MS TCDC
Training Centre for
Development Co-operation

Mission

MS Training Centre for Development Cooperation endeavors to **strengthen the capacity of civil society organizations and other stakeholders to empower people to question their situation and act to realize their vision of a dignified life.**

Training Report on

POLICY ANALYSIS AND ADVOCACY

Helen Keller International

Contact Person:

Beverly McIntyre, PhD
Senior Advisor, Food Security, Agriculture and Nutrition
Helen Keller International
bmcintyre@hki.org
www.hki.org

MS Training Centre for Development Cooperation
P.O.Box 254,
Arusha, Tanzania
Tel: 255 27 2553837/8/9
Mobile: 255 0744 651715
Email: mstcdc@mstcdc.or.tz
www.mstcdc.or.tz

8th - 12th November, 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS --**Page Number**

Appendixes:

1. Course Background

The training program on policy analysis and advocacy was organized for Helen Keller and their partners to enable them gain skills in Advocating for Orange Fresh Sweet Potatoes. It is becoming clear now that for any organization to be effective in their development work, there is need to be engaged in addressing the root causes of poverty, which go hand in hand with Human Rights and Human Needs. Policy analysis and Advocacy skills are now critical for improving effectiveness of CSO's work and the quality of the contribution the work makes to the lives of the poor people. Therefore, development practitioners in both public and private sector need to be equipped with Policy and Advocacy skills to enable their communities to realize their vision of dignified life. This course was tailor-made for Hellen-Keller partners working in Tanzania, Nigeria and Mozambique in order to enhance their skills in engaging with national and international community members on nutritional issues related to Vitamin A deficiency for women of child bearing age and their children.

2. Course Objectives and Contents

The main aim of the workshop was to equip participants with basic knowledge for effective advocacy work, in order to influence decision making processes regarding the uptake of Orange Fresh Sweet Potatoes to reduce Vitamin A deficiency amongst women of child bearing age and children.

The main aim of the training was to build the capacity of the participating organizations to:

- Gain confidence in engaging in policy dialogue with various government organs
- Map and analyse the socio-political landscape for advocacy engagement
- Identify how to strategically put out their advocacy issue
- Select strategies and areas of intervention according to their specific contexts and aim

The Course Contents included the following:

- Basic Concepts in Policy analysis and Advocacy

- Basic Tools in Policy Analysis

- Understanding the stages in the public policy processes

- Understanding what advocacy is all about

- Tools for advocacy work

- Working with the Media as a tool for Advocacy work

- Advocacy Strategy Development plans for their work in the field

  (a copy of the 5day program is annexed)

3. Course Participants

A total of 16 participants from Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Nigeria, Mozambique, USA, attended this tailor made course. These NSA are implementing projects which are supported by Hellen Keller International. A sample of the participants immediate learning needs were as follows:

- ➢ Lobbying at the local and regional Government Level
- ➢ Packaging advocacy issues
- ➢ Networking and sensitization at the grassroots
- ➢ Techniques in advocacy
- ➢ Working and engaging with the media for advocacy
- ➢ Working with advocacy issues that are not immediate needs of the communities
- ➢ Approaching decision makers

It was initially expected that there would be more policy engagement and learning how to work with Policy issue, but in the end, it was felt that participants needed to learn more on advocacy and to develop their advocacy strategic plans for their country programmes.

4. Training Methodology

The training approach was based on adult learning style taping on the participants experience and skills through group discussion and very interactive sessions. Participants were facilitated to share their experience and each session lecturet presentations, followed by group work and plenary discussion in order to ensure maximum participation of each individual and share experience from the various organizations represented. Media examples were also given to provide more concrete examples of advocacy issues.

The flexibility of the sessions allowed participants to also have time each end of the day to focus on their own team and organizational issues.

5. Setting the scene

The course was officially opened by the MS-TCDC management team who went through the introduction of the center and other logistical issues. After the opening ceremony, the course Coordinator went through the course overview.

According to the course schedule, the first day covered Policy Advocacy Concepts and its linkage to advocacy. Participants were given time to look at the policy making

environment and the spaces available for CSO's to engage with the government. The second covered policy making processes. It was important for the participants to understand the policy process and whom to engage with to push for policy support for their issue revolved around increased intake of the OFSP by women and children. The next two days explored the process of advocacy and the various strategies to develop a workable strategy. In between participants had time to learn how to engage with the media, network with like-minded organizations, and how to assess their organizations suitability for advocacy work. The last day of the training involved participants working on advocacy strategies, presenting the strategies and providing feedback to each other on how best to improve their strategies. Samples of the strategies are attached to the annexes. What follows is a presentation of the five days workshop and sample presentations from the participants, which are annexed in the appendices.

6. Workshop sessions

DAY 1 & 2: Conceptual Understanding of Policy

a) Objectives and expectations:

It was expected that day 1 of the workshop would lead to the following outputs:
  - ➢ *The meaning of Public Policy*
  - ➢ *Terminologies in Public Policy Making*
  - ➢ *Tools for Policy Analysis*
  - ➢ *Policy Environment*
  - ➢ *Analyzing the policy environment.*

b) Public Policy
To start with the facilitator said the word policy is commonly used in the different countries represented. However, many NGO's in wanting to be seen as non-partisan, non-political seem to stay away from issues of policies/politics. She explained that everyone had a role to play in helping draft, shape and implement policies and the civil society needed to be engaged in the whole process if the realization of ensuring their issue of OFSP was to be taken up seriously.

The facilitator started the session by making a presentation on the meaning of public policy. This was later discussed in the group and grey areas were explained.

To harmonise the facilitator said public policy has been defined variable by different authors but in a nutshell could be defined as statement of intention with specific objectives and means to achieve the objectives. Public policy is always linked with pragmatic and functional typically linked with questions of the government. Thus public policy is a tool to implement government mission/programmes. She said frameworks of policy include objectives, setting priorities, describing a plan and specifying decision rules. The facilitator said the government makes policy through statements and programmes.

CSO have a crucial role in advocacy to ensure that the public policies are formulated and implemented for the purpose of promoting peoples well being. She said without CSOs advocacy many development policies will fail to reduce poverty, which is both the government and the global commitment.

c) Basic tools for Policy Analysis
After introducing the meaning of Public Policy, the facilitator made a presentation on Policy analysis process. The following are exerts from that presentation.

Why analyze Policy?

The facilitator stated that to be effective and pro-active in advocating for any given policy it is important to analyze the policy to:

- Establish whether the policy exists? Sometimes there are problems because there is no written policy on a particular issue.
- Test its appropriateness in terms of solving the issue/problem that has been identified or whether it is the problem. *(i.e. there is no policy, policy is not implemented, policy has gaps)*
- Identify gaps and or omissions
- Establish whether the legal aspects have been provided for. In other words is there a related regulatory framework to back up the policy and is it adequate?
- Determine whether it can be/or is being implemented. Are there provisions in the policy or law on how to operationalize the policy framework? Who are the actors and what are their responsibilities? Are the resources adequate? Will they be provided? Be timely?
- Whether the necessary resources are available i.e. the need for technical expertise to assist in the analysis and articulation of the problem in the policy advocacy paper or platform and financial resources.

At this point participants were given questions to address regarding various policies they were interested in. **A sample of the question is provided in the appendix 1.**

d) Policy Analysis: Using which tools?

The facilitator explained that before one can analyze a policy, it is decide important what they want to do with the policy. Is it to implement it? Is it to look at the gaps? Is it to develop a policy that might not be in existences?

There are various steps that one can follow to analyze a policy. The following steps were presented during the power-point presentation:

1. The first tool is to gather the information about the policy – if a policy is documented acquire the policy documents and related statements, legislation and regulations or bye-laws. One of the best ways of gathering information is to conduct a quality/cost-effective research on the policy. Without proper research you will be unable to determine the origin, rationale and the critical issues surrounding the policy hence making your advocacy effort very difficult.

2. Read and be familiar with the background information to get both the historical perspective and context within which the policy operates. Find out:

- When it was made (*time assists to put things in their proper perspective)* and by whom?
- Who were the actors and how were they involved?
- Determine source of the policy (s*ome policies derive their legitimacy from global, regional and/or national conferences from which they derive their names. For example the Universal Primary Education initiative in Eastern and Southern Africa*

*emanates from the Dakar Framework of Action on EFA/World Conference on Education for Al*l

- ➢ Establish the rationale for making the policy including key problem being addressed;
- ➢ How is the policy linked to other sectors and with what implications?
- ➢ *Why is the policy important to you? What is its significance?*
- ➢ *Are there gaps in the Policy? Why do those gaps exist and how can you address this gaps.*

3. Examine other policies, laws, regional and international obligations and establish coherence or divergence with your policy, determine if policy will conflict with other regional or international policies and if there is need for harmonization? *The answer to these questions may have far reaching effects on the policy and at times render it impossible to implement.*

4. If in-house analytical capacity is unavailable, source external expert advice to improve the quality of your analysis.

5. Determine the impact of the policy especially on the poorest/most marginalized sectors of society by:

- ➢ Analyzing the policy for its equity dimensions: establish whether the policy is gender sensitive; whether it caters for marginalized groups-children, women, the disabled, nomads, street families, forest dwellers, people in conflict situations (refugees, IDPs)?

- ➢ What are the strengths and weaknesses (pros and cons) of the policy (SWOT analysis)? Who are benefiting from the current policy and who are losing out? For example – an import tariff imposed on imported sugar to counter smuggling and protect the local sugar industry may hurt other industries which import sugar as a raw material in their production e.g. the beverage making industry has to import sugar because what is on the local market is either insufficient or of poor quality. On the other hand, importers often dump cheap sugar onto the market thereby hurting local producers but benefiting local consumers (at least in the short run!).

7. What resources (human, financial and institutional) are available for the implementation of the policy? If policy has a budget, at what level is this controlled (central, local?) and with what consequences? Also consider whether there is equitable allocation of resources (for the implementation of the policy) as well as timely disbursement. Identify the implementers and their implementation strategies.

8. Conduct an analysis and mapping of the key stakeholders:

- ➢ Who are the key decision makers (primary targets)?
- ➢ Who has the power to change the policy (primary targets)?
- ➢ Who has influence over those with power to change policy (secondary targets)?
- ➢ Who is directly affected by this policy? Who is indirectly affected? – (Allies, constituencies)
- ➢ Which other people care enough about this issue to support our cause (allies)?

> ➢ Who else is working to change this policy and with what results (experiences, learning or lessons)?
> ➢ Who else would benefit from being involved in advocating on this policy (constituency)?

e) What Makes a Good Policy?

Having established the tools for policy analysis we can elicit basic criteria or attributes that make a good policy. A good policy:

> ➢ Promotes inclusiveness in the policy making process
> ➢ Fosters harmony with other policies – ability to address cross cutting issues
> ➢ Is beneficial to the largest number of people
> ➢ Does not marginalize or polarize sections of society
> ➢ Is allocated adequate resources
> ➢ Is implemented with the fewest possible constraints
> ➢ Recognizes social values and norms – e.g. culture, rights, customs
> ➢ Is regularly reviewed, evaluated and up-dated.

Identifying Policy Gaps:

Values	Satisfactory ☺	Fair 😐	Poor ☹	Remarks
Inclusiveness of policy making process				
Harmony with other policies				
Beneficial (stakeholders)				
Does not marginalize or polarize				
Allocated adequate/timely resources				
Adequate Implementation guidelines				
Recognizes social values and norms – e.g. culture, rights, customs				
Regular review				

Identifying policy gaps is key to identifying our entry point in the policy making process, laying our strategy for advocacy action and identifying who to bring on board from among relevant stakeholders.

DAY 3: Conceptual Understanding of Advocacy

a) Objectives of the Advocacy Sessions: Day 3

- o Understand the meaning of advocacy and related concepts
- o Conceptualize the reasons behind advocacy work
- o Explore the various activities/approaches/tools used in advocacy

b) What is Advocacy?

The facilitator asked the participants to explain their own understanding of what advocacy was and this is what was harmonized:

- ➢ To change something
- ➢ To speak for the poor
- ➢ To speak for the voices less
- ➢ To push for change within the government
- ➢ To work with government
- ➢ To work for the poor
- ➢ To help with community issues
- ➢ To bring to attention through the media
- ➢ To take part in changes
- ➢ To fight for a cause

After this buzz words, the facilitator followed with a short presentation on the meaning of advocacy. She gave the participants a list of definitions that are used to define advocacy. A few of them are:

- ➢ "Seeking with, and on behalf of, the poor to address the underlying causes of poverty by influencing the decisions of governments, companies, groups and individuals whose policies or actions affect the poor" Tearfund
- ➢ "A set of strategies that aims to defend and promote human rights regardless of race or religion, and with a particular emphasis on the most vulnerable groups" WV Latin America
- ➢ "To plead the cause of another" Chambers English Dictionary
- ➢ "The promotion of a specific message and/or course of action in order to influence or contribute to the development and implementation of public policies which will alleviate the causes and consequences of poverty" Oxfam

The facilitator also explained that Advocacy can be done **By the Poor, For the Poor, and with the Poor.** For communities to reach a level where they feel that they can actually do it themselves, they have to be empowered enough to be able to carry it out on their own.

Empowerment included having a voice, a voice to ask questions, and this takes place after various interventions have taken place such as awareness raising, trainings, and working one on one with the poor.

The facilitator concluded by explaining to the participants that as advocates, we are mainly concerned with:

a) Who decides: legislators, heads of state, appointed officials, policy-makers, judges, ministers, boards of advisors, managing directors, administrators, etc.

b) What is decided: laws, policies, priorities, regulations, services, programs, institutions, budgets, statements, party platforms, appointments, etc.

c) How decisions are made: accessibility of citizens to information and the decision making process, extent of consultation with the direct say of citizens; accountability and responsiveness of decision makers to citizens and other stakeholders, etc.

d) How decisions are enforced, implemented, and evaluated: ensuring accountability so that decisions are put into action, laws enforced equitably, etc.

Other concepts involved with Advocacy were introduced which included: Human Rights, Accountability, Lobbying, Legitimacy and Accountability. This was done through a power-point presentation.

c) Advocacy Cycle

Once the participants came up with issues, the facilitator explained that the issues follow stages which are defined as advocacy cycle shown

DAY 4: WORKING WITH THE MEDIA AND COALITION BUILDING

Objectives of Day 4:
1. To Understand the process of engaging with the Media
2. To gain from examples presented on media engagements
3. To understand how to build partnerships with like-minded organizations

The fourth day sessions addressed the issue of working with each other and working with coalitions. One thing that came out clearly was that because the participants were working in different contexts, within very different governing structures, meaning each context was different. The facilitator for the day started the session by explaining that for any advocacy to take place well, teamwork both within and outside the organization was of essence. The participants felt that as an organization they worked together as a strong team, however, more efforts needed to be put in place for coalitions to work.

e) Working in Coalitions, Networks, and Teams
In Buzz groups, the participants were asked to explain the differences between Coalitions, Networks and Teams. After their presentation, the facilitator explained the following differences;

a) **Coalitions:**

Coalitions are groupings of different organizations pursuing a common cause in a coordinated fashion.

Coalitions are useful in advocacy work because they enable organizations to:
☐ Share resources;
☐ Involve a larger number of actors to widen outreach and have a bigger impact on the policy process;

☐ Achieve synergy. This is achieved through scale economies, more efficiency (reduced wastage of resources), more effective use of resources (better targeting of resources) and louder voice;
☐ Reduce competition for funding and support;
☐ Benefit from strength in diversity because different groups bring different skills, knowledge and resources to the coalition.

b) **Networks:**
➢ A network consists of individuals or organizations who share information, ideas, resources or goals to accomplish individual or group goals Networking is a process of acquiring resources and building power by using or creating linkages between two or more individuals, groups, or organizations. It provides a valuable tool for getting things done
➢ We can have greater impact on our goals by using networks and coalitions as major tools to multiply our power and efforts

After the Presentation, the participants were asked to discuss the following questions:

☐ *Who would be best to work with?*
☐ *For what specific benefits?*
☐ *What would be the limitations/challenges of working in such a coalition?*
This was done in a round table discussion. Participants were given opportunity to decide whom they would like to work with in a coalition and the reasons why they had chosen that organization. For instance, most groups choose to work with the media group for they felt that getting involved with Media would help them highlight the issues more.

DAY FIVE : DEVELOPING AN ADVOCACY STRATEGY

After the explanation on the day before over what advocacy strategies were all about, the participants were now moved to the next level of developing an advocacy strategy. It was expected that at the end of the day the participants would:

> ➢ Objectives of Strategy Development
> ➢ Understand the Process of identifying a problem
> ➢ Understand the process of doing an advocacy strategy
> ➢ Develop an Advocacy strategy for their work

a) Advocacy Strategy: The Steps:

Step One. Problem Identification:

Problem identification involved developing an issue that would be worked on as part of the advocacy work. The facilitator introduced a table to help identify the issue that an organization could work on and the questions that would help them throughout the whole process of identification.

ISSUE SLECTION FRAMEWORK

CRITERIA FOR SELECTING AN ISSUE	*SCORE*		
The Issue Affects Many people			
The issue has a significant impact of the community			
The issue is consistent with your organization mandate			
The issue is consistent with national strategic plan			
The issue is amenable to advocacy interventions			
The issue can mobilize a large number of interested stakeholders			
Total Score			

b) Step Two: Goals and Objectives:

The facilitator explained the process of identifying the goals and objectives was the same as the process used while working on project objectives. The objectives needed to be SMART, have a timeline for achieving results based on the budget, and be able to achieve the results. The facilitator told the participants that Advocacy work was the most challenging because unlike projects which were tied to achievable results within a given framework, advocacy work took a long, long time to achieve results hence can be very frustrating, She can an example of issues that dealt with behavior change in a community, for instance in the case where an organization is advocating for safe sexual behavior, it might take years to change people's way of behaving. Other issues that take a long time to change are cultures and traditions (early marriages, FGM, Land inheritance etc). Advocacy entails not only advocating for changes in policy, implemementation of policies, but also

community advocacy, where this policies need to be implemented. The groups were asked to come up with Goals and objectives for their chosen issues and it is annexed within the annexes.

c) Step Three Stakeholders Analysis:
The facilitator introduced the matrix for stakeholders' analysis as shown below:

IDENTIFICATION AND ANALYSIS OF STAKEHOLDERS: (Advocacy Audience Analysis)

Stakeholders Category	Sub-Groups
Decision Makers	
Partners	
Resistant Groups	

Since the stakeholders had already been introduced earlier, the facilitator simply explained the important of identifying all of the people who were to be involved directly and indirectly with the advocacy work. She further explained the importance of identifying all the resistant groups and think of ways to work with them as they could mean the success of failure of the advocacy strategy. Stakeholders' matrixes that were done by the groups are found in Annexes.

d) Selecting Advocacy Communication Tools:
For Advocacy work to be effective, involving the right people and use the right channel of communication was very important. It was explained that depending on the group that one is targeting the channel of communication differs. If one was targeting the community, the message developed and how it was presented was very different from if one was communicating with the government leaders.

Communication at community Level:
There are various ways of communicating with the community.
- *Face to face in Bazaars*
- *Focus group discussions,*
- *Popular Theatre,*
- *Radio, and advertisements*
- *Fact Sheets*
- *Still Pictures with Short Messages*

The facilitator also explained that it was important to:
- *Use multiple entry points (build on what is already available e.g. community health workers, schools, rural banks)*
- *Use multiple communication techniques that are participatory in nature (e.g. community theatre) but also include mass communication (e.g. radio, posters)*

The panel discussion led to further understandings of scenarios that the above communication tools could be used, at the community level.

b) Communication at leadership level:
For various government leaders, both at the local and regional levels, the facilitator explained that the best mode of communicating is through:

- Pressurizing
- Petition
- Lobbying
- Negotiation
- Dialogue/ Lobbying
- Mobilizing
- Debating
- Use of Mass Media

The facilitator went through the above terms and explained what each term meant. This was also done using panel discussion and a Movie whereby the participants explained further what they understood by the terminologies and any experience they had had with them.

c) Communication with Allies and Partners:
Just like the mode of communication with community was important and used various tools, the same case applied to communicating with the allies; various techniques were explained to be essential whilst communicating with other like-minded groups. These techniques included:
- Reports
- Journals/Articles
- Letters
- Fact Sheets
- Background reports
- Research

The groups were then given the table below to work on:

Developing Core Advocacy Messages			
Stakeholder/Audience Analysis	**Issue/Problem**	**Message Tool/s**	**Advocacy Message**

This appendix was put together within the strategy development matrix.

The process started by asking the participants within the groups to identify an issue that they would like to work on. Since they were already working with various issues they decided to continue with those issues instead of developing new one. They needed to identify who their stakeholders were, the message they needed to deliver to the

stakeholders and the technique they would use to deliver the message. **Samples of the Participants Strategies are included in the appendix.**

G) Strategy Development:

Each group developed a strategy that they would further develop for the actual work on the ground. Due to time limitations, the strategies were provided as examples for further work that the groups would pursue on their own when they moved back to their contexts. The session ended with both an oral and written evaluation of the 5 day program and next steps for working with advocacy work.

Appendix 1: Summary of Evaluations

	Improved Knowledge
1.	**Has the training improved your knowledge?** **Comments:** • There was so much to learn in a short time, highly appreciated • Policy analysis is new to me, but I have learned so much • The training was very engaging and enriching • The facilitator was highly skilled and kept us engaged • The skills were well delivered, in a participatory manner. • The group work was very enriching • Course creativity • Well packaged presentation • The course was very inclusive of all participants • Use of different training methods enriches learning • Now I know have an idea on how to work on strategies • I understanding the need to conducting a full analysis of the needs of the people
2.	**Suggestions for Improving the Course:** Need more time for some particular topics to allow for slow learners More specific element of tailor making Prior briefing to facilitator about the organization and project Less use of PowerPoint's Need to be longer to allow participants to internalize and think about the course Need more training in Policy analysis Due to time limitations, I feel the policy analysis part needs to be done again There is a need for a TOT for those on the ground More on Policy analysis strategies is needed If assignments are given in advance, there should be allocated time to ensure that this is integrated into the course More time in the groups The learning environment Is very good. Keep it up. The day off was not necessary, we could have used it for more learning More future trainings are needed particularly in partnership development and sustainability

LEARNING POINTS and WAYFORWARD FOR POLICY AND ADVOCACY WORK

The group closed the 5 days training with an oral evaluation of the program and a discussion regarding some of the key follow-up issues they would be putting out as their Action Plans. It was agreed that each platform would develop its own action Plans which would be shared with the platform and the partners. Other recommendations made included:

1. ToT to be conducted for each partners at the community level
2. Partners to go fully develop their own advocacy plans and share with the New Advocacy Advisor
3. A more indepth training conducted on analysing policies, lobbying and negotiating with government officials

Recommendations from the Facilitator

1. Five days of training on both policy and advocacy is too short. Under normal circumstances we have policy for 5days and advocacy for 5days. In order for the participants to fully understand how to analyze policies, 3-4days were needed. Another 2-3 days were need to discuss on various ways to engage an lobby to government officials. Time was taken by organizational discussions. In the future it is important to set 1-2 days where the organization can concentrate of discussion of partner issues.