**Case study Activity 3 task description**

**Making the case to others**

Participants assume the roles of: 1) decision makers (Sugar industry owner/ manager/ farmer / sector ministries (energy, agriculture, industry) and 2) potential advocacy groups (Environment agency (NEMA)/ EU delegation/ civil society)

Each stakeholder has a set of interests and also a set of capacities (the report and background material gives indications about these and a summary annex on stakeholders is attached). There is also a set of actions that the sector has a whole could do (simplified from the background report)

There would be three groups: a first group of the decision makers that need to be convinced about mainstreaming environment and implementing the mitigating and other measures and then two “advocacy” groups (environment agency, EUD and civil society) that will make the case.

The decision makers will form a panel - and two “advocacy” groups will present a case which the panel will judge and question. The panel will then decide which made the better case and took account of both capacity and vested interests and set a realistic ambition level

10’ for additional reading; 20’ for group discussion and cards; 30’ for plenary presentation to panel; 20 for summing up and discussion. Allow 1½hrs

**Annex on stakeholders**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Stakeholder** | **Interests** | **Capacities** |
| Sugar factory owner (private and government) | Safe guard investment  Adjust production costs to reduce impact of tariff changes  Vested interests to slow privatisation  Expand production areas (new mills) | Government factories have lower capacity  New investors tend to have high capacity |
| Manager/ workers | Profitable operation that safe guards employment so operations are not on a skeleton budget  Simplify operations and reduce complexity | Vary depending on whether government or private (old or new) |
| Farmer (Kenya sugar growers association) | High price for cane and steady dependable sales  Safe working conditions  Sucrose cane payment system  Improved research and extension services | Many grower associations under the KESMA umbrella are weak  Poor cane husbandry  High transport costs |
| Sector Ministries  (sugar board; research bodies) | Safeguard the Kenyan sugar industry  Reduce the subsidy and sugar price disparity  Ensure continued rural employment | Low staff capacities and recurrent budget |
| NEMA | Environmental and climate impact understood  Compliance with relevant regulations  Exploit opportunities to improve the environment, reduce emissions and adapt to CC  Habitat protection; Soil erosion | Capacity and budget available to monitor and enforce regulations is limited |
| EUD | Reduce risks of collapse of the sugar due the slow pace of privatization / reform | Limited resources to monitor |
| Civil society | Competition for land, given increasing population (Western Kenya) Land use change  Competition for access to water  Water pollution from sugar mill effluent | Access to information is weak  Do not act with one voice |