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1. Agenda setting
Define the problem (identify causes, size and who is affected, and where) and define associated objectives

2. Policy Analysis
Frame questions, assess past performance and future options, techno-socio-economics viability, and prioritise

3. Policy Formulation
a. Draft policy
b. Design implementation process (strategy)

4. Policy Adoption
Process (technical committee, cabinet, parliament approvals)

5. Policy implementation
Actions: What by who, when and where, what scale

6. Policy Evaluation
Monitoring, management and evaluation

The lonely step in STI Policy Making: Implementation
• Politicians make policies while bureaucrats implement
  • Is there a clear separation of roles;
  • Politicians & policy implementation

• Policies are good in design but poorly implemented
  • Is there a clear plan/strategy in place? Is it realistic?

• Poor stakeholder engagement?
  • Do they have any stake, which stake, how large or how small?
  • Are roles clearly defined, commitment secured or arbitrarily assigned?

• Fragmentation, duplication of efforts or competition?

• Policy and inaction
  • Codified or uncodified, is policy action needed?
  • Lack of policy results IS NOT action?
…“failure is rarely unequivocal and absolute…even policies that have become known as classic policy failures also produced small and modest successes”.

**Appreciating some causes of implementation failure**

- **Manage political commitment**
  - Vested interests of stakeholders and their interests and relationships
  - Enhance their absorptive capacity of complex and interlinked issues (e.g. 4IR)
  
  *High political commitment is often a disadvantage to success (need space to experiment)*

- **Overly optimistic policy agendas**
  - Beyond reach? Resource, technological and industrial targets that are unattainable, etc.

- **Inadequate coordination arrangements**
  - Governance of mechanisms for knowledge exchange (silo!), shared vision and interests, etc.

- **Poor collaborative problem-solving platforms**
  - A platform where key players meet periodically, review progress, make adjustments

- **Rapidly revolving political cycle**
  - Short-term gains, low hanging fruits and so forth versus long-term and strategic outcomes
The case of Zambia NSTP 1996
# Goals and Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Enhancing linkages between technology research institutes, the private and public sector to encourage demand-driven research and development;</td>
<td>“embed science and technology [in] key sectors for promoting competitiveness in the production of a wider range of quality goods and services”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Developing and sustaining a national scientific and technological capacity and providing highly skilled human resource for increased productivity in the economy;</td>
<td>• Recognizing gender concern;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fostering national and international linkages for enhanced technology transfer; and</td>
<td>• changing institutional structure;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Facilitating the acquisition, adaptation and utilization of foreign technology.</td>
<td>• ensuring that research is guided by national developmental goals;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• establishing a mechanism for increased innovation, transfer, diffusion and commercialization of technology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The main asks

1. Separate R&D from policy advice and technology commercialization
2. Establish the Depart. of S&T in the Ministry
3. Establish post of S&T Advisor to the President
4. Create S&T Development Fund and Venture Fund
5. Introduce tax breaks for R&D, commercialization, licensing and other tech inputs
6. Allocate 3% of GDP to S&T
Implementation

Accomplished

✓ Separate R&D from policy advice and commercialization
  
  \textit{NISIR for R&D, NCST for Advice and NTBC for ToT created}

✓ Establish the Depart of S&T

✓ Introduce tax breaks for R&D, commercialization, licensing and other tech inputs
  
  Most already existed for public and private R&D, tech transfer and capital goods

Not accomplished

✗ Establish post of S&T Advisor to the President

✗ Create S&T Development Fund and Venture Capital (VC) Fund
  
  ☐ Some funds but not VC or standalone funds

✗ Allocate 3\% of GDP to S&T
  
  ☐ No too ambitious and unrealistic
Internal conflicts or interests? (Case of Science Advisor)

➢ The Head of NCSR was automatically Science Advisor to, appointed by, and reported to the President and; Chaired or was board member of other public R&D entities. The 1996 policy changed in favour of independent office. STI community *Lost both*

Unclear mandates (case of VC)

➢ None of the entities could run a venture capital fund - NTBC can neither take equity in nor give loans to firms. *Legally not feasible*

Unreasonable ask (case of 3% of GDP)

➢ Very few countries meet R&D expenditure of 3% of GDP – none at Zambia’s level of economic development ever.

➢ 3% of GDP is about 8-10% of national budget (more than the entire budget for Health or Education). *Over-optimistic/ unrealistic*

Strong political commitment? (case of institutions)

➢ Almost all institutions established, benefited the same teams championing the policy - *Extremely inward looking*
Implementation – beyond good expectations

- As a lonely step and happens late
  - Several meetings, travels and teams involved in formulation but almost NONE in implementation
- Assumed to be logical progression
  - Goal determine institutions, institutions determine outcomes, but rather complex, non-linear and in everchanging environment (cases of Internet, mobile, biotech)
- The links between goals and the planned actions
  - “… embed science and technology [in] key sectors for promoting competitiveness in the production of a wider range of quality goods and services” and establishment of institutions…is weak
- Implementation always bring new issues on the agenda
  - ‘Things never go as planned’ – one route to the President was cut and new one was not created
- Blurring distinctions between policy formulation and implementation (e.g. health decisions are self-implementing and similarly renaming NCSR to NISIR – required just change in law-made it even weaker in all aspects)
- Absence of an implementation plan (e.g. Acts establishing institutions include all key details like a plan) but outcomes and goals require Acts more than Acts/laws – require ACTION!
What are the targets of your national STI on agriculture?
Exceptional shortfall in food supplies

- Central African Republic: Conflict, population displacement, high food prices, floods
- Kenya: Drought conditions
- Niger: Conflict, shortfall in cereal production
- Somalia: Drought conditions, civil insecurity

Widespread lack of access

- Burundi: Weather extremes, high food prices
- Chad: Civil insecurity, shortfall in cereal production
- Democratic Republic of the Congo: Civil insecurity in eastern areas, high food prices
- Djibouti: Unfavourable weather, high food prices
- Eritrea: Macroeconomic challenges
- Ethiopia: Conflict in Tigray Region, drought conditions in southeastern areas, high food prices
- Malawi: Localized shortfalls in cereal production, high food prices
- Nigeria: Conflict in northern areas, localized shortfalls in cereal production, high food prices
- South Sudan: Economic downturn, floods, civil insecurity
- Zimbabwe: High food prices
Understanding the major causes of policy implementation failure in your environment can inform the design of measures to enhance policy implementation and effectiveness.

The boundaries between policy formulation and implementation may be blurred and raise issues that may need policy action.

No policy fails or succeeds absolutely: design a clear implementation plan while being flexible to changes that may will arise.
Thank you.