures</i> | <i>Brief (www ref)</i>                                       |
| <b>Review of soil mgt &amp; use of agro-chemicals in agriculture (use vs. recommendations)</b>  | <i>Report<br/>Brief</i>                                       | <i>Focus group meetings<br/>Radio</i>   |   | <i>Report &amp; dataset<br/>Brief &amp; www ref)</i>         |
| <b>Agro-chemical toxicity &amp; recommended management</b>  | <i>Report<br/>Policy brief<br/>Guidelines</i>                 | <i>Posters (Creole/<br/>English)<br/>Leaflets</i>                                 | <i>Brief<br/>Leaflet</i>                          | <i>Brief (list serve)<br/>Guidelines<br/>Report</i>          |
| <b>Baseline survey report and literature reviews</b>  | <i>Report<br/>Brief<br/>Policy brief</i>                      | <i>Focus group meeting<br/>Radio<br/>Posters</i>                                  |   | <i>Publication<br/>Brief (St Lucia &amp; Jamaica report)</i> |
| <b>Communications Plan for decision-makers (incl. Products, mechanisms, arrangements)</b>   | <i>Policy brief<br/>Report chapter</i>                        |   |   | <i>Policy brief</i>  |
| <b>Guidelines for monitoring agro-chemical imports</b>  | <i>Policy brief<br/>Guidelines (&amp;#2)</i>                  |   |   | <i>Policy brief<br/>Guidelines</i>                           |
| <b>Options for environmental / health monitoring (guidelines)</b>   | <i>Report<br/>Recommendations</i>                             | <i>Education program in participatory monitoring<br/>Public health monitoring</i> |   | <i>Management guidelines</i>                                 |
| <b>Review of management options – use of agro-chemicals (categorise &amp; review recommendations for pesticide use/ admin &amp; registration/ monitoring import</b> | <i>Management guidelines for use of pesticides<br/>Report</i> | <i>Guidelines for use of pesticides</i>   |   | <i>CCP &amp; guidelines</i>                                  |

**Q8 How will project team ensure that communication materials are useful (e.g. contain relevant information), usable (e.g. in a language they understand) and accessible (e.g. at a suitable time and place) for those with whom project team wish to communicate during and after the project?**

No examples are available. Please see the relevant resources instead

## Q9 Are the proposed Communication Plan activities and materials included in the project budget?

**Table 13 Costed recommendations for awareness creation for farmers and aquaculture extension agencies. Taken from NRSP project R6759 ‘Aquaculture extension: Overview and a framework of options. A case study of aquaculture extension planning by a DFID research project in Eastern India’**

| Recommendation   | Cost   | Total          |             |
|--|--|----------------|-------------|
|  |  | (Rs)           | £           |
| Project findings (research methodology and specific recommendations) published in both international and in-country scientific journals by the end of the project.   | 1.5 months * one full time project staff @ Rs 6000 per month   | 9000           | 132         |
| Meetings between project staff and ICAR institutes to ensure that local research institutes are aware of approaches taken by the project (the project is already co-operating elaborately with CIFA).  | 1 trip to CIFA HQ Bhubaneswar @ Rs 600 * 5 KRIBP(E) Aquaculture staff = Rs 3000  | 3000           | 44          |
| A local drama group with tribal actors commissioned to write a play on aquaculture as an option.<br>Performance in 20 villages in project area.  | Rs 15,000 for play<br><br>Rs 1500 per performance*20 = Rs 30,000 plus transport and accommodation for actors @ Rs 200 p.p. * 15 actors * 20 nights = Rs 60,000   | 105,000        | 1544        |
| Performance of the play for recording on video in Hindi and English<br>Video taping of play<br>Translation of video into Bangla, Oriya, and Hindi<br><br>100 copies of video<br>Demonstration of video to farmers in Bihar, Orissa and West Bengal on the communal TVs present in most villages.<br>The video should be made available to CIFA, the FFDAs and the KVKs and NGOs of the region. | Rs 5000 * 2 languages = 10,000<br><br>Rs 100,000<br>Dubbing studio at Rs 200 *10 hours * 3 languages = Rs 6000<br>Rs 200 * 100 copies = Rs 20,000<br>4 full-time staff @ Rs 300 per day * 5 days each = Rs 6000.<br><br>1 full-time staff @ Rs 300 per day * 5 days = Rs 1500. | 143,500        | 2110        |
| Folksongs in Nagpuri and Hindi with aquaculture message recorded<br>250 copies of tape made<br>Songs played on radio stations and at market fairs and sold on cassettes to farmers in village stores<br>Copies distributed to the FFDAs, the KVKs and the NGOs of the project area.  | Rs 3500 * 2 languages = Rs 7000<br><br>Rs 20 * 250 copies = Rs 5000<br>1 full-time staff @ Rs 300 per day * 5 days = Rs 1500   | 13,500         | 199         |
| Fairs and markets arranged to increase the opportunities for farmer communication and thereby the dissemination of information.  | Rs 5000 * 9 fairs (3 in each project state) = Rs 45,000  | 45,000         | 662         |
| <b>Total</b>   |  | <b>319,000</b> | <b>4691</b> |

## Q10 How will project team monitor and evaluate the implementation of the Communication Plan and its component parts?

**Table 14 Table showing the way in which communication related activities and products can be integrated into a logframe for monitoring. Extracted from the logframe for NRSP project R7958 'Developing supportive policy environments for improved land management strategies – Nepal'**

| Narrative Summary  | Objectively Verifiable Indicators   | Means of Verification  |
|--|---|--|
| <b>Goal</b> Not provided in this example   |   |  |
| <b>Purpose</b>   |   |  |
| Ways to accelerate and upscale pilot research experiences to the wider community determined through developing supportive policy environments for improving land management strategies.  | By 2003, links improved between policy makers and Nepal research organisations through use of policy briefing papers related to APP.<br>By 2004, target institutions in Nepal make changes in policy which are supportive of improved land resource management by farmer, following decisions informed by use of briefing papers.   | Agendas and minutes of policy making bodies<br><br>Govt Reports on use of briefing papers<br>Government policy statements and strategy documents |
| <b>Outputs</b>   |   |  |
| 2. Constraints to uptake and adaptation of land resource management strategies, which are amenable to policy intervention, <i>identified and promoted</i> .<br>3. Sustainable processes for informing policy discussions at national level, within government policy making structures and within organisations that provide support services to rural land users, <i>identified, validated and promoted</i> .   | By 2002, three widely applicable improvements to land management being promoted by target institutions to farmers and policy makers<br>By 2002, two briefing papers on policy constraints prepared and submitted to HMGN, by target institutions with support from research team<br>By 2004, three target institutions will <i>be actively discussing changes</i> in their policies for service delivery or infrastructure, in support of improved strategies | Reports of target institutions<br>Briefing papers for HMGN and target institutions<br>Acceptance letters from journals                           |
| <b>Activities</b>  | <b>Budget and Milestones</b>  |  |
| 1.2 (b) Prepare overview of current policies likely to affect adoption of land management strategies at farm and landscape levels<br>1.2 (c) Prepare initial overview of policy making processes<br>1.2 (d) Prepare overview of Policy Analysis methodology, and review of scaling up concepts   | 1b) Overview of policies completed by end of month 7 (30/9/2001)<br><br>1c )Overview of policy making processes completed by end of month 7 (30/9/2001)<br>1d) Overview document on Policy Analysis methodology circulated to research partners by end of month 7 (30/9/2001)   |  |
| 2.2 Identify individuals and organisations in policy formulation processes relevant to upscaling, through stakeholder analysis and individual discussion with key informants<br>2.3 Assess policy environment and analyse policy making process within local government bodies, district administration and national Government bodies, and within service providing organisations, using a resource based framework<br>2.4 Stakeholder workshop to (a) explore constraints amenable to policy intervention, (b) map policy making process using a resource based framework, (c) identify ways in which policy makers are made aware of alternative actions, and (d) develop a detailed activity plan for Output 3 activities. | 2a )brief paper on key actors in policy formulation process prepared by end of month 15 (31/5/2002) ( <u>Working Paper 2</u> )<br><br>2b)report on policy environment and policy making processes completed by end of month 18 (31/8/2002) ( <u>Working Paper 2</u> )<br><br>2c) Report of workshop, including activity, plan distributed by end of month (31.11.2002)  |  |
| 3.1 Through self-completion questionnaire and discussion, assess awareness of policy makers on (a) land management issues and (b) opportunities for policy to influence uptake of appropriate technologies.<br>3.4 Produce briefing papers to inform policy makers<br><br>3.6 Hold stakeholder workshop to review impact of the process on policy<br>3.7 Re-assess awareness of policy makers through self-completion questionnaire<br>Meeting to brief policy makers on project findings  | 3a) Brief report on awareness of land management issues among policy makers completed by end of month <u>31 (30/9/2003)</u><br><br>3b) Two briefing papers on policy constraints distributed by end of month <u>32 (31/10/2003)</u><br>3c) Stakeholder workshop held by end of month 37 and proceedings delivered by end of month <u>38 (30/4/2004)</u>   |  |

## Part 3 Resources

These resources provide:

- **Examples of communication strategies (Resources 2, 3, 4, 7).**
- **Guidelines for developing communication strategies ( Resources 11,12, 13,14,15)**
- **Approaches to stakeholder analysis ( Resources 1, 2 ,6 ,10,)**
- **Examples of planning, costing and using local media and local media consultants (Resource 4, and 13).**
- **Methods for finding out about the communication context in which people live and work (Resource 2, 4, 5 and 6).**
- **Methods for finding out what people already know, think about and practice in relation to a specific NR technology or NR management practice (Resource 1, 2, 5)**
- **Methods for pre-testing for, and achieving, usability and comprehension (print or computer based communication) (Resource 2, 8, 16 and 17)**
- **An approach to monitoring/tracking what project teams are doing (Resource 9)**
- **Guidance on developing policy briefs and advocacy (Resource 19, 20 and 21).**

### Resources

1. Consensus building in common pool resources: a learning and communications programme for the PAPD methodology (R8223) Inception Report, 28th February 2003.
2. PD 124: Better Options for Integrated Floodplain Management – Uptake Promotion Communications Plan, *First Draft, April 2003*.
3. NRSP: Project R7958: Developing supportive policy environments for improved land management strategies – Nepal. Project Communication Strategy.
4. Aquaculture extension: Overview and a framework of options; A case study of aquaculture extension planning by a DFID research project in Eastern India. Malene Felsing and Graham Haylor. Institute of Aquaculture, University of Stirling, SCOTLAND. August, 1999.
5. Understanding the communication context in TESO and LANGO farming systems: The agricultural information scoping study. Alexis Turrall, Abby Mulhall, David Rees, Julius Okwadi, James Emerot, Robert Omadi. (Revised March 2002).
6. Communications consultancy for the COARD Project (Client Oriented Agricultural Research and Dissemination), Uganda, May 6th - 24th 2001, Patricia Norrish, Michael Ocilaje.
7. C. Mees, Communication strategy – DFID NRSP project R7668 Impact and amelioration of sediment and agro-chemicals in Caribbean coastal waters.
8. Nigel Bevan, Usability issues in web site design. 1998.  
<http://www.usability.serco.com/papers/usweb98.pdf>
9. Mande web site ([www.mande.co.uk/news.htm](http://www.mande.co.uk/news.htm)).
10. DFID NRSP (2002) Conceptual Impact Model (CIM).

Research Projects

---

11. DFID-NRSP (2002) Scaling-up and communication: Guidelines for enhancing the developmental impact of natural resources systems research. 8 pp.
12. P. Norrish, K.L. Morgan, M. Myers (2001) Improved communication strategies for renewable natural resource research outputs. Socio-economic Methodologies for Natural Resources Research. Best practice Guidelines. Chatham, UK: Natural Resources Institute
13. P. Norrish, K.L. Morgan, M. Myers (2001) Improved communication strategies for renewable natural resource research outputs. Annex: Practical aspects of communication media use. Socio-economic Methodologies for Natural Resources Research. Best practice Guidelines. Chatham, UK: Natural Resources Institute
14. C. Garforth (1998) Dissemination pathways for RNR research. Socio-economic Methodologies for Natural Resources Research. Best practice Guidelines. Chatham, UK: Natural Resources Institute.
15. Draft: Guidelines for planning a communications strategy for a natural resources project. COARD Project Uganda (no date)
16. A. Mulhall and A. Islam. R8223 (2003) Report on pre-testing and development of PAPD promotion leaflet. March 2003.
17. H.R. Folmer, M.N. Moynihan, P.M. Schothorst (no date) Testing and evaluating manuals: making health materials more useful. RTI: Amsterdam
18. Turongruang, D. and H. Demaine (2000). Participatory development of aquaculture extension materials and their effectiveness in transfer of technology: the case of the AIT Aqua Outreach Programme, Northeast Thailand. In: Rural aquaculture (eds. P. Edwards, D.C. Little and H. Demaine), pp. 0-00. Proceedings of the Special Session on Rural Aquaculture, The Fifth Asian Fisheries Forum, International Conference on Fisheries and Food Security Beyond the Year 2000, November 11-14, 1998, Chiang Mai, Thailand. Asian Institute of Technology, Bangkok and The Asian Fisheries Society, Manila.
19. Ritu. R. Sharma. An Introduction to Advocacy: Training Guide.  
<http://www.aed.org/democracy/publications>
20. Guidelines for Writing a Policy Brief. Johns Hopkins University.  
<http://jhunix.hcf.jhu.edu/~ktsai/policybrief.html>
21. ODI Research Programme on Research and Policy in Development.  
<http://www.odi.org.uk/RAPID/index.html>

These resources are available to download on the NRSP web site ([www.nrsp.co.uk](http://www.nrsp.co.uk)) or from the links given. They can also be provided by email, or on CD, on request to [nrsp@htsdevelopment.com](mailto:nrsp@htsdevelopment.com). Please include 'CP Guidelines' in the subject line of email requests.